

SLAVERY, POPULATION, AND PROGRESS

Rebecca J. Scott
University of Michigan

SLAVERY AND HUMAN PROGRESS. By DAVID BRION DAVIS. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984. Pp. 374. \$25.00.)

SLAVE POPULATIONS OF THE BRITISH CARIBBEAN, 1807–1834. By B. W. HIGMAN. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984. Pp. 781. \$65.00.)

FREE COLOREDS IN THE SLAVE SOCIETIES OF ST. KITTS AND GRENADA, 1763–1833. By EDWARD L. COX. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984. Pp. 197. \$16.95.)

SUGAR AND SLAVERY IN PUERTO RICO: THE PLANTATION ECONOMY OF PONCE, 1800–1850. By FRANCISCO A. SCARANO. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984. Pp. 242. \$21.50.)

Scholarship on the phenomenon of slavery in the United States, the Caribbean, and Latin America has steadily matured over the last decades, moving away from sweeping comparisons toward more precise studies of specific slave societies, and toward a greater degree of self-consciousness about the assumptions that guide modern analysts of a repugnant institution. The four works under review reflect this maturation in different ways and to differing degrees. David Brion Davis explores the intellectual history of an issue that animated contemporaries of slavery and has shaped modern scholarship: the relationship between slavery and what is imagined to be “human progress.” Barry Higman employs a carefully focused comparison and precisely analyzed demographic data to evaluate a range of hypotheses about the slave experience in the British Caribbean. Edward Cox examines the free colored sectors within two British West Indian slave societies, raising questions about the validity of interpreting the place of intermediate groups as an index of the “openness” of such societies. Francisco Scarano links the history of slavery with that of economic growth and the development of elites in a sugar-producing region of Puerto Rico.

David Brion Davis’s *Slavery and Human Progress* combines mastery of a wide range of secondary sources on slavery with an insightful reading of primary texts relevant to the development of proslavery and

antislavery thought, and it displays the Davis trademarks of remarkable breadth and perceptive synthesis. It is at the same time, however, a book that shows an odd uncertainty, a tendency toward demurrers and disclaimers on both thematic and interpretive points.

This tendency may result, in part, from the theoretical mandate that the book by its title appears to assume. Much scholarly debate has focused on the relationship between the institution of slavery, on the one hand, and the process of economic and technological development, on the other. In his introduction, Davis sketches what he takes to be the lines of this debate, but he then quickly backs away, noting that it is not his purpose “to evaluate these conflicting theories or to argue that slavery has either furthered or retarded human progress,” and that on the question of what progress itself really means, he is “agnostic” (p. xvi). Instead, he will trace the links between changing conceptions of the relationship between slavery and what was viewed by contemporaries as some form of progress—be it imperial expansion, growth in trade, or evangelization. This approach then permits him to highlight a nice irony: enslavement appears as a concomitant of the growth of numerous empires, but it is emancipation that accompanies the progress of British colonization in Africa.

Limiting his task in such a fashion is entirely legitimate, and it may be wise for Davis not to attempt to resolve in *Slavery and Human Progress* a set of difficult questions in economic history, questions that are in any case overly broad in formulation. But the diffidence Davis shows toward these and related issues gives even his own project a hesitant, unfinished quality. Thus Chapter 1 narrates the story of a slave revolt in 869 A.D. in Iraq but refrains from classifying that revolt as either a racial conflict or “part of a continuing revolutionary struggle of slaves against masters,” and its centrality to the arguments of the remainder of the book is unclear (p. 7). Chapter 2 shifts ground and discusses with considerable subtlety a range of problems of definition and comparison, tracing metaphorical and philosophical connotations of the term *slavery*, noting that slavery’s antonym is not necessarily freedom in the modern sense of autonomy, and examining psychoanalytic parallels to the concepts of bondage and freedom.¹ In Chapters 3 and 4, Davis looks at the way in which enslavement accompanied major phases of imperial expansion by the Romans, Arabs, and Iberians, and he explores the roots of symbolism concerning color. Each of these chapters constitutes a perceptive essay in itself, but together they convey a sense of false starts: themes are touched upon, tropes are analyzed, but sustained argument has not yet begun.

