

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/74559/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Doddington, David 2015. Informal economies and masculine hierarchies in slave communities of the U.S. South, 1800-1865. *Gender and History* 27 (3) , pp. 773-787. 10.1111/1468-0424.12162

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12162>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



‘Informal Economies and Masculine Hierarchies in Slave Communities of the U.S. South, 1800-1865’

Over the past few decades historians have dismantled the revisionist canard that enslaved people in the U.S. South were automatically unified by their shared experiences of racial oppression, emphasising instead the multiple and overlapping identities, communities, and strategies for survival enslaved people used to shape human lives in an inhumane institution. Scholars of the U.S. South increasingly note how solidarity in slave communities was negotiated, and that enslaved people made choices and developed identities that did not correspond with simplistic notions of heroes and villains.¹ While part of a broader historiographical trend, the movement away from one-dimensional portraits of communities engaged in collective resistance to accounts stressing the flexibility of identities and the negotiations, tensions, and conflict that accompanied survival in slavery has been of critical importance to discussions on enslaved masculinity. Whereas much early work focused on the perceived emasculation of the enslaved male population as a whole, or, in response to this, on the reclamation of a heroic black masculinity, historians increasingly emphasise the diverse forms of masculinity available to enslaved men in spite of bondage.²

This article aims to develop this historiography by emphasising how masculinity could be a site of tension among the enslaved. While Edward Baptist highlighted the significance of homosocial interactions in structuring relationships in slave communities, historians of U.S. slavery have rarely taken his lead in examining how a multiplicity of masculinities could cause problems.³ Indeed, recent scholarly work on the topic emphasises the collective and supportive elements to enslaved manhood. Sergio Lussana, for example, recently described

how an ‘all-male subculture’ helped unite enslaved men against an emasculatory white society.⁴ Yet, although enslaved men supported one another against the oppression of slavery, they also viewed, judged, and ranked one another in order to validate their gendered sense of self. Rather than simply respond to oppositional white models of masculinity, invidious comparisons and challenges from within the black community could be a key part of enslaved men’s identity formation. Although historians have explored physical conflict as a means of validating manhood in slave communities, the gendered tension presented by independent economic success has received comparatively little attention.⁵ Jeff Forret noted the potential for violence in this sphere, but I am interested in moving beyond physical contests and exploring how gendered assessments of men’s activities helped foster exclusionary identities.⁶ This article will, therefore, examine comparison and competition between enslaved men in informal economies, the ‘quasi-independent economic activities’ conducted by enslaved people following the completion of set tasks or in limited free time at night or at weekends. Typical activities here (although not an exhaustive list) included planting small patches of land with cotton or food, hunting, fishing, making and selling small goods, trading illicitly with poor whites, or engaging in overwork in skilled labour such as blacksmithing.⁷ While agreeing with much scholarly opinion that these activities helped enslaved men to develop a masculine identity, this article will demonstrate that these identities could be strengthened by comparison with, and even the denigration of other black men in the community.

While scholars rarely argue for static hierarchies of masculinity, showing in diverse historical contexts that multiple gender identities co-exist within ostensibly unified groups, it is important to explore how these identities interact with one another.⁸ Different models of manhood do not exist in isolation, and the performance of a particular version of masculinity

can rest upon the rejection or refusal of another. This rejection may have consequences on a personal level, but may also inform how people negotiate with power or interpret their position within broader social hierarchies and frameworks. Indeed, to return to slavery, historians acknowledge that different models of enslaved masculinity existed but they have not interrogated the different responses to bondage that such identities could engender. Yet the political significance of black masculinity in the period meant that alternative masculine ideals were a site of tension: valorising and politicising the actions of some men could involve denigrating others.⁹ Abolitionist authors who prioritised violent resistance as the route to manhood and the key to ending slavery appeared to establish one such hierarchy of masculinity. Fierce declarations that “real” men rejected bondage appeared to entail a concomitant emasculation of those who remained enslaved and, more particularly, those who appeared to acquiesce to the system to survive. David Walker famously asked ‘Are we MEN!!!’, when demanding slave rebellion in an appeal from 1829, but he plainly rejected those ‘swell-bellied fellows... whose greatest object is to their fill their stomachs’, stating simply: ‘Such I do not mean.’¹⁰

Although such statements highlight a belief among some abolitionists that manhood should be proven in outright resistance, the vast majority of enslaved men did not martyr themselves through rebellion; many chose not to risk the uncertainty of fight or flight. While insurrectionary literature was not easily transmitted to the enslaved population of the South, enslaved men who remained in bondage could be forced to interact with men who chose to pursue such paths; these men could be forced to justify their choices and identities accordingly.¹¹ One possible way of rejecting rebellion while maintaining manhood was through emphasising economic or familial responsibilities, a familiar trope of masculinity to contemporary Americans but also plausibly connected to certain West African beliefs linking

manhood to provider roles.¹² While the fugitive author Henry Bibb regrettably felt it was better to seek freedom, to ‘forsake friends and neighbors, wife and child’, than ‘consent to live and die a slave’, not all men agreed.¹³ The abolitionist James Redpath noted one such occasion during his travels through the Southwest, detailing a conversation with an enslaved man who refused to escape. While clearly desiring freedom, this man appeared to disagree with Redpath’s belief, stated earlier in the book, that the liberty of just one slave ‘would be cheaply purchased by the universal slaughter of his people and their oppressors.’¹⁴ He instead claimed to have made a choice to remain enslaved because of his perceived responsibility to his family: ‘I see, if I hadn’t been married, I would have been free now; bekase [sic] I would have had a thousand dollars by this time to have bought myself with. But it took all I could make to get along with my family.’ While unable to gain his own freedom, this man’s economic contributions helped his sons in theirs.¹⁵

Historians have, of course, demonstrated how economic activities helped enslaved men create a masculine identity as a provider.¹⁶ However, many have perhaps understated the need for men who performed these roles to interpret other models of masculinity or to explain their actions in the shadow of more rebellious men. John Hooker Banks, who successfully escaped from a cotton plantation in Alabama following a violent confrontation with his overseer and enslaver, claimed to have laid a gendered gauntlet down to his male peers before his flight: ‘I have done my work. I am going to leave. Look out for yourselves. If you undertake to do anything, do it like men.’¹⁷ The men who remained were surely forced to rationalise their actions accordingly. Returning to Redpath, the man he spoke with had clearly considered the actions and the alternative identities available to him, eventually placing his sense of familial responsibility above his personal freedom.

