You Are Whatever I Say You Are: White Dominance Over the Identity of Enslaved Black Peoples

**Abstract**

This article analyzes the fluidity of Black identities created, maintained, and destroyed by white plantation holders to maintain white supremacy and economic advantages. It argues that as wealth began to flow from plantations, the identities of enslaved individuals morphed. From heathen, ‘brutish,’ wild peoples needing to be controlled to chattel property able to be manipulated and bred, to rebels and fugitives whose actions justified violence to maintain white dominance and economic status quo. This article seeks to demonstrate how contemporary Black identities within the greater society continue to be influenced by religious and codified identities enacted by white men in power. It asks us to critically engage with how we are complicit in enforcing specific identities onto Black communities. Through this analysis, the link between wild heathens and violent criminals within societal perceptions can be illustrated.

“I must have them…[I] cannot get along without them, unless at considerable loss of time and money, and at a great inconvenience.”[[1]](#footnote-0) The sentiment held by this Antebellum South plantation owner regarding the necessity of owning more enslaved people seems to have been a shared sentiment amongst all slaveholders in the area, given the flippant passing of IOUs with enslaved names quickly scribbled on them.[[2]](#footnote-1) Historian Walter Johnson discusses the common practice of Antebellum Southern men—both slave owners and those desirous of becoming one—to use the bodies of African and Caribbean individuals as equivalencies to cash to purchase land, mortgages, business investments, or settling debts.[[3]](#footnote-2) The two-hundred-year practice of institutionalized slavery by European nations and their colonies not only economically benefitted plantation owners but the settler colonies within the United States and the Caribbean—the effects of which can be felt in the present.[[4]](#footnote-3) The desire to maintain wealth and status enabled existing and aspiring slaveholders to change perceptions of Black identities over time to their advantage. As wealth increased, creating Southern ‘sugar barons,’ the identities of Black individuals decreased to the extent that most of the white population settling within the colonies could scarcely believe them to be a “race of beings.”[[5]](#footnote-4) Black identities transitioned from heathen, “brutish,” wild peoples needing to be controlled to chattel property able to be manipulated and bred to rebels and fugitives whose actions justified violence to maintain white dominance and economic status quo.[[6]](#footnote-5)

As Europeans settled within the southern colonies of Virginia, North Carolina, Massachusetts and the Caribbean, the transition from indentured servitude toward slavery began in the Jamestown colony in Virginia. The coincidental landing of the *White Lion* slave ship introduced settlers to ships holding kidnapped Africans and a captain ready to barter enslaved people for supplies.[[7]](#footnote-6) The ease of purchasing lifelong labour and the frequency of slave ships willing to enter business with the colonies enabled planters to see the worth of a potential lifelong servant.[[8]](#footnote-7) Having someone bound to an individual or family to work in the home or on the land was not a new concept. Upon arrival and throughout European settlement, indentured servants accompanied their employers or were sent to the colonies by the Virginia Company. Bound by contract, these individuals were controlled for a set period to perform the labours of their employers until they had paid off their debt—or completed their contract. [[9]](#footnote-8) However, the happenstance docking of the *White Lion* started the progressive creation of racial identities and the use of these identities to benefit one’s economic prosperity.[[10]](#footnote-9) The potential economic benefit was not the only justification for transitioning away from indentured servitude. Settlers understood the premise of slavery prior to the arrival of the *White Lion*. Typically, those who were non-Christian, “infidels or heathens,” were punished by way of slavery, and prior to arriving in the colonies, various countries within Europe had aspects of slavery, making it an unpracticed concept by the English, but not an unheard-of concept.[[11]](#footnote-10) Thus, the lack of Christian faith separated the kidnapped Africans from their captors and provided another benefit to taking up slavery. Unlike indentured servants, their bondage as labourers had no expiry date. As colonies like Virginia began to develop their economy through cash crops, the need for labour increased dramatically.[[12]](#footnote-11) Planters could rely on servants, but the exponential growth of cash crops and the servants’ eventual contractual end date provided uncertainty in maintaining production and its associated wealth.