It is only in the second part, one hundred pages into the book, that the study begins to coalesce. Under the title “Redeeming Christianity’s Reputation,” Davis addresses the continuing interaction of reli-

gious thought and the fight against slavery. Here he is on firm and familiar ground, and he weaves his new concern with progress and its multiple conceptualizations together with his earlier themes of the ideological roots of antislavery.² He portrays Christian antislavery activists as engaged in a double campaign: to challenge the growth of secularism by associating it with racism, self-interest, and slavery itself; and to advance universal betterment through the moral purification attendant upon emancipation. Being hostile to secularism did not mean being antiprogress, and abolitionists were generally convinced that material progress was consistent with moral uplift.

A central theme thus emerges of the “power conveyed by harnessing antislavery to progress,” the linking of Christian visions of redemption to British convictions of unstoppable scientific and imperial advancement (p. 257). The yoking of the two, however, was by no means secure: in the face of antislavery initiatives, planters could invoke competing ideals of progress to justify various forms of melioration and gradualism, and abolitionists themselves were later to become entangled in the logical implications of their claim that West Indian emancipation would increase prosperity. If emancipation was both morally right and economically progressive, how were they to explain the postemancipation decline in plantation output?³ Some of the ground that Davis covers in tracing abolitionist rhetoric and politics is familiar, but his formulation of the problem is one that can profitably be expanded to new territory.

Indeed, the diffidence of Davis’s work is closely linked to one of its strengths. By stepping back from issues of slavery and economic development, or slavery and technological advancement, and insisting on discussion of *conceptions* of progress, Davis may actually bring historians closer to answering persistent questions about the causes of abolition. Upon reading this work, one is struck by the extent to which modern historians have framed certain questions in dichotomous and categorical terms arising in large measure from nineteenth-century moral discourse—slavery as stimulus versus slavery as fetter. But such terms are quite unlikely to yield definitive historical answers. Moreover, such answers as scholars think they have found may prove deceptive. As Howard Temperley has argued, much of the early disputation concerning the efficiency and productivity of slavery was derived from ideological first principles and thus was notably resistant to revision in the light of experience.⁴ It is not difficult to show through modern research that some free-labor ideologists were mistaken about the relative profitability of slave and free labor. But when one is seeking the motive forces behind abolition, one must recognize that the formulations themselves had a significance unaffected by later calculations of productivity and profitability.

It was, after all, contemporary perceptions of interests and of the probable course of change that most directly shaped the behavior of slaveholders and the state during the period of debate over abolition. Davis notes that in Brazil, “the growing conviction that a Brazilian institution was founded on provincial prejudice and was contrary to universal forces of betterment shook the confidence of all but the most resolute planters” (p. 298). Similarly, although Cuban slaveholders in the 1870s and 1880s tended to cling to their slaves and to accuse abolitionists of seeking to undermine the island’s prosperity, most were also open to the notion that an eventual shift to free labor would stimulate immigration, hasten technological advancement, and make the island of Cuba a more modern and prosperous place. Caught between a desire to maintain control and a hope that abolition, properly managed, might further the interests of the island, they lobbied for concessions and dragged their feet when hurried but did not take up arms against the state that legislated gradual abolition.⁵

Hence one could argue that Davis’s work points the way toward a generalized explanation of abolition, not just of British and American abolitionism, even though he himself refrains from assigning and ranking causes. Rather than assume that capitalism would directly bring about the end of slavery, one must examine the way in which the free-labor ideology that flourished with the rise of capitalism mediated the perception of interests, even, in some cases, on the part of slaveholders themselves. It becomes particularly important, then, to compare those circumstances in which such an ideology came to complement visions of moral improvement through emancipation with those circumstances in which the two positions remained separate.

Davis’s insights into abolitionism, and into British policy in particular, nonetheless remain at one remove from the actual experiences of slavery and emancipation. It is revealing that Davis, after devoting a few pages to the fate of former slaves in the British West Indies, concludes that while the evidence is varied, “the important questions pertain to the uses made of such evidence” (p. 210). This statement seems a candid admission of his preference for analyzing texts and disputes rather than directly examining social and economic conditions. As a result, Davis’s interpretation serves as a significant corrective to mechanical pictures of the relationship between ideas, interests, and policies, but it cannot resolve certain key questions concerning emancipation as a social process, a process that primarily took place well out of the range of vision of the metropolitan lobbyists and administrators who are his primary concern.