While fiery activists could condemn men who seemingly negotiated within slavery as dependent or docile, those who sought to provide for themselves and others could offer a defence of their actions and identities by emphasising a different set of attributes. Economic success could be made more “manly” through showcasing the difficulties overcome, and, perhaps more significantly, through emphasising that not all men had the drive to reach similar heights. In doing so, these individuals could perhaps claim a manhood that was based on “individual enterprise,” and “competitive success,” ideas which held increasing prominence in the U.S. over the course of the nineteenth century, and which were not alien to enslavers or the enslaved.¹⁸ Indeed, when the former slave Josiah Henson wrote in his autobiography of his hope to inspire newly freed slaves with his work-ethic, he praised the ‘indestructible character for energy, enterprise, and self-reliance’ that characterized America, stating ‘it was precisely the Yankee spirit which I wished to instil into my fellow-slaves, if possible’. Despite declaring this to be a “Yankee” spirit, Henson’s “energy, enterprise, and self-reliance” had played a significant role in his development while enslaved and had, in his mind, helped elevate him above others in his community.¹⁹ This article will, therefore, showcase some of the tension that arose when men connected their manhood to work, with enslaved men or their loved ones aiming to prove that material or monetary success in slavery was not evidence of docility or dependence, that it was not simply evidence that they held the ‘certificate of soulless manhood’ that was being known as “a good character.”²⁰ To best prove this, however, enslaved men or their loved ones could be required to emphasise different and, at times equally exclusionary characteristics.

It is worth noting that regional issues influenced the semi-autonomous economic activities of the enslaved. While scholars have shown that enslaved peoples’ independent economic efforts were integral to the running of the plantation societies across the Caribbean and Latin

America, the demographic, geographic, and economic diversity of U.S. slavery impacted the opportunities available to the enslaved.²¹ Although gradual emancipation took place in much of the North following the American Revolution, slavery extended its reach across the U.S. South in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first federal census of 1790 reported 697,897 enslaved people, and, despite the restrictions on the Atlantic slave trade from 1808, the enslaved population had risen through natural increase to 3,953,760 in 1860.²² Over the first few decades of the nineteenth century cotton became “King” in the South, with production spreading throughout the Lower South, eventually stretching from Georgia to Texas. The coastal regions of South Carolina and Georgia were key areas of rice and indigo production, while Virginia, North Carolina, and other western and Border States offered more mixed economies, including tobacco, mining, and staple crops such as wheat and corn. Southern Louisiana was the only major area of sugar production in the United States.

Rather than a stable plantation monoculture, therefore, the regional crop diversity in the U.S. meant different labour systems and different mechanisms of control developed, all of which impacted the economic opportunities available to the enslaved. Historians commonly agree that informal economies flourished in parts of the Lowcountry where rice was dominant, as in coastal South Carolina, as the standard system of “tasking” meant the enslaved population were theoretically allowed to engage in their own work once they had completed set activities for the day.²³ The gang labour that marked much of the “Cotton Kingdom”, where enslaved people worked under close supervision from “dawn till dusk” did not allow for similar arrangements and those enslaved in cotton or sugar regions were generally forced to conduct independent labour at night or during limited free time at the weekend.²⁴ While location undoubtedly influenced enslaved peoples’ opportunities to conduct work for themselves, historians increasingly acknowledge that informal economies were significant in slave

communities throughout the antebellum South and that the decisions of individual masters to allow such arrangements were not entirely dictated by crop or region.²⁵ These quasi-independent economic arrangements offered enslaved people a degree of agency and the chance to develop identities beyond that imposed upon them by their masters as chattel, including, as will now be discussed, by performing gendered roles such as providers.

Pro-slavery contemporaries such as Daniel Hundley had portrayed enslaved men as economically irresponsible, if not invisible in domestic economies, noting that most were ‘too indolent to strive to make any money for themselves, but spend their holidays sleeping, fishing, or playing like so many children’, but revisionist historians from the 1960s stressed the significance of enslaved men’s activities as providers.²⁶ By highlighting how skilled labour which allowed for overwork, such as carpentry or blacksmithing, was performed predominantly by men, and the contributions enslaved men made to domestic economies through gendered activities such as hunting or fishing, historians challenged notions of emasculation and demonstrated the connections enslaved men made between their work and their masculinity. More recently scholars have demonstrated that not only enslaved men but also enslaved women contributed to domestic economies.²⁷ I am not, therefore, arguing that enslaved men were solely responsible for independent economic production. However, it is generally acknowledged that ‘the tasks that men and women performed for themselves and their families differed’, and that these differences could be used by enslaved people to speak to gender roles and identities.²⁸ Historians have used divisions in informal (and formal) economies to showcase collective gender identities, as with Deborah Gray White’s pioneering work on the female slave network, and, more recently, with Lussana’s research on black masculinity.²⁹ By highlighting how enslaved men and women lived and worked with a

degree of gender segregation, scholars have shown the interdependence and co-operation which helped structure supportive group identities for enslaved men and women.