Moreover, unlike the servants who looked like them, settlers recognized visible distinctions between their looks and the Africans. Furthermore, concepts of witchcraft, cannibalism and devotion to totem deities accompanied European understandings of Africans, making them believe that they were “surrounded by savages and barbarians.”[[13]](#footnote-12) With different languages, skin colour, religion, clothing or cultural practices, it was apparent from the outset that Africans brought to the Americas were “exotic…mysterious… [and full of] savagery.”[[14]](#footnote-13) Outside the mainland colonies, perceptions of exotic-looking heathens with black bodies found their way into Caribbean colonies. Richard Ligon described his experiences while living in Barbados in 1657 and illustrated the different perceptions of African identities compared to indentured servants or colonists. Ligon—an English settler hoping to increase his status through owning a plantation—shares how newly arrived enslaved were inspected before being purchased like horses, stating, “the strongest, youthfullest [sic], and most beautifull [sic], yield the greatest prices.”[[15]](#footnote-14) Unlike indentured servants who arrived in the colonies and were immediately guided to their new homes on the plantation, Africans arrived naked and were thoroughly inspected.[[16]](#footnote-15) The difference in treatment upon arrival illustrates the inherent understanding that while both were bound to the master, one could become free and equal. At the same time, the other would remain inferior and captive.

Legal documents like the 1661 Barbados Slave Code further illustrated the perception of Black racial inferiority. The Code condemned ‘negroes’ as “heathenish, brutish, and an uncertaine dangerous kinde of people [sic].”[[17]](#footnote-16) By focusing on two of the most significant differences—religion and skin tone—planters saw the economic benefit of transitioning from indentured servitude to enslavement. Societal mores surrounding the inability to enslave Christian whites meant that, at most, indentured servants were guaranteed labour for the short term.[[18]](#footnote-17) On the other hand, the beliefs of “heathen brutes” that deserved to be controlled by “civilized” white Christians explains the transition in the late 1690s to enslaved people becoming the main source of labour within the colonies.[[19]](#footnote-18) Similarly, should planters doubt imposed viewpoints on enslaved Africans, the influence of the church and its interpretation of biblical verses might have caused one to reaffirm the enslaving of the “Sons of Ham.”[[20]](#footnote-19)

The transition of economic labour from indentured servants to enslaved individuals occurred as planters saw captured Africans as heathens. By associating heathens with a lack of civility, planters began to recognize how visible, religious, linguistic and cultural dichotomies between the two “races” could justify the lifetime enslavement of an inferior race while ensuring the stability of their plantation labour force. Unfortunately, the influx of slave labour created a disproportionate slave population in the colonies, which undermined white supremacy and required adjusting perceptions of enslaved people from heathens to chattel. The influx of enslaved people throughout the Caribbean and mainland colonies to maintain plantation output created a disproportionately high number of enslaved people compared to white colonists. Many planters within the Caribbean were nervous that enslaved people might view the unequal demographics as an opportunity to rise in rebellion against their owners.[[21]](#footnote-20) Viewing enslaved people as inferior would not prevent such fears. The concept of being chattel would accompany enslaved people’s identities well into the 19th century. In 1645, the Massachusetts *Body of Liberties* introduced the concept of enslaved Africans as chattel into the legislation. By the start of 1661, Barbados enacted legislation protecting the institution of slavery through racial codification.[[22]](#footnote-21) Subsequently, other colonies enacted their slave laws based on Barbados’s Act. Using legislation to define enslaved people as physical property, white Southerners could justify capturing and indiscriminately buying or selling enslaved people without undermining their Christian duty or considering the lasting consequences to couples or families. Thus, when abolitionists like Banneker contend that a Christian has a duty to “extend their power and influence to the relief of every part of the human race, from…burden or oppression,” legislation determined that enslaved or born free Black individuals were not human and therefore not owed any sort of relief by Southern Christians.[[23]](#footnote-22)

Throughout Southern patriarchal slave societies, legislation regarding slavery became increasingly gendered. Virginia’s 1662 *Hereditary Slavery* *Law* and Louisiana’s 1724 *Code Noir* outlined that a matrilineal designation would only be applied to enslaved Black women.[[24]](#footnote-23) By having enslaved women’s children follow her family line, owners were guaranteed to increase enslaved people in perpetuity.[[25]](#footnote-24) Slaveholders saw the long-term economic benefit of buying women of ideal reproductive age and breeding them through “unwanted matings” with enslaved men or themselves.[[26]](#footnote-25) Historian Kathleen Brown argues that the ability to be born into slavery “strengthened the appearance that slavery was a natural condition for people of African descent,” thereby viewing newborn children as naturally the slaveholder’s property and not tied to their parents.[[27]](#footnote-26) Children born into slavery provided slaveholders and their families time to mould them into ‘ideal’ enslaved people, which previously enslaved children indicated was through brutal processes.[[28]](#footnote-27) As children were introduced to the world of slavery, learning their roles on plantations was taught and reinforced through experiences of floggings, beatings, whippings, and any other means of violence, the slaveholder felt would help their ‘lesson’ sink in.[[29]](#footnote-28)