Barry Higman, although concentrating on the years just prior to emancipation, turns his attention precisely toward those whom the abolitionists perceived only dimly. His *Slave Populations of the British Ca-*

ribbean, 1807–1834 is a milestone in the study of slavery, and its physical form is appropriate to its metaphorical status: it is a tome of some 780 pages, incorporating a vast statistical appendix within its impressive scholarly apparatus. The archival research, statistical sophistication, and intellectual breadth displayed in the book as are daunting as its size. But the purpose of Higman's display is not to intimidate the reader. The book aims quite clearly at a specific goal: to examine with care the demographic experiences of the slave societies of the British Caribbean in order both to permit evaluation of hypotheses concerning population history and to lay the foundation for understanding other aspects of slave life.

Scholars of slavery have frequently resorted to comparison of one kind or another, pairing societies with different cultural backgrounds or different crop experiences, or attempting to generalize about colonies of different imperial powers. Higman's project shares the conviction that comparison can illuminate essential processes, and he constructs his comparison rigorously. He examines a large set of colonies that varied in their economic experiences and histories of settlement but were, as British possessions, affected by some of the same external pressures. Moreover, they were all subject to slave registration, a nineteenth-century bureaucratic exercise in enumeration that opens the way for the modern scholar to establish a comprehensive statistical data base and to begin to scrutinize patterns of similarity and difference.

Slave Populations of the British Caribbean is marked by detailed presentation of evidence and by complete explicitness about the author's methods. This approach is laudable, but it requires the reader to join in his passion for the data or be numbed by his careful examination of each case, each category, and every unevenness in the record. Higman's second chapter, for example, which examines all the pitfalls and difficulties with the registration returns in preparation for the elaborate analysis to follow, verges on the tedious. By the third chapter, however, the major lines of argument begin to appear, and Higman establishes the categories of physical and economic environment that will remain crucial to his interpretation, dividing his cases into old sugar colonies, new sugar colonies, marginal societies, and, on its own, Jamaica. The typology combines crop concentration and settlement history and enables him to discuss systematically the patterns of variation among the cases under study.

In addition to laying out the actual structure of slave populations—in terms of sex, color, age, birthplace, size of holdings, and other features—Higman focuses directly on work regimes. Here his careful calculations of hours worked and patterns of labor yield both confirmation of other scholars' views—notably on the devastating qual-

ity of work on sugar estates—and challenges to some common assumptions. While scholars concerned with the possibilities for cultural autonomy have called attention to the relative independence associated with provision-ground cultivation, for example, Higman notes that it was in many ways an imposition, associated at times with hunger and burdensome extra hours of work. Perhaps surprisingly, Barbados, with its specified system of rations, stands out for its relatively favorable demographic experience. Similarly, he calls attention to the negative side of self-hire, noting that “the numerous psychological and cultural advantages of the relative independence associated with self-hire and board-wages were not generally matched by material gains” (pp. 204–12, 259). Time and again, Higman’s precise analysis of data enables him to evaluate anecdotal evidence critically, provide a fuller portrait of work rhythms and levels of material welfare, and evaluate causal hypotheses concerning patterns of work, family life, and disease.

The registration returns prove to be an exceptionally useful source for understanding health, fertility, and mortality. Higman discusses the early-nineteenth-century debates concerning the negative rate of natural increase of the slave populations and notes the ideological weight such disputes carried: abolitionists tended to ascribe these trends to high mortality, attributable to slavery and brutality, while slave-owners pointed to low fertility, which they generally blamed on slaves. Higman does not resolve the question as posed but instead implies that it may not lend itself to a single answer. Overall, low fertility and high mortality appear to have made approximately equal contributions to the negative rate of natural increase (p. 374). But his careful examination of the statistical evidence suggests that patterns varied widely within the British Caribbean, with generally positive and improving rates of natural increase in the old sugar colonies and marginal colonies after 1807, “heavy but improving negative rates” in the later sugar colonies, and “relatively light but deteriorating negative rates” in Jamaica (pp. 307–11). Even when one takes into account the different age and sex compositions of the populations in different colonies, the contrasts in levels of mortality remain. Sugar emerges again and again as the villain, with notably higher death rates in the sugar parishes within each colony than in regions producing other crops.