However, the fact that enslaved men's identities were frequently established through homosocial interactions could also lead to comparative assessments of effort and skill. When James Day recalled his experiences as a slave in Tennessee he highlighted his father's independent economic success as a blacksmith, an occupation almost exclusively reserved for men, by noting that he 'could make axes, mattocks, hoes, plow shares, knives and even jew's harps.' James appeared proud of his father, concluding his discussion on his efforts by claiming: 'I never seen such a worker as my father. He just had more energy and strength than anybody I ever saw.'³⁰ Although James was impressed by his father's skill, the explicitly comparative language he used to applaud him suggests how enslaved men's economic success invited comparison, as well as connection. Furthermore, the distinctly "manly" and individual characteristics James chose to explain his father's productivity, with his 'energy and strength' the key to his comparative success, suggest the possibility of a more exclusionary understanding of enslaved men's economic efforts than has been considered before.³¹

Many historians have shown that enslaved men who experienced economic success were applauded for their efforts. Yet we also know that some men did not succeed, and this was a site of regret in abolitionist literature. Henry Bibb stated that one of the horrors of slavery was that the enslaved man, 'unlike other men,' was 'denied the consolation of struggling against external difficulties, such as destroy the life, liberty, and happiness of himself and family.'³² Much of the historical information available on independent economic production

in slave communities emphasises its difficulty and hardships. One former slave from Alabama highlighted how the restrictive conditions of slavery prevented such activities. While accepting that enslaved people had limited free time on a Sunday, they starkly rejected the “benevolence” of such schemes:

Most of them were too tired to work, and would throw themselves down anywhere upon the ground, and sleep through the day like so many dogs. Bred to nothing but physical exercise--having only their animal nature cultivated, and constantly over-tasked, what else could be expected?³³

The argument that the harshness of bondage prevented enslaved people from participating in the informal economy is, of course, a compelling one, and the message showcases a common abolitionist desire to highlight the horrors of slavery while challenging the idea black men were innately lazy. Such depictions could also be used by abolitionists to strengthen northern assertions of the virtues of free labour and to highlight that enslaved men had the ability to thrive as providers if they were given the freedom white northerners enjoyed. Indeed, Bibb went on to compare his lack of economic success while enslaved to his efforts as a free man. After escaping to the North he was able to enjoy ‘a comfortable living by my own industry’, stating this, finally, meant he was regarded as a “man.”³⁴

To return to the significance of exclusion and comparison, though, some former slaves claimed that men could achieve a degree of success if they had the necessary self-discipline. James Day’s father was enslaved, yet his “energy” and “strength” put him above others. The sense that a man’s success related to the effort they put in was reflected in the comments of Will Sheets, who had been enslaved in Georgia. When Will noted that on Saturdays ‘de ‘omans washed, patched, and cleaned up de cabins, and de mens wukked in dey own cotton

patches what Marse Jeff give ‘em’, he seemed to applaud the economic efforts of individual slaves. However, he also offered a comparison of men’s efforts in their patches, noting how failure here was not caused by slavery, but instead related to a lack of effort. According to Will, ‘some Niggers wouldn’t have no cotton patch cause dey was too lazy to wuk.’ While leisure activities were perhaps more important to some enslaved people in the development of personal dignity and selfhood, others clearly disagreed.³⁵ Indeed, to Will’s annoyance, these “lazy” slaves ‘was all of ‘em right dar Sadday nights when de frolickin’ and dancin’ was gwine on.’³⁶ Mandy Jones, who was formerly enslaved in Mississippi, noted that her father earned ‘ample money’ from making cotton baskets at night, but also described how her parent’s frugality and religiosity led to them scorning those who frolicked away their free time.³⁷ Such statements suggest that independent economic success came from personal initiative, but also that failure could be similarly personalised.

Of course, such statements were potentially self-serving. Former slaves interviewed in the racist environment of the “Jim-Crow” South may have sought to please white interviewers by highlighting the “plantation idyll” so beloved in the South.³⁸ They may also have stressed their belief in the efficacy of hard work so as to make them seem “deserving” of assistance during the Depression.³⁹ Yet it is also possible that they were repeating long-held, even cherished stories. While adult recollections of childhood do not offer an uncritical window into the identities of enslaved men, Marie Jenkins Schwartz has noted how enslaved children could learn from their kin ‘what it meant to be a man or a woman, a parent or a child, a teacher or a playmate, as much as a slave’, using this to develop identities and to structure relationships with others.⁴⁰ The fact that children or dependents of these men applauded their efforts suggests their parents or others in the community had shared with them a belief that admirable men worked hard and worked for their families, and they may have sought to

emphasise this as a positive element of masculinity. These former slaves may also have absorbed a patriarchal understanding of masculinity later in their lives and, while speaking of male role models, projected this back onto their childhood. While necessarily speculative, the positivity and competitive elements of this success suggests how forms of masculinity could be validated in comparison.

Positive references to industry, responsibility, and energy, traits contemporaries commonly associated with manhood, suggest how enslaved men's independent economic efforts could be connected to a masculine identity. Yet the personalised character of these attributes presents a challenge to those who declared barriers to economic advancement were automatically accepted as a shared horror of slavery. Enslaved men who had experienced economic success, or former slaves who described fathers, husbands, or male role models as responsible providers, could suggest that this advancement occurred by virtue of their efforts. Yet in doing so, they seemed to set a comparative homosocial hierarchy in which they could denigrate their less successful counterparts by reference to laziness, dependency, and a lack of industry. Such traits were not merely negative, but were frequently feminised in nineteenth, and, indeed, early twentieth-century discourse.⁴¹ Rather than inevitable proof of the harshness of a repressive regime, the economic failings of some men could be considered a failing of manhood, as proof that some men were manlier than others. Josiah Henson, noted earlier as a proponent of industrious manhood, proudly described his illicit support for enslaved women who were 'starved, and miserable, and unable to help themselves', but he strengthened the heroic nature of such activities by making this a test of character. This was not an impossible task, but the other men 'had not the wit or the daring to procure' such items.⁴² Such gendered comparisons were not unusual for Henson; whose narrative is replete with descriptions of his superiority over others, but the gendered and comparative

connotations to Henson's statements on economic assistance suggest a belief that, while men *should* support others, only some had the manly qualities needed to do so.