Enslavers benefitted from the practice of chattel slavery. However, they used the work of slave traders to differentiate themselves from the barbaric practices of slave trading. How they treated enslaved people on their plantation, away from prying eyes, was one thing, yet, in public and at the slave market, planters used any means necessary to differentiate and exonerate themselves and their practices from the slave traders.[[30]](#footnote-29) Although it was not the traders who codified racial identities into the legal system, viewing traders as the professionals who marketed enslaved people created a hierarchy of civility.[[31]](#footnote-30) By focusing on differences in mannerisms, dress, crude language or hygiene, planters viewed themselves as well-bred and in a position of civility where the threat of selling their slaves did not make them evil. Instead, the trader was the brutal, uncivilized man willing to kidnap and destroy families by forcing them into slavery. Often owners viewed themselves as engaging in slavery only when some justified reason or happenstance required them to sell their slaves. Johnson argues that debts, angry wives, division of a deceased’s will and punishment for some perceived actions were often used by planters as justification for engaging in the slave market.[[32]](#footnote-31) Thus the significant distinction between planters and traders seems to be the perception by planters that markets and slavery existed because of traders who ran the markets. To them, the traders ensured enslaved people were ever-present and always for sale, whereas planters required specific circumstances to occur in order to engage with the slave market.[[33]](#footnote-32)

Regardless of who supposedly was less civilized for upholding chattel slavery, owners’ actions in the markets accentuate their understanding of enslaved people as physical property, not human beings. As traders lined enslaved people up for inspection, owners would walk along the line slowly, “[running] their hands over [the] bodies…rubbing their muscles, fingering their joints, and kneading their flesh.”[[34]](#footnote-33) Women who had the potential to be bred experienced potential buyers grabbing their breasts and feeling their stomachs, trying to determine each woman’s “reproductive history and capacity,” which could benefit or hinder the buyer’s economic output through labour growth or deficit.[[35]](#footnote-34) Traders and buyers used racialized definitions and descriptions to illustrate the worth of each enslaved person, defend the price expected or offered, and each enslaved person’s potential health and work ethic.[[36]](#footnote-35) Throughout the Southern colonies—and eventually, the Southern states—traders would describe their “merchandise,” and the owners would physically ‘read’ the bodies to determine the truth of such descriptions.[[37]](#footnote-36)

Outside of the slave market, identities of being chattel were evident in the way owners used enslaved people for business and in their daily dealings with other Southerners. Should an owner go into debt, gamble himself into a hole, require more land, or desire to get into investing, their slaves became their collateral.[[38]](#footnote-37).[[39]](#footnote-38) Within the Louisiana *Code Noir* (1791), enslaved people were “movables,” part of the owner’s “acquests,” ensuring that all enslaved people could be “divided among co-heirs”—again, legally illustrating that Black identities were equal to that of non-animated property.[[40]](#footnote-39) Inanimate objects carry no feelings and are oblivious when purchased as a set or divided upon selling them. Why, then, would slaveholders, slave traders, and all those who benefitted from the institution of slavery consider their role in destroying families? The perception of enslaved individuals as chattel destroyed Black identities and families. Daily “promises, obligations and settlements” between slaveholders by way of slave IOUs perpetuated the belief that Black bodies had an inherent value that could be “cashed in when the occasion arose.”[[41]](#footnote-40) Regardless of the intent or reasoning behind each sale, the inevitability of being sold brought fear and insecurity into enslaved people’s daily lives.[[42]](#footnote-41) Within interstate sales alone, “twenty-five percent [destroyed] a…marriage, and fifty percent destroyed a nuclear family…many of these separating children under the age of thirteen from their parents.[[43]](#footnote-42) Unfortunately, Christian family values did not extend to these families.