When Higman turns to the question of fertility, some cultural aspects of slave life emerge to complement his focus on material conditions. He finds, for example, that within rural populations, fertility tends to increase with the size of the slaveholding, probably “as a direct response to the local availability of potential co-residential mates in the context of the limited mobility permitted by the slave system” (p. 361). The balance of factors invoked in that sentence mirrors the tension in his analysis between an interest in the slaves’ ability to manipulate their

“material conditions of life” and the degree of constraint to which they were subject. Thus while fertility was influenced by lactation practices that were clear reflections of African customs, in this as in other aspects of life, “the parameters were always set by the masters” (p. 396). Although they might choose not to, masters could force mothers to wean their children early or could reward those who did so (p. 354).

Higman’s chapter on refuge and resistance indulges in some welcome subjective evidence concerning maroons and rebels, but he returns in the end to the focus on material conditions, and to the overwork, mortality, and morbidity that testify to the extraordinary harshness of slavery in sugar. Higman links the slaves’ torment in part to the “efficiency” of the systems under which they labored. The combination of gang labor in sugar and manufacturing labor in processing “created conditions that made demands on human endurance rarely matched on such a scale” (p. 375).⁶ In this sense, his evidence strengthens the brutal association between slavery and progress analyzed by Davis, even though it does not directly address questions of profitability or overall economic development. In the dry, yet powerful, language of demographic analysis employed by Higman, “The results of this maximization of labor productivity were seen in the maximization of mortality” (p. 332).

Edward Cox’s *Free Coloreds in the Slave Societies of St. Kitts and Grenada, 1763–1833*, although a more modest study of two small islands in the British Caribbean in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, shares Higman’s strategy of holding the time period and the colonial power constant while examining the disparities in levels of economic development in each case. St. Kitts was an established colony and had a substantial output of sugar by the mid-eighteenth century, while Grenada remained less developed and under French rule until 1763, although it underwent a thorough sugar revolution immediately thereafter.

The demographic weight of the free population of color varied somewhat between the two islands. St. Kitts by 1812 held almost twenty thousand slaves, sixteen hundred whites, and about two thousand free persons of color, with the last group constituting 55 percent of the free population. Grenada held about twenty-nine thousand slaves, only some eight hundred whites, and seventeen hundred free persons of color, the last group constituting 67 percent of the free population, rising in significance to 84 percent by 1830 (pp. 13–14). Free persons of color, many of them French-speaking, were crucial to the economy of Grenada, but they were caught up in the legal constraints imposed by the British on French colonists. In 1795–96 an uprising occurred on Grenada in which free persons of color, provoked by cultural and racial discrimination and armed with French revolutionary ideology, chal-

lenged the British colonial government and held their own for over a year.

Cox sets out methodically to discuss demography, patterns of manumission, the role of free coloreds in the economy, the insurrection on Grenada, the struggle for civil rights, and patterns of religion and education. He accumulates evidence, primarily from Colonial Office papers, and periodically links his cases to larger debates concerning the causes of social upheaval, the nature of Caribbean peasantries, and the economic concomitants of distinct patterns of race relations. But the evidence shows noticeable gaps, particularly on such questions as patterns of association and organization of free persons of color, and the author conspicuously deploys the terms "probably" and "may have," as well as the dubious "undoubtedly," at crucial points in his analysis. Careful qualification can be a virtue, but an overabundance of qualifiers at precisely the points of linkage between evidence and argument hints at weaknesses in the research design.

Cox's analysis is strongest on those issues where Colonial Office documentation is central, such as petitions for civil rights and campaigns for legislative representation, and weakest where a range of social, economic, and cultural factors need to be considered together, as in the discussion of religion and belief systems. For example, it is difficult to know what to make of his claim (for which no source is given) that "Shango, myalism, voodoo, santería, rada, and a number of other African religions seem to have been effectively syncretized with or subsumed under the Judeo-Christian tradition and thereafter became virtually nonexistent in either island" (p. 131). Are readers to assume that he means that each of these systems of belief, among them syncretic manifestations from disparate areas of the Caribbean, was strictly "African" and was adhered to by slaves at some point in the history of these two islands? The point seems both implausible and unclear.