This must, of course, be contextualised. The belief that some men suffered through no fault of their own, but were instead hindered in honest efforts to provide for their loved ones, could justify support from other members of the slave community.⁴³ Expectations could also shift over time, with enslaved men required to try and take economic responsibility as part of a transition to manhood.⁴⁴ The sense that enslaved men strove for a degree of economic self-sufficiency as part of a transition to full manhood could be considered a direct challenge to popular depictions of feckless black men, and the suggestion of personal responsibility in spite of the harshness of bondage made such acts all the more laudable to a northern public who believed in the efficacy of hard work. Indeed, in William O'Neal's postbellum memoir of life as a slave in Louisiana, it was noted that marriage had increased his responsibilities, 'and made him more thoughtful and sedate.' Furthermore, this newfound responsibility spurred him on to succeed; having gained the confidence of all he worked with due to his 'industrious and active nature', William took on a new role and rapidly earned a reputation as 'among the finest coopers of his race'. What appeared more celebratory was that his success came from hard work: 'with no aid from his master; single-handed and alone, with the shackles of a slave upon him, he has risen above his condition and made for himself a name.'⁴⁵

However, not all enslaved men appeared to accept economic responsibilities in the community. To some of their peers, this was not the inevitable result of the harshness of slavery and nor was it inevitably a laudable act of resistance. James Southall noted that on his

Tennessee plantation, ‘iffen dey didn’t work dey didn’t have nothing to eat and wear and de hands what did work wouldn’t divide wid ‘em iffen dey didn’t work.’⁴⁶ This sort of resentment was plainly demonstrated when enslaved men resisted the actions of thieves. Indeed, in the recollections of Peter Still’s life in Alabama, the author noted how Peter’s ‘industry and self-denial’ left him in a better position than the other slaves, but later claimed that success could come at the price of envy:

As the wealth of the young couple increased, they bought a cupboard, and afterwards a chest. This latter article was very necessary, that Vina might lock up her week’s provisions, and any little comforts which Peter brought her; as, if they were exposed, some of the half-clad hungry slaves were sure to steal them.⁴⁷

While the enslaved population could recognise that individual masters or the system was to blame, they could use the industry of some men as justification for success and suggest this was a model for others to follow. Snippets of slave folklore recorded in the postbellum years, which included sayings such as ‘Don’t trus a man dat nebber got tired in his life’, suggests that industry could be applauded in communal or familial settings and gendered accordingly.⁴⁸ Occasionally a lack of drive had personal consequences. Susan Dabney Smedes, a plantation mistress from Virginia and Mississippi, noted in her postbellum memoir an occasion when an enslaved woman rejected her previous husband on account of his comparative lack of energy. Alcey, having been temporarily separated from her husband, told her master ‘not to bother ‘bout sendin’ for him. He lazy an’ puny an’ no ‘count.’⁴⁹ The sense that men’s industry could be compared, and that this could affect intimate relationships, is certainly implied. The words of a former slave from Alabama, when describing their father’s efforts in the informal economy, similarly highlight how men’s efforts and achievements could be validated in homosocial comparison. Laura Thornton claimed that her master allowed men to participate in the informal economy, noting that ‘my daddy made his farm

jus' like colored people do now. White man would give him so much ground if he'd a mind to work it.' Indeed, Laura recalled how her father 'made a crop every year' while enslaved. Her father's success, though, highlighted a division and hierarchy to the informal economy, with Laura claiming that if men had 'a mind' to work for themselves, they could achieve a degree of success. However, not all men rose to the challenge: 'many folks too lazy to git theirselves somethin' when they have the chance to do it.' According to Laura, these economic failings did not relate to a laudable desire to reject slavery, and nor did it simply reflect the harshness of slavery. Her father's efforts proved otherwise. While some men were simply 'too lazy' to succeed, Laura explained her father's success by stating simply: 'my daddy wasn't that kind.'⁵⁰

Fairly or not, the enslaved and formerly enslaved population did not uniformly agree that bondage prevented men from achieving economic success. Nor, too, did they agree with fiery abolitionists who declared that men who worked within the system were unquestionably emasculated. To showcase this most effectively, they could emphasise the alternative masculine attributes which allowed them to succeed. In his post-war memoirs on life as a slave, Henry Clay Bruce applauded enslaved men who refused to submit to abuse, but he refused to condemn those who worked within the system. With an eye to his own experiences, and perhaps influenced by his connection of racial uplift to the divisive postbellum politics of "respectability", he noted with some pride that enslaved men who knew 'their own helpless condition... did not give up in abject servility, but held up their heads and proceeded to do the next best thing under the circumstances.' Rather than a dichotomy in which total rejection of slavery proved manhood while accommodation equalled emasculation, Bruce felt that hard work allowed enslaved men to prove manhood in a different form, noting that 'high-toned and high-spirited slaves, who had as much self-

respect as their masters' were 'industrious, reliable and truthful, and could be depended upon by their masters in all cases.' The sense that, in spite of bondage, enslaved men could use work to create a masculine identity is evident; yet so too is the sense that this identity was consolidated in comparison to less "admirable" men. While Bruce applauded enslaved rebels, he stressed an alternative masculinity forged by hard work and strengthened this through the denigration of a class of men who failed to fulfil the manly responsibilities inherent in either of the roles described. These men had refused to take the rebel's path to manhood, but they had also refused to follow the alternative path of respectability and responsibility. In Bruce's formulation of multiple masculinities, there was a clear sense of hierarchy; there were rebels and strivers, but also skivers. Indeed, Bruce went on to condemn enslaved men who refused to show responsibility in work for themselves or their masters by noting they were 'almost entirely devoid of all the manly traits of character.'⁵¹

