

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JAMAICAN MAROON ETHNICITY

Today, when we speak of ethnic diversity or heterogeneity of Caribbean peoples, we usually lump together all African-derived peoples, and contrast them with others who are derived entirely, or in part, from Europeans, Indians, Amerindians, Chinese, and so forth. If pressed for further distinctions, we can mention certain groups that show greater "Ashanti" or "Yoruba" influence, but most such distinctions cannot be carried very far. They might point to a dominant African influence in the past, but not to an exclusive one. Furthermore, the amalgamation of African-derived populations of the Caribbean is now such that few people's identity is dependent on a connection with a specific African area or ethnic group¹ When traces of some particular African ethnic origin can be found, the important point is surely that the African heritage can be traced at all, not that the connection is to one group rather than to another. Certainly one detects no feelings of ethnic rivalry, competition or hostility based on descent from different African stocks. In other words, there is today no political significance attaching to differences in African ethnic origin.

But this was not always true in the Caribbean. In the days of slavery, when thousands of Africans were imported yearly and a large proportion of the population in most territories had been born in Africa, African ethnic identity was an important fact of life. It could serve positively as a source of comfort and solidarity, and as a rallying point in slave rebellions, but it could also be a divisive element, leading to rivalry and hostility among groups of different origin. This occurred on the plantations, and was even more pronounced among Maroons, escaped slaves who gathered in inaccessible retreats in the interior of islands and mainland territories.² It is among these Maroons, uninhibited by plantation rule, that African ethnicity had the freest rein, to shape and be shaped by the groups of Maroons it united or divided.

This paper examines the question of ethnic identity among the 18th century Jamaican Maroons. It will first consider the nature of African ethnic groups in the New World. Then it will look at the ethnic diversity among the Jamaican Maroons of the early 18th century, the problems the diversity caused, and the solutions that allowed the Maroons to emerge as integrated societies. Finally, it will suggest that the achievement of the Maroons in overcoming ethnic rivalries while retaining a more generalised African heritage foreshadowed a phenomenon that took place in Jamaica as a whole and made possible the integration of its Afro-American population.

African Ethnic Groups in the New World

Before going any further, let us distinguish and clarify several concepts central to the analysis:

1. **Reference group**³ —Any group, real or imaginary, with which a person feels iden-

tified. An Akan-speaking slave in Jamaica might feel identified with any or all of the following: his home lineage, village and chiefdom in Africa; the shipmates with whom he shared the passage across the Atlantic; all persons associated with his plantation, slave and free, Black and White, all Akan-speaking persons in the island; all slaves in the island; and so forth. The stronger the identification, the more likely it is to direct a person's behaviour. The group that claims a person's strongest loyalties is called his primary reference group. A reference group based on ethnic identity may be called an ethnic reference group.

2. **Culture-bearing group**⁴—A group with common cultural norms that are developed and maintained through the interaction of its members. This concept deals with "culture" not as a collection of discrete traits, but as a continuing product of group interaction, a live and constantly adjusting set of patterns that makes social life possible. This view is particularly useful in dealing with African slaves brought to the New World because it focuses our attention not on the bits and pieces of their African ancestry that survived the middle passage, but on their adaptive and creative efforts to fuse new sets of common patterns among themselves out of the diverse raw materials they had at hand. Culture-bearing groups may be overlapping, and an individual may belong to more than one such group at a time. The slaves on a plantation might become a culture-bearing group; so might the Akan-speaking slaves on that plantation. For the members of both these groups, the scope of their common culture would be limited to certain areas of their lives.

3. **Ethnic identity**—Consciousness of kind, based on perceived similarity of culture and origin, and usually of language as well.

4. **Ethnic group (culture-bearing)**—A group based on common ethnic identity that has common cultural patterns developed and maintained through the interaction of its members. An ethnic group as here defined is a culture-bearing group.

5. **Ethnic pool**—A collection of individuals of a given ethnic background who do not constitute an ethnic group as defined above, but whose basic similarity of language and culture is such that ethnic groups could arise among them with relative ease, for example, all Akan-speaking Africans in Jamaica. Ethnic groups would be likely to arise among members of an ethnic pool whenever local clusterings of them lasted long enough to allow them to develop common norms through interaction, and particularly when they were surrounded by others of different ethnic backgrounds.