After American Independence in the 18th century, many enslaved saw a change that Americans had not expected, much less deemed possible—freedom. Throughout the world, abolition was beginning. Abolition brought an opportunity to run away from bondage and towards freedom or find ways to earn money and buy one’s freedom.[[44]](#footnote-43) Moreover, slaveholders were unaware of how they helped create confidence to rebel against slavery before and after 1776. As they talked of their fears of the rebellions of Stono, New York, or Haiti, owners did not think of their slaves working around them, listening intently to the successful attempts to overthrow oppressors.[[45]](#footnote-44) America’s rebellion against England was a direct example to enslaved peoples that rebellions could be successful. More importantly, it highlighted the hypocrisy of Americans who justified their rebellion by refusing to be treated by England in the same manner they treated their slaves.[[46]](#footnote-45) Therefore, the abolitionist movement meant very different things to enslaved people and slaveholders; for one, it was a beacon of hope, a chance to overcome and resist on a large scale. While for the other, the rise of rebellions shifted Black identities from chattel to rebels and fugitives requiring forced dominance and submission, respectively.

The rise of abolition and buying one’s freedom provided opportunities for Black Americans who were freed to call out the hypocrisy of Americans. Born into freedom, Benjamin Banneker wrote to Thomas Jefferson. He pointedly called attention to how “pitiable” it was that Americans could justify their rebellion while actively continuing to use “fraud and violence” to maintain slavery.[[47]](#footnote-46) It was hypocritical for enslavers—like Jefferson—to use violence against domestic acts of rebellion while also wanting liberty for themselves.[[48]](#footnote-47) Frederick Douglass, who ran away and later bought his freedom, voiced similar frustrations sixty-one years after Banneker.[[49]](#footnote-48) Pointing out the “immeasurable distance” between white freedom and Black bondage, Douglass stated that the irony of American liberty needed to be exposed, and Americans’ conscience “must be roused” (Douglass, 1852).[[50]](#footnote-49) Unfortunately, Banneker and Douglass represented an anomaly within American society. Their rebellion against slavery through words was inaccessible to the enslaved. Although Banneker and Douglass could capture the ear of white Americans within society and government, they were largely unsuccessful in convincing Americans that abolition and the lives of enslaved Black individuals outweighed the economic benefits for the Southern states and the country as a whole. Those still in bondage used their enslaver’s economic ambition to help gain their freedom. Many enslaved men and women had opportunities to work on steamboats along the Mississippi as their owners used their slaves to engage in river commerce.[[51]](#footnote-50) Being away from the watchful eyes of their owners and overseers, Black workers, both free and enslaved, worked together on boats and created a network of connections all along the Mississippi, which “nourished collective challenges to authority.”[[52]](#footnote-51) Although slave owners knew that their slaves would be in direct contact with freemen, the growth of the Southern river economy and the wealth to be made from it overpowered fears of runaway slaves.[[53]](#footnote-52)

In a country dominated by white supremacy, Southern states enacted laws to circumvent potential revolts through fines, jailing free Black people while docked, and pass systems for enslaved people working on the boats ensuring they had their master’s permission.[[54]](#footnote-53) Fortunately for enslaved peoples, the ability to escape to freedom through the river system was still fruitful, thanks to the networks they had created. Historian Thomas Buchanan states that thousands escaped through the river system by relying on accomplices, forging passes, pretending to be white through fancier dress, hiding away in boxes, or pretending to be a white passenger’s slave.[[55]](#footnote-54) As more enslaved people found ways to escape bondage, they became fugitives. Slaveholders posted notices about missing fugitive slaves, sent men to hunt them down, and appealed to the government to create laws around assisting slave escapes.[[56]](#footnote-55)