Such a divisive position may have been an attempt to stave off racist explanations for the economic problems black men faced in the postbellum period, with Bruce similarly condemning poor whites for their lack of industry and suggesting a blueprint by which "respectable" black men could inspire others.⁵² Yet these recollections also suggest the degree to which work could be a competitive measure for enslaved men. Enslaved manhood could be proven through economic success, and if this success was tied to personal effort, responsibility, and industry, it could be solidified by comparison to those men who had not succeeded. In spite of the fact that no amount of work would offer them true equality, some members of the enslaved population appeared to share the antebellum belief that, in work, 'equal opportunity meant equal opportunity to either succeed or to fail.'⁵³ Rufus Dirt, who was made a driver on his plantation in Alabama, seemed to believe this was the case, telling his interviewer: 'I don' remember nothin' in particular that caused me to get dat drivin' job,

ceptin' hard work.'⁵⁴ The implication, that had others worked harder they could have earned an authority position instead, is clear. Robert Young, whose father was a slave driver on his plantation in Mississippi, claimed that his role offered him economic privileges and compared his success to others in the community. Indeed, Robert's father was the 'onliest one [who] had a garden of his own.' This "freedom" allowed him to feel 'like he wadn't no slabe 'tall.' While his father helped discipline other slaves, Robert refused to accept that these individuals were heroic rebels. Instead, he denigrated them by reference to a lack of industry: 'dey was rogues an' some would'n wuk.'⁵⁵ Such recollections suggest that, while enslaved men and their dependents could construct masculine identities through work, applauding those who succeeded was not always enough. Instead, one effective way of validating this manhood might be through comparison to men who were not successful. For enslaved men who had worked hard and succeeded in supporting others, their counterparts who seemed less concerned with this could be worthy of scorn and comparative emasculation.

Charles Ball's fugitive account offers some indications of the comparative nature to men's independent economic success, as well as how enslaved men could weigh up alternative forms of manhood. In his recollections, Ball frequently recalled how his 'great industry and vigilance' had allowed him to improve his condition, including through participation in informal economies.⁵⁶ Ball was able to supplement his rations, as well as those of the families he lived with after having been uprooted from his biological family, by engaging in hunting and overwork. However, his success did not occur in a vacuum; his manly industry could be set against other men in the community. While Ball established friendly and supportive relationships in many of the communities he lived in, he emphasised his ability to lead in diverse forms of labour, as in the establishment of a fishery, where Ball 'flattered' himself to think he would 'become the head man.' When he was made a driver in Georgia he admitted

that ‘the men left under my charge did not consider me a very lenient overseer’, but he essentially denigrated their complaints by noting that this simply reflected his own propensity for hard work: ‘I in truth compelled them to work very hard, as I did myself.’⁵⁷ Ball frequently described how he was willing to help those he felt deserving, but at times he offered more barbed observations of men in the community, whose economic failings served to highlight his sacrifice and skills. While in South Carolina, Ball emphasised his economic success by noting: ‘all the people on the plantation did not live as well as our family did, for many of the men did not understand trapping game, and others were too indolent to go far enough from home to find good places for setting their traps.’⁵⁸ The sense that men should be held responsible for familial provision was clear, but so too is an implicit sense of hierarchy in which Ball felt his efforts marked him above other men. Furthermore, while some were apparently less talented than Ball, his highest level of disdain appeared to be reserved for those who were ‘indolent.’

Such beliefs about the significance of men’s contributions are expressed in yet more detail in Ball’s description of how he felt compelled to assist women who suffered from a lack of male support. Having described the sufferings of a slave woman named Lydia, Ball went on to note that she was ‘one of the women whose husbands procured little or nothing for the sustenance of their families’ and that he would give her food instead. Ball’s anger at this indicates his belief economic contributions were an expected responsibility of manhood; the cost of this lack of support to Lydia’s health suggests how important this role was considered by some contemporaries. Furthermore, what appeared to inspire more anger in Ball was that this failure of masculine duty was not caused by the horrors of slavery, but, according to Ball, at least, was due to the ‘lazy indignity’ of this man.⁵⁹ During this time Ball lived with another family and helped contribute to this domestic economy. Yet despite initially applauding the

father's efforts, Ball appeared to suggest that his additions to this family's sustenance were more significant. Although Ball noted this man 'was a very quiet, worthy man', he also considered him to be 'slothful and inactive in his habits', preferring the relative domesticity of mending baskets and mats in his cabin to the more masculine act of hunting. According to Ball, 'he seldom thought of leaving the cabin again before morning.' While these efforts had offered the family some benefits, Ball highlighted the significance of his contributions by direct comparison to the father's previous work: 'After I came among them and had acquired some knowledge of the surrounding country, I made as many baskets and mats as he did, and took time to go twice a week to look at all my traps.'⁶⁰ While the father had attempted to provide for his family, Ball's emphasis on the comparative laziness of this man, as well as the gendered contrast of hunting with domestic labour, suggests that masculine identities forged in work could be consolidated in comparison.⁶¹

The emphasis of some former slaves and abolitionists on personal characteristics as key to enslaved men's success may have been a challenge to conventional myths about black male laziness. In demonstrating that black men believed in the virtues of hard work and strove against the harshest conditions, activists could more effectively make the case they deserved equal status when free. Such statements may also have been a way of challenging equations of economic success with docility and acquiescence and rejecting claims that the only route to manhood was through violent rebellion. While abolitionist authors such as Charles Grandison Parsons could note that only some slaves were "indulged" with independent economic privileges – with the language of indulgence implying paternalistic benevolence as opposed to masculine self-making – the emphasis of some former slaves on autonomy, agency, and industry perhaps mapped a path to masculine redemption for enslaved men who had struggled to forge a life in chains. In comparing efforts in informal economies to other

men and using the personalised language of a self-made manhood, enslaved men or their loved ones could explain economic success outside of a framework of fawning dependency, instead claiming this was proof of their abilities above others in the community, and, indeed, proof of their identities as men.