There are also some conceptual weaknesses in the work. An ill-defined notion of "race relations" is periodically invoked, and Cox attempts to link "deteriorating" or "harmonious" race relations to patterns of political behavior (pp. 108–9). This approach might be useful in the context of a broad base of evidence on actual intergroup and interpersonal relations, but his evidence is modest and his argument largely inferential.

Nevertheless, Cox does argue usefully that patterns of manumission and even the status of free persons of color cannot be used mechanically as indices of the harshness of a slave system or of the nature of social relations within a slave society. To be sure, links exist between the ways that governments and masters dealt with slaves, on the one hand, and with free persons of color, on the other. But the connections are complex and are made even more so by the ambiguous nature of

the relations between free persons of color and slaves. One of the most interesting portions of Cox's book is his tracing of the interaction between the metropolitan campaigns for amelioration and abolition and the struggle of free persons of color in the islands for fuller civil rights. The anticipation of an eventual emancipation of the slaves stimulated British encouragement of schools and missionary activities in the islands, while fear of a coalition between slaves and free coloreds increased colonial willingness to remove the legal constraints upon free persons of color in hopes of securing their loyalty. Policy toward free persons of color was thus shaped not by a unified set of attitudes toward slaves and their descendants but by pragmatic attempts to maintain stability during a process of change.

Cox's juxtaposition of St. Kitts and Grenada yields significant contrasts, particularly between free persons of color as competitors with whites in St. Kitts and as a buffer between whites and slaves in post-1796 Grenada. Unlike Higman's work, however, this is not a study that takes full advantage of the potential for comparison among slave societies. It would have benefited from a firmer grasp of major interpretive issues and from greater analytic rigor.

Francisco Scarano's *Sugar and Slavery in Puerto Rico: The Plantation Economy of Ponce, 1800–1850*, by contrast, is unified and animated by a clear thesis. Like Davis, Scarano is concerned with slavery and progress, but in Scarano's case, the progress at stake is economic, and the focus is as much historiographical as theoretical. In the conventional view of the nineteenth-century Hispanic Caribbean, economically backward Puerto Rico is perceived as contrasting sharply with booming Cuba, with its classic features of a Caribbean sugar-and-slavery complex. Although Puerto Rico produced sugar for export, it is viewed as having relied more heavily on free labor, and thus, so the argument goes, its planters were not as committed to the continuance of slavery.

Scarano methodically attacks the underpinnings of this easy contrast. One of the frequently cited sources for the view that Puerto Rican sugar production did not rely heavily on slavery turns out to be a tendentious narrative by a proslavery propagandist, George Flinter, who was for his own reasons very much concerned to downplay the importance of bondage. Population figures have seemed to bear out Flinter's claim, but Scarano argues that it is only a mistaken averaging of population across the entire island that creates this impression. Based on a careful study of the region of Ponce, Scarano argues instead that slavery was crucial to the Puerto Rican sugar economy. Puerto Rico thus does not represent an anomalous nineteenth-century Caribbean sugar economy resting on free labor. Although coffee production did rely primarily on free labor and the island's peasant base was wide, its sugar regions conformed more than previously realized to classic Caribbean

patterns. Work regimes in sugar were generally repellent to free laborers, in Puerto Rico as elsewhere. Even when free laborers were available, employers found their absenteeism a serious drawback in an industry that could ill afford unpredictability of productive activity in the processing sector.

Scarano's study of Ponce goes beyond the effort to substantiate this thesis about labor use. He also examines processes of capital formation, levels of technological development, and the crucial role of immigrants within both the artisan and the planter classes. On the questions of capital formation and immigrant activities, a more refined contrast with Cuba can be drawn: in Cuba, he argues, creoles were able to accumulate capital in the tobacco industry and in trade during the early and mid-eighteenth century and then invest heavily in the sugar industry in the late eighteenth and nineteenth, while in Puerto Rico the opportunities for such accumulation were distinctly circumscribed by the island's more marginal position in the Spanish colonial system, leaving a significant role to be played by external capital.