A striking finding of recent research on ethnic groups in Africa has been the flexibility of ethnic identity and ethnic group boundaries. While ethnic identity does not normally change very much in an individual's lifetime if he stays in the same place, surrounded by the same people, migration may result in redefinitions of ethnic group boundaries and of the basis of ethnic identity itself. One finds such ethnic redefinition in multi-ethnic African cities and towns today. New immigrants, with few or no fellow "tribesmen" in the towns, will immediately widen the basis of their ethnicity to find a lowest common denominator by which to link themselves to other people. While at home the important criterion may have been membership in a particular chiefdom, in the city a larger common region of origin or a common language may serve to justify a claim of common ethnicity and thus allow a person to attach himself to an ethnic group whose culture

may differ in many respects from the one he left at home. For people who seldom go home to their natal villages, the new town community can become the dominant focus of ethnic identity and may even come to supersede the old loyalties to village and chief.⁵ The important point to keep in mind is that ethnic identity should be seen here as a **linking principle rather than a fixed attribute.**

The readiness and ease with which modern Africans engage in a creative and adaptive redefinition of ethnic boundaries and an expansion of the basis of ethnic identity, and their creation of new ethnic groups in changing circumstances (as when they become separated from their home villages), can help us to understand the nature of African ethnic groups in the New World during slavery. Africans whom the New World planters called by a common name such as “Eboes,” “Pawpaws,” “Mundingos,” and so forth, were clearly not the same sort of unit as an ethnic group in Africa, even if they sometimes bore the same name. The “Congo” in Jamaica were not all BaKongo, but included Africans from a number of ethnic groups throughout the Congo region and sometimes Angola as well. The “Coromantee,” so important in fomenting Jamaican slave rebellions, were not all Ashanti. Edward Long, in 1774, called attention to the complex reality that term covered.

The Negroes who pass under this general designation are brought from the Gold Coast; but we remain uncertain whether they are natives of that tract of Guiney, or receive their several names of Akims, Fantins, Ashantees, Quanboos, &c from the towns so called, at whose markets they are bought. . .⁶

The Coromantee slaves who did come from the Gold Coast might have been bitter enemies at home, but in Jamaica they constituted what we would call an ethnic pool of slaves from a broadly similar background; and this broad commonality included people who spoke mutually unintelligible but related languages, and practised diverse but similar customs. Within this pool, common ethnic identity might be asserted, and when that happened, the same processes of ethnic redefinition one now finds in Africa must have been operating on a large scale. Africans from the Gold Coast, finding themselves cut off forever from their ties at home, sought to establish new ties with the people around them whom they found most familiar: people from the same area who spoke related languages and had similar traditions.

These processes of ethnic redefinition must have started even before the Africans reached the New World. We know that slaves who shared the middle passage considered themselves kin; and even before that, in the slave factories and baracoons of the African coast, African captives in their fear and sorrow may have found comfort in asserting kin ties with others who, if they did not come from the same village or chiefdom, at least came from a part of their known world.⁷ Reference groups of fellow sufferers were created and given a charter of kinship. The assertion of common ethnicity did not by itself make them ethnic groups as defined above. For that, they had to develop common norms and means of communication among themselves, to adjust the differences in their *languages and cultures, to resolve their diverse customs into a common culture.* This process could start as soon as they came into contact with one another, and was continued on the slave plantations of the New World and in the bush where Maroons encountered one another.

Such New World African ethnic groups, as opposed to ethnic pools, were thus local creations, groups of individuals who could identify and interact with one another and in doing so establish cultural norms. Each local group of, say, Coromantees would have differed somewhat from the next in custom and dialect, depending on the relative representation of different Gold Coast peoples and of other factors of group composition, as well as on the relative isolation of the group from others on a plantation or in the bush where Maroons gathered. Different local groups of Coromantees doubtless had a great deal in common; any group could and did absorb new adult members and two or more local groups could easily adjust their cultural differences to form a larger common ethnic group. But this does not mean that different local groups of Jamaican Coromantees were always ready to join, or to assert their common heritage and claim kinship and brotherhood with one another, that is, to allow their primary reference group to extend to include other Coromantees. That would have been a strategic decision of the moment. Coromantee slaves from several plantations who were planning a joint rebellion would assert their common ethnic identity. Rival Coromantee Maroon bands who were fighting one another would not, but if one such band defeated another, common Coromantee identity might be called upon to aid in the assimilation of the defeated band. In other words, the ethnic identity of Africans in the New World could be manipulated in the same strategic ways ethnic identity is manipulated in Africa, or anywhere else for that matter.