The escaping fugitives were not the only cause of frustration for enslavers. Throughout the 19th century, an increasing number of enslaved people began to incite rebellions or organized resistance against their plantation owners. One such example came in 1831 when preacher Nat Turner organized a rebellion against Virginian planters in which every white person found on each plantation they raided was murdered.[[57]](#footnote-56) Even with laws like South Carolina’s *Negro Act* in 1740, which made gatherings of three or more Black individuals illegal, resistance and rebellion against the institution of slavery persisted.[[58]](#footnote-57) Uprisings occurred outside of the United States as well. Jamaica had Tacky’s Revolt, which threatened British colonial control and Toussaint L’Ouverture’s Revolution, which ended French control and brought about the creation of Haiti, these were significant events, but it was not uncommon for daily acts of rebellion and resistance to occur.[[59]](#footnote-58) Knowing the importance of the plantation to their owner’s income, many enslaved people used acts of arson, thereby destroying or at least hindering their owner’s potential profits.[[60]](#footnote-59) If arson or violent rebellions did not successfully undermine their slaveholder’s operations, newly enslaved Africans in the Caribbean were more than willing to threaten or carry out death by suicide as they “preferred dying to living” a life of slavery.[[61]](#footnote-60) The increasing active resistance or outright rebellion against the plantation status quo justified the planter’s “right” to invoke violence. Planters believed creating fear through violence would either suppress further actions by rebels or dissuade potential thoughts of rebellion by other slaves.[[62]](#footnote-61) It became increasingly common throughout plantations in the South to see decapitated heads on pikes, bodies mutilated, or rebels burned alive.[[63]](#footnote-62) Any attempt to undermine the workings of the plantation system was met with swift, violent justice. Maintaining white supremacy while getting their money’s worth out of enslaved bodies required violence. Without extreme violence, each act of rebellion was a direct challenge to the long-held and codified expectations of slaves the Antebellum South had created—especially concerning interactions between the enslaved, planters, or overseers.[[64]](#footnote-63) Therefore, those that undertook rebellious actions had their identities transformed from chattel to rebel. With rebel identities, slaveowners could use these identities to inflict violence, reinforcing their control over enslaved bodies while visually informing their chattel what would happen if they also attempted rebellion.

From the beginning of institutionalized slavery until emancipation in 1865, those involved in the creation and sustaining of slavery created, modified and benefitted from changing the identities of black bodies. From the racialized perspective of Africans being heathens and brutes, white settlers saw the economic benefit of having life-long slaves compared to term contract indentured servitude. The rise of cash crop economies and wealth derived from exploited slave labour caused a dramatic increase in Black populations within the colonies. Unequal demographics required codified racial laws to maintain white supremacy and justify the capture, inhumane treatment, and indiscriminate buying and selling of Africans forced into slavery. Dehumanizing Black identities through concepts of chattel slavery justified the sexual exploitation of women’s bodies for reproduction and the child’s subsequent labour earned without purchasing it. Childbearing for enslaved women became an investment opportunity for plantation owners wanting to expand their labour potential without paying for it. It also qualified enslaved people as inheritable property to be passed down within slave-holding families. By the 18th and 19th centuries, the rise in slave rebellions, global abolition practices, and the expanding river economy undermined the status quo of plantation economies. Life-long property exploited to the fullest extent suddenly became fugitives and rebels who undermined white supremacy and plantation wealth by running away or inciting riots. Transforming Black identities from chattel to rebel or fugitive required and condoned extreme violence and mutilation to salvage control over their remaining slaves through fear and intimidation.

Throughout the history of slavery in the United States and its former colonies, race has been a central factor in the relationship between slavery, economic opportunities, and treatment within society—largely determined by white men. Determining someone’s identity and treatment has persisted for Black individuals to this day. While no longer viewed as property or rebels, now Black Americans are identified as violent, drug-dealing criminals, which informs how White Americans treat them. Abolition might have brought an end to slavery within the United States, but the entrenched racial stereotypes of Black Americans could not be destroyed with abolition. Many held—and might still hold—the same sentiments that planter Robert Patterson had in 1954: “We [do not] consider ourselves hate-mongers and bigots…we just [feel] like integration would utterly destroy everything we value[].”[[65]](#footnote-64) The reality of the intersectionality of being Black and American continues to be associated with increased acts of violence by police and individuals, exclusion from adequate housing or barriers to voting through intimidation or legal criteria that disproportionately affect Black communities.[[66]](#footnote-65) In 2014, US Veteran Clyde Ross shared how he recognized himself as American but that his father admonished him to keep quiet about violence as his community was prone to supremacists murdering any Black American bold enough to call out injustices or expect equality.[[67]](#footnote-66) From the flagrant and open abuse or murder of enslaved people in the colonies to the murder of Emmett Till in 1955 to the murder of George Floyd in 2020, or the murder of English teacher Keenan Anderson in January 2023, Black communities continue to exist and persist in the face of violence often rooted in white supremacy and racist stereotypes.[[68]](#footnote-67) One must consider the effect of slavery and its codification of racial hierarchies and violence centuries later. Can we genuinely contend that consistent violence is not rooted in white supremacy and slavery? Alternatively, can we acknowledge that once again, white supremacy reigns, stating: you are whatever I say you are.
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