A great virtue of Scarano's book is its ability to convey interconnections while concentrating on a single sector. Thus the expansion of sugar cultivation into new lands is linked to profitability and technological change in the sugar industry, and indirectly to the pushing of peasants into the highlands, where they would later participate in the expansion of sugar's competitor, coffee. External capital is seen as having stimulated growth, although the predominance of recent immigrants among entrepreneurs tended to inhibit the formation of a national consciousness.⁷

The major drawback of Scarano's study results from its self-imposed limitations of focus. Although the portrait of Ponce is intended as "microhistory," it lacks some of the descriptive depth that one expects such an approach to supply. We meet planters and merchants and come to know them by name, but the slaves who are crucial to the industry appear only as statistics in a population pyramid, or as valuables sold in a notarized transaction. Studies of other slave societies in Latin America have succeeded in extracting more than this, and one wishes that Scarano had chosen to examine such questions as slave insurrections, family patterns, provision-ground cultivation, and marketing.

Despite their quite disparate aims and differing degrees of success, each of these four works raises important questions about conventional views concerning the relationships between slavery, demography, and development. Together they suggest that research on these subjects requires a high degree of self-consciousness about terminology and assumptions. While leaving one puzzled about the meaning of

“progress” itself, Davis’s study implies that any dichotomous categorization of slavery per se as either a stimulus or an inhibition to progress should be viewed with caution. Higman’s comprehensive analysis evaluates the relative importance of high mortality and low fertility to the population experience of the British Caribbean but at the same time moves the question aside. More important to modern social history, he suggests, are the variant demographic patterns of the different islands as well as the underlying material, social, and cultural conditions that they reflect. Edward Cox’s work, perhaps inadvertently, reveals the near exhaustion of the “race relations” framework. He argues correctly that the experience of free persons of color does not mechanically reflect the slave experience; one could go a step further and argue that the error arises from implicitly grouping both together as members of the same “race,” forgetting that such categories are in their nature socially and culturally specific. Scarano, like Cox, is sensitive to the usefulness of historical comparison but is also concerned to reject comparisons, such as that between Cuba and Puerto Rico, that have degenerated into stereotypes. It is to his credit that after demolishing the classic antinomy, he succeeds in reconstructing a useful contrast between the two islands.

Davis, Higman, and Scarano thus succeed in demonstrating and challenging the way in which current scholarly debates are still unwittingly shaped by a range of nineteenth-century shibboleths and preconceptions, and in doing so each performs a valuable work of revision. At the same time, Davis’s work suggests that a critical and contextual study of these shibboleths and preconceptions, in conjunction with an analysis of the slave societies themselves, can reach beyond intellectual history and contribute to an explanation of the dynamics of social and economic change.

NOTES

1. The observation that the antithesis of slavery may not be autonomy, but rather “embeddedness,” reflects a definition of slavery not simply as a relationship that involves the holding of property in men and women, but as one that entails “natal alienation” and defines its victims as outsiders. Differing versions of this view have been developed more fully by Orlando Patterson and Moses Finley. See Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), especially pp. 1–34; and Moses I. Finley, s.v. “slavery,” in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968), 14:307–13. In this and other works, Finley questions the universality of an antithesis between slavery and freedom. See his “Between Slavery and Freedom,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5 (1962–63):233–49.
2. The classic earlier works are Davis’s *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), and *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).
3. For a perceptive discussion of this issue, see Thomas C. Holt, “‘An Empire over the Mind’: Emancipation, Race, and Ideology in the British West Indies and the Ameri-

- can South," in *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, edited by J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
4. See Howard Temperley, "Capitalism, Slavery, and Ideology," *Past and Present* 75 (May 1977):94–118.
 5. See Rebecca J. Scott, *Slave Emancipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860–1899* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985).
 6. Manuel Moreno Fraginals makes a similar point concerning the particular exigencies of labor in mechanized and semimechanized sugar mills, although he does not characterize the result as efficiency. In his memorable phrase, "A new world is created which adds to the barbarism of slavery the civilized torments of overwork." See Manuel Moreno Fraginals, *The Sugarmill: The Socioeconomic Complex of Sugar in Cuba, 1760–1860*, translated by Cedric Belfrage (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976), p. 18. See also Manuel Moreno Fraginals, *El ingenio: complejo económico social cubano del azúcar*, 3 vols. (Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1978), especially vol. 2.
 7. On this point, Scarano's work nicely complements that of Laird Bergad on coffee, in which a similar argument is made about the role of immigrant entrepreneurs. See Laird W. Bergad, *Coffee and the Growth of Agrarian Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Puerto Rico* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983).