The bonds between members of the newly created ethnic groups, most of whom had been strangers to one another, must have been as heavily dependent on shared experiences as on their common African heritage. A shared middle passage, residence on the same plantation, escape together, membership in the same Maroon band: each of these in itself might be used as a basis for a claim of kinship. Africans who had shared several or all of these experiences must have had a strong bond indeed. But while the bonds between individual members may have been very strong, Afro-American ethnic groups must have been in general more fluid and less cohesive as groups than their rural counterparts in Africa. This would have been due to several factors. First, the African members did not grow up in the group, but were diverse in origin. They might from time to time discover that they had more in common with members of other local groups than with others in their own group by virtue of having been more closely related in Africa, or of having shared the journey across the ocean. Such cross-cutting ties would be likely to keep group boundaries flexible, and make it relatively easy for individuals to move from one local group to another when circumstances allowed, as, for example, when a Coromantee slave from one plantation was sold to another plantation containing Coromantees. Second, the rapid turnover of population of the plantations, caused by the high mortality rate, the large numbers of Africans imported yearly, and the power of the masters to sell slaves at will, meant that any existing local group might frequently incorporate new members, and new groups were constantly being formed. The larger the proportion of new members, the less the shared experience of the group as a whole, the less developed its common culture, and the less its cohesiveness. Third, a group of Coromantees on a plantation was not an exclusive group for all purposes, and indeed, not for most purposes. They were a limited culture-bearing group, re-creating their own Akan culture in some spheres of life, but they also belonged to the larger culture-bearing group of all slaves on their plantation, a group that had its own flexible boundaries and

changing membership. They may have lived in their own quarter of the slave village, but much of their life was shared with other slaves, and they were taking part in the plantation's and the island's developing Creole culture as well.⁸ Thus, on a plantation, an African ethnic group had limited scope to develop its own norms apart from those of the other slaves, and the lives of all slaves were, of course, severely constrained by the social institution of the plantation.

In the bush, where Maroons collected, escaped slaves were free to regulate all aspects of their lives, not only those that occurred between sunset and sunrise. Furthermore, a group of Coromantees, having managed to escape, might be much more isolated from other Africans and Creoles than they were on the plantation, and thus could more readily develop their own distinctive culture. But even among Maroons, African ethnic groups were more fluid than their rural counterparts in Africa: there was still the diverse origin of the members and the frequent absorption of new adult members. If they had not been fluid and willing to accept a changing membership, they might not have been able to sustain their existence at all, because it seems they were not naturally producing populations (see below).

This adaptive fluidity must have been characteristic of all African ethnic groups in the New World, and of many ethnic groups that were based not on African ethnic identity, such as groups of Creole slaves on plantations. We suggest that this fluidity, and other factors that made possible the formation and continuation of African ethnic groups in the New World—the flexible sense of common heritage, the redefinition of ethnic identity, the creation of a common culture out of disparate materials—that these factors also allowed a further regrouping: they allowed Jamaican Maroons to overcome the cultural differences that various local communities had developed, and to integrate their societies around a more generalized Maroon ethnicity.

Ethnic Diversity among the Jamaican Maroons

In 1739, the English in Jamaica signed treaties with two groups of Maroons who had been collecting in the interior of the island since the Spaniards gave it over to the English in 1660. Initially there were a number of separate communities of varying size in the bush; they were continuously forming, growing, fighting, and rearranging themselves according to their various affinities; by the early 18th century, they had coalesced into two large polities: the Windward Maroons in the eastern mountains and the Leeward Maroons in and around the Cockpit Country of the western interior, and each polity contained at least two settlements.⁹

A number of populations were represented among these 18th century Maroons. One cannot always tell what degree of ethnic solidarity the people from each population had, or the amount of ethnic rivalry among different local groups drawn from the same ethnic pool, but we can at least catalogue the populations from which the Maroons were drawn, and in some cases we can say something about the local groups of Maroons drawn from them. By far the overwhelming majority of Maroons were West and Central Africans brought to Jamaica for use on the English plantations, and their descendants, but there were several other minor sources of Maroons that we may mention.