Scholars have plainly demonstrated that multiple masculinities developed in slave communities of the U.S. South. Yet these masculinities did not exist in isolation and enslaved men who articulated their actions within a gendered framework could be forced to defend or justify their actions to a sceptical audience. Men who negotiated within bondage in order to provide for themselves and others could face such scepticism; the language of paternalism or indulgences which more fiery contemporaries, and, indeed, some historians have used to explain some men's economic success could undercut their claims to manhood. Many of those quoted in this article, did, in fact, hold relatively "privileged" positions. James Day's father's close relationship with his enslavers narrowly spared him from sale; the eventual fugitives Henson and Ball were trustees who held positions of authority before their escape, with Henson even explicitly refusing the bloody rebel's path.⁶² Yet, in stressing industry, self-denial, and energy as key to their success, enslaved men who were able to provide for themselves and others could perhaps refashion forms of "accommodation" to slavery as proof instead of responsible and industrious manhood. Such claims only made sense if a degree of economic success was considered possible in slavery and that endeavour, energy, and effort could find limited rewards. Within this framework, though, those who failed to rise were not universally considered sympathetic victims of a repressive regime. Instead, some men could be depicted, with varying degrees of disdain, as lesser men, emasculated not by slavery, but by a lack of drive, industry, or responsibility. Enslaved men who survived and self-loved in spite of the tremendous oppression of American slavery could attach gendered meanings to

their work in the informal economy, noting how their efforts had allowed them to provide for themselves or loved ones. If emphasising the self-made nature of success, however, they could implicitly or explicitly personalise and condemn the failings of others.

¹ Peter Kolchin, 'Reevaluating the Antebellum Slave Community: A Comparative Perspective', *Journal of American History*, 70 (Dec. 1983), pp. 579-601, offered an early challenge to revisionist accounts that had stressed solidarity and harmony among the enslaved; Walter Johnson, 'On Agency', *Journal of Social History*, 37.1 (Autumn, 2003), pp. 113-124, critiqued scholars who, in their aim to restore the agency of enslaved people, risked supporting the racist assumptions that had denied black humanity in the first place while noting the complications of conflating slave agency with "resistance"; Anthony Kaye, *Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007) and William Dushinberre, *Strategies for Survival: Recollections of Bondage in Antebellum Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), stressed the spatial and practical restrictions enslaved people faced and how these shaped the communities they lived in and their responses to enslavement.

² Early studies which emphasised the childlike character of black men include Ulrich Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1929). More sympathetic scholars tied emasculation to the brutality of slavery. See: Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Negro Slavery in the American South* (New York: Knopf, 1956); Stanley Elkins, *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959). The Civil Rights-era historiography, and particularly Black Power advocates, rejected emasculation and emphasised resistance. For an overview of this discourse, see: Roland Murray, *Our Living Manhood: Literature, Black Power, and Masculine Ideology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). Recent collections on black masculinities include: Darlene Clark Hine and Earnestine Jenkins (Eds), *A Question of Manhood: A Reader in U.S Black Men's History and Masculinity. Vol. 1. "Manhood Rights": The Construction of Black Male History and Manhood, 1750-1870* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999); Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Glover (Eds), *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004); Timothy Buckner and Peter Caster (Eds), *Fathers, Preachers, Rebels, Men: Black Masculinity in U.S History and Literature, 1820-1945* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011).

³ Edward Baptist, 'The Absent Subject: African American Masculinity and Forced Migration to the Antebellum Plantation Frontier', in Friend and Glover, *Southern Manhood*, pp. 136–173.

⁴ Sergio Lussana, 'No Band of Brothers Could Be More Loving': Enslaved Male Homosociality, Friendship, and Resistance in the Antebellum American South', *Journal of Social History*, 46.4 (2013), pp. 872-895, p. 872. Supportive masculine connections are also explored in Rebecca Fraser, 'Negotiating their Manhood: Masculinity amongst the Enslaved in the Upper South, 1830-1861', in Sergio Lussana and Lydia Plath (Eds), *Black and White Masculinity in the American South, 1800-2000* (Newcastle under Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009), pp. 76-95; and T. J. Desch Obi, *Fighting for Honor: The History of African Martial Art Traditions in the Atlantic World* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008).

⁵ Conflict generated by the informal economy has received attention, but is rarely explicitly gendered. See: Lawrence McDonnell, 'Money Knows No Master: Market Relations and the American Slave Community', in Winfred Moore Jr, Joseph Tripp, and Lyon Tyler Jr, (Eds), *Developing Dixie: Modernization in a Traditional Society* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1988), pp. 31-43; Dylan Penningroth, *The Claims of Kinfolk: African American Property and Community in the Nineteenth Century South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), esp. chapter 3.

⁶ Jeff Forret, 'Conflict and the "Slave Community": Violence among Slaves in Upcountry South Carolina', *Journal of Southern History*, 74 (2008), pp. 551-588.

⁷ On the types of labour conducted by enslaved people in their free time, see, for example: Betty Wood, *Women's Work, Men's Work: The Informal Slave Economies of Lowcountry Georgia* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995); Philip Morgan, 'Work and Culture: The Task System and the world of Lowcountry Blacks, 1700-1880', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 39.4 (1982), pp. 563-599; Larry Hudson Jr., *To Have and To Hold: Slave Work and Family Life in Antebellum South Carolina* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997).

⁸ On the complex interplay between race, gender, and class in relation to identity, see: Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, 'African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race', *Signs*, 17.2 (1992), pp. 251-274. On the need to explore tension between masculinities and the significance of homosocial comparisons, see: Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996). R. W. Connell (who developed much of the literature on hegemonic masculinity), and James Messerschmidt noted the need to reformulate some ideas on hegemony and

hierarchy to show the agency of subordinated masculinities. See: R. W. Connell and James Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender & Society*, 19.6 (2005), esp. 847-849. Toby Ditz has stressed the need to examine conflict within supposedly stable gender systems and challenge ideas that "hegemonic" forms of identity simply dominate all others. See: Ditz, 'Afterword: Contending Masculinities in Early America', in Thomas Foster (Ed.), *New Men: Manliness in Early America* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), pp. 256-267, p. 256.

⁹ On the political significance of antebellum debates on slavery and masculinity, see: Sarah Roth, *Gender and Race in Antebellum Popular Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), esp. chapter 3.

¹⁰ David Walker, *Walker's Appeal, in Four Articles; Together with a Preamble, to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in Particular and Very Expressly, to Those of the United States of America* (Boston: Published by David Walker, 1829), p. 19. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/walker/walker.html>

¹¹ Roth notes Walker's appeal was found in the South. See, *Gender & Race*, p. 44

¹² This is not to argue that uniform or nuclear patriarchal models dominated West African gender familial structures, but contemporaries and historians have argued that West African gender ideals still contained expectations men would act as providers. See, Venture Smith, *A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Venture, A Native of Africa: But Resident Above Sixty Years in the United States of America. Related by himself* (New London: C. Holt, 1798), p. 5. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/venture/venture.html>. Daniel Black, *Dismantling Black Manhood: an historical and literary analysis of the legacy of slavery* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997), p. 11. More detailed information on gendered ideas and labour in West African societies can be found in G. Ugo Nwokeji, 'African Conceptions of Gender and the Slave Traffic', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 58.1 (2001), pp. 47-68, pp. 55-58.

¹³ Henry Bibb, *Narrative of the Life and Adventures of HENRY BIBB, An American Slave Written by himself* (New York: Published by the Author, 1849), p.47. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/bibb/bibb.html>. Bibb's repeated, yet ultimately futile attempts to rescue his family suggest just how difficult the choice was.

¹⁴ James Redpath, *The Roving Editor: Or, Talks with Slaves in the Southern States* (Negro Universities Press; New York, 1968. Originally published in 1859 by A. B. Burdick), p. 85.

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 35. This man claimed that his owner hired him out for \$20 a month and that he cleared around \$200 for himself from this arrangement, noting that his sons were free through their mother and that he was helping them gain an education.

¹⁶ Two excellent books which contain historical and historiographical information on men's activities as providers are: Emily West, *Chains of Love: Slave Couples in antebellum South Carolina* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Rebecca Fraser, *Courtship and Love Among the Enslaved in North Carolina* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2007).

¹⁷ James Pennington, *A Narrative of Events of the Life of J. H. Banks, an Escaped Slave, from the Cotton State, Alabama, in America* (Liverpool: M. Rourke, 1861), p. 63.
<http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/penning/penning.html>

¹⁸ Julius Bailey, 'Masculinizing the Pulpit: The Black Preacher in the Nineteenth Century AME Church', in Buckner and Caster (Eds), *Fathers, Preachers, Rebels, Men*, pp. 80-101, p. 82-83. Scholars increasingly emphasise the overlapping pressures men, North and South, faced in the competitive economic environment of the nineteenth century, the ways in which U.S. slavery was a bulwark of capitalist thought and action, and how this helped shaped identities and status. See, for example: John Mayfield, *Counterfeit Gentlemen: Manhood and Humour in the Old South* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009), p. xvii-xviii; Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), p. 89, p. 243; Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A New History of Global Capitalism* (London: Allen Lane, 2014), pp. 105-120. For a recent account noting how ideas on industry and thrift were part of the political negotiations between enslavers and the enslaved, see: Kathleen M. Hilliard, *Masters, Slaves, and Exchange: Power's Purchase in the Old South* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 28-29, pp. 57-59.

¹⁹ Josiah Henson, *The Life of Josiah Henson: Formerly a Slave, Now an Inhabitant of Canada, as Narrated by Himself* (Boston: Arthur D. Phelps, 1849), p. 68. On his work ethic while enslaved, see p. 7-9.
<http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/henson49/henson49.html>.

²⁰ Redpath, *Roving Editor*, p. 10.

²¹ Michael Mullin, *Africa in America: Slave Acculturation and Resistance in the American South and the British Caribbean, 1736-1831* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), p. 127; Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1865* (New York: Penguin, 1996), p. 153.

²² Kolchin, *American Slavery*, pp. 93-113.

²³ See, Morgan, 'Work and Culture'; Hudson Jr., *To Have and To Hold*.

²⁴ Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), p. 177. Contemporary recollections of work at night or at the weekend can be found in: Solomon Northup, *Twelve Years a Slave*, edited by Sue Eakin and Joseph Logsdon (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968; Originally published New York; London, 1853), p. 148; Duties of overseer, Alabama, 1857, William H. Sims diary and Papers #1403, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²⁵ See: Penningroth, *Claims of Kinfolk*, esp. pp. 46-53. On the significance of regional distinctions in the U.S., see: Damian Alan Pargas, "'Various Means of Providing for their Own Tables': Comparing Slave Family Economies in the Antebellum South", *American Nineteenth Century History*, 7.3 (2006), pp. 361-387. Pargas suggests that the Upper South offered fewer economic opportunities to the enslaved due to the small holdings and mixed-economies, and stresses the significance of planter caprice.

²⁶ Daniel Hundley, *Social Relations In Our Southern States* (New York: H. B. Price, 1860), pp. 355-357. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/southlit/hundley/hundley.html>. See also: George Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All! Or, slaves without masters* (Richmond: A Morris, 1857), pp. 297-298. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/southlit/fitzhughcan/fitzcan.html>. Even sympathetic contemporaries agreed that enslaved men contributed little to their families: Francis Anne Kemble, *Journal of A Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984: originally published, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1863), p. 95. Note 2 contains examples of historians who agreed with such views. Notable revisionist challenges to such claims include: John Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 100; Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (London: Pantheon Books, 1975), p. 486.

²⁷ See: Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I A Woman? Female Slaves in the Plantation South* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985); Brenda Stevenson, 'Gender Conventions, Ideals and Identity among

Antebellum Virginia Slave Women', in David Barry Gaspar and Darlene Clark Hine (Eds), *More Than Chattel: Black Women and Slavery in the Americas* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), pp. 169-193; Daina Ramey Berry, *Swing the Sickle for the Harvest is Ripe: Gender and Slavery in antebellum Georgia* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

²⁸ Kirsten Wood, 'Gender and Slavery', in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 513-535, pp. 515-517.

²⁹ White, *Ar'n't I A Woman*, chapter 4; Lussana, "No Band of Brothers".

³⁰ Rawick, *American Slave, Supplement, Series 2, Volume 4, Part 3*, p. 1163.