First, there may have been some Amerindians among the Maroons. There is a possibility that some of the native Arawak Indians, most of whom had died out by the 17th

century, remained in the interior to mix with later escapees from Spanish and, later, British rule in the island. There is no evidence to support the claim advanced by some writers and some present-day Maroons (other Maroons strongly deny it) that Maroons are descended from Arawaks.¹⁰ We know that as late as 1601, there were some Arawaks living in the Blue Mountains independent of Spanish control, but there is no clue as to whether or not they survived to mix with later Maroons.¹¹ Obviously, such Indians constituted an ethnic group, and would have continued to do so within later Maroon societies, if they survived to join them.

Apart from Jamaican Arawaks, there were other Amerindians who might have joined Maroon communities in the 17th and 18th centuries. Mesquito Indians were imported to hunt down Maroons, and there are other references to “free Indians” of unknown origin in the island.¹² If any such Indians joined the Maroons they would have been very few in number, and almost certainly would not have constituted ethnic groups. The entire Amerindian contribution to the Maroon stock was doubtless very small, and their cultural contribution appears at present to have been negligible, even if some did survive to impart their bush skills to Maroons.

A second and more important small population that contributed to the Maroons was said to have come from Madagascar, whose people are more closely related to Malaysia than to the rest of Africa. In the early 18th century, Madagascar slaves, recent arrivals in Jamaica, escaped from several plantations in St. Elizabeth parish and fled into the western interior. Their leader was a Madagascar who led the escape from Down’s plantation in 1718.¹³ They were distinctive in appearance and language. Dallas describes them as

“... another tribe of negroes, distinct in every respect; their figure, character, language, and country, being different from those of any other blacks. Their skin is of a deeper jet than that of any other negroes; their features resemble those of Europeans; their hair is of a loose and soft texture and like a Mulatto’s or Quadroon’s; their form is more delicate, and their stature rather lower than those of the people they joined; . . .”¹⁴

These Madagascar Maroons, and others who had joined them, were engaged in something of a feud with the group of Maroons, mainly Coromantees and their descendants, who came to dominate the Leeward interior. The Madagascars and the Coromantees

“... after many disputes, and bloody battles wherein a great Number were slain on both Sides and among others the Madagascar Captain, joined and incorporated themselves. Hence arose that great Body of Negro’s. . . now under the command of Captn. Cudjo. . .”¹⁵

The Madagascars were eventually integrated into the Leeward polity, adjusted to and learned the dominant culture, but remained a distinct ethnic group for many years, using their own language at home, and presumably practising their own customs in private. Dallas, writing some eighty years after the merger, could still identify remnants of the former group.

Some of the old people remember that their parents spoke, in their own families, a language entirely different from that spoken by the rest of the negroes with whom they had incorporated. They recollected many of the words for things in common use, and declared that in their early years they spoke their mother-tongue. The Coromantee Language, however, superseded the others, and became in time the general one in use.¹⁶

Another group of Madagascar slaves was shipwrecked on the eastern end of the island some time round 1670 and was said to have joined with other runaway groups in the east. We have no record of the process of that merger, and apparently they had no contact with the Leeward Madagascars.¹⁷

A third small population contributing to the Maroons were ex-slaves the Spaniards had left behind when they gave up the island to the English in 1660. These Spanish Blacks had harassed the English settlers until one of their settlements was discovered, and the inhabitants agreed to help the English in hunting down the others and in chasing the last Spaniards from the island. The remaining hundred or so ex-slaves, called Varmahaly Negroes, alternately signed treaties and fought with the English, who never succeeded in routing them. They retreated to the mountains and were discovered in time by escapees from the new English plantations.¹⁸

These particular Spanish Maroons may not have formed a distinct reference group (or groups) when the Spanish were in control of the island, but after 1660 they certainly did.¹⁹ Furthermore, their common experiences as slaves in Spanish Jamaica and their common Spanish language set them apart from escapees from the English plantations. They became a cohesive and exclusive ethnic group and did not, at first, welcome the others into their midst. As an 18th century author reports, the Spanish Maroons

“... grew familiar, and held a Correspondence with the English Negro’s; however, they did not encourage them to desert, and those that did were treated with great severity, obliged to do all Servile Offices, they put them to, which prevented many others from joining them.”²⁰

Eventually they did join with some escapees from the English plantations, prompted in part by a shortage of women, but the process of adjustment was a slow one, involving cultural change. The Spanish Maroons

“... associated themselves with some of those small Bodies [of new escapees], followed the same Customs, and abated of their Severity to those, who deserted and came to join them. . .”²¹

The descendants of the Spanish Maroons thus became the nucleus of the Windward Maroons that drew together into a loose federation in the eastern mountains some time before 1730. They

“... were joined by divers small Bodies, and after many disputes and Battles with some other Gangs, incorporated and settled together in the Mountains near Port Antonio, where They made a considerable Settlement, which they called Nanny Town.”²²

We do not know the African provenience of the original Spanish Maroons, nor what proportion of them were African, as opposed to Creole. Morales Padron says that the majority of Spanish slaves in Jamaica came from the Gold Coast, so it is possible that some of the Spanish Maroons recognized in Coromantee escapees from the English plantations a common African heritage.²³ Their ethnic identity as Spanish Maroons was evidently strong enough initially to prevent association with other Maroons, although when they did decide to join with others, the common African heritage may have made the eventual amalgamation easier, and helped to provide a basis for their broader Maroon ethnicity.

A fourth population, and the one that made the greatest contribution to the Maroons, were the Coromantees, or slaves from the Gold Coast. Gold Coast slaves played by far the greatest role in rebellions throughout the slave period in Jamaica.²⁴ They were considered so dangerous that the Jamaican government considered a bill to impose an extra duty on them to discourage their importation.²⁵ The reports of rebellions and escapes that specify the background of the slaves involved almost always name them as Coromantees. For the other uprisings, we must rely on Long's general report that Coromantees were responsible for most of the rebellions.²⁶ Furthermore, we can see the Akan presence in the names of the 18th century Maroon leaders: Cudjoe, Accompong, Quaco, Cuffee in the west; Quao and Cuffee in the east; and even the present-day language and culture of the Jamaican Maroons show an Akan influence.²⁷

But let us again stress that the common Coromantee background of local Maroon communities did not preclude rivalry. Within the ethnic pool of Coromantees any number of local groups formed, plotted and carried out rebellions and escapes from the plantations, and many continued for a time as separate bands in the bush. Each such community would have had its own ethnic identity and would have constituted an ethnic reference group, which might or might not be extended to include other Coromantee groups. Given the amount of rivalry and hostility reported among various Maroon bands, and given the preponderance of Coromantees in slave rebellions and escapes, it is clear that some of the inter-group rivalry was between different groups of Coromantees. And merger, even with ethnically similar groups, did not mean that all distinctions were erased. In the 1730's, a group of Windward Maroons, called Cottawoods, marched across the island to join the western Maroons, under Cudjoe. We know that Cudjoe's Maroons were largely Coromantees and the descendants of Coromantees, and it is likely that the Coromantees were too; but in spite of the common culture that in time developed among them, separate reference groups continued to exist some sixty years later. Dallas, in 1803, reported that

“... though consolidated into one body... the distinction of their origin was always kept up. The name of Cottawood was preserved among the descendants of that tribe, and the original body of Negroes under Cudjoe were distinguished by the appellation of Kenkuffees, in which line the succession of chiefs continued.”²⁸

In this enumeration of the various ethnic pools, fifth are the non-Coromantee Africans; here we have a number of different ethnic pools: “Congos,” “Eboes,” “Mundingos,” “Pawpaws” (Slave Coast), “Nagos” (Yoruba), and so forth. While our information is very meagre on African Maroons other than Coromantees, there may well have been some Maroon groups that were composed mainly of “Congo” or “Eboe” slaves, or other African groups. As early as 1686, White discovered three “provision-Plantations” in St. George's parish, each belonging to Maroons of a different “country”²⁹ After the Maroons had signed their treaties, several runaway settlements of “Congos” were discovered, one in 1780, containing some 60 persons, and another in 1795, of about 35 inhabitants. The latter settlement, deep in the western woods, was estimated to have been in existence some twenty years.³⁰ Perhaps our best clue to the existence of Maroon communities of diverse African ethnic identity before 1739 is a general account in an 18th century Jamaican manuscript on the Maroons. Of the small early Maroon communities that existed prior to their merger into two large polities, it says

“... these small bodies were composed of negroes of different countrys & of different manners and customs in Guinea and often very opposite and at great variance with one another and when in time afterwards they became numerous (for all of these companies endeavoured to corrupt and enveigle from the plantations and were ready to receive their respective countrymen) they had many bloody battles with one another.”³¹

In