³¹ On gendered terms such as "energy", see: Ben Barker-Benfield, 'The Spermatic Economy: A Nineteenth Century View of Sexuality', *Feminist Studies*, 1 (1972), pp. 45-74, p. 45.

³² Bibb, *Narrative of the Life*, p. 18.

³³ Issac Williams, *Aunt Sally: or, The Cross the Way of Freedom. A Narrative of the Slave-life and Purchase of the Mother of Rev. Isaac Williams, of Detroit, Michigan* (Cincinnati: American Reform Tract and Book Society, 1858), pp. 166-67. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/sally/sally.html>.

³⁴ Bibb, *Narrative of the Life*, p. 176.

³⁵ See: David Wiggins, 'Leisure Time on the Southern Plantation: The Slaves' Respite from Constant Toil, 1810-1860', in Donald Spivey (Ed.), *Sport in America: New Historical Perspectives* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985), pp. 25-50, p. 45.

³⁶ Rawick, *American Slave, Series 2, Volume 13, Part 3*, p. 241.

³⁷ Rawick, *American Slave, Supplement, Series 1, Volume 8, Part 3*, p. 1230.

³⁸ On the context of the interviews, see: Stephanie Shaw, 'Using the WPA Ex-Slave Narratives to Study the Impact of the Great Depression', *Journal of Southern History*, 69.3 (2003), pp. 623-58.

³⁹ Some former slaves explicitly requested food or financial assistance from their interviewers. See, for example: Rawick, *American Slave, Supplement, Series 1, Volume 10, Part 5*, p. 2120.

⁴⁰ Marie Jenkins Schwartz, *Birthing a Slave: Motherhood and Medicine in the Antebellum South* (Cambridge; MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 130. On using childhood testimony to explore slavery, see: Donna Spindel, 'Assessing Memory: Twentieth-Century Slave Narratives Reconsidered', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 27.2 (Autumn, 1996), pp. 247-261; Edward Baptist, "'Stol' and Fetched Here": Enslaved Migration, Ex-slave Narratives, and Vernacular History', in Edward Baptist

and Stephanie Camp (Eds), *New Studies in the History of American Slavery* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006), pp. 243-274.

⁴¹ See: Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, pp. 23-26; Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), pp. 2-4; Erica Ball, 'To Train Them for the Work: Manhood, Morality, and Free Black Conduct Discourse in Antebellum New York', in Buckner and Caster, *Fathers, Preachers, Rebels, Men*, pp. 60-80, p. 67. For more on how competitive attributes and a fear of dependency shaped ideas on manhood in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century, see: Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

⁴² Henson, *Life of Josiah Henson*, p. 9.

⁴³ See: Rawick, *American Slave, Series 1, Volume 4, Part 1*, p. 203; John Blassingame (Ed.), *Slave Testimony: Two Centuries of Letters, Speeches, Interviews and Autobiographies* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), p. 491.

⁴⁴ On age-related economic efforts, see: Hudson, *To Have and To Hold*, p. 156; Rawick, *American Slave, Series 2, Volume 12, Part 1*, p. 197.

⁴⁵ William O' Neal, *Life and History of William O'Neal; or, The Man Who Sold His Wife* (St. Louis, Mo.: A. R Fleming and Co., 1896), pp. 27-34. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/oneal/oneal.html>.

⁴⁶ Rawick, *American Slave, Series 1, Volume 7*, p. 307.

⁴⁷ Kate Pickard, *The Kidnapped and the Ransomed. Being the Personal Recollections of Peter Still and his Wife "Vina", After Forty Years of Slavery* (Syracuse: William T. Hamilton, 1856), p. 141 & p. 210. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/pickard/pickard.html>.

⁴⁸ J. Mason Brewer, 'Aphorisms from the Quarters', *American Negro Folklore* (Chicago, 1968), 315-325. This is not to say that all folklore applauded hard work, with many tales stressing cunning resistance to exploitation and material appropriation instead. These conflicting ideals perhaps suggest disagreements over appropriate strategies for survival. On folklore's disputed meanings, see: Rebecca Griffin, 'Courtship Contests and the Meaning of Conflict in the Folklore of Slaves', *Journal of Southern History*, 71 (November, 2005), pp. 769-801.

⁴⁹ Susan Dabney Smedes, *Memorials of A Southern Planter* (Baltimore: Cushings & Bailey, 1887), p. 77-8. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/smedes/smedes.html>

⁵⁰ Rawick, *American Slave, Series 2, Volume 10, Part 6*, pp. 323-328.

⁵¹ H.C Bruce, *The New Man. Twenty-Nine Years a Slave. Twenty-Nine Years a Free Man* (York, PA: P. Anstadt & Sons, 1895), pp. 38-40. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/bruce/bruce.html>. In chapters 13-14 Bruce emphasised the economic and moral shifts needed for black people to succeed, stressing education and industry.

⁵² While abolitionists had claimed that emancipation would allow black men to flourish, the violent backlash of white southerners and harsh conditions of the postbellum period hindered such progress. Racial explanations of black failure quickly, if unfairly, took hold among whites, north and south. In highlighting personal success, responsibility, and respectability, some black activists challenged charges of racial inferiority and argued for a program of moral uplift with them at the head. The fact that such politics tended to deny or minimise the structural oppression black people faced had enduring social, economic, and cultural consequences. On this topic, see: Kevin Gaines, *Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

⁵³ Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, p. 23.

⁵⁴ Rawick, *American Slave, Series 1, Volume 6*, p. 117.

⁵⁵ Rawick, *American Slave, Supplement, Series 1, Volume 10, Part 5*, 2409.

⁵⁶ Charles Ball, *50 Years in Chains or, The Life of an American Slave* (New York: H. Dayton, Publisher; Indianapolis: Asher & Company, 1859), p. 149. <http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/ball/ball.html>

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 265-67.

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 196.

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 197.

⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 202-03.

⁶¹ On hunting and masculinity, see: Nicholas Proctor, *Bathed in Blood: Hunting and Mastery in the Old South* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2002).

⁶² Henson, *Life of Josiah Henson*, pp. 42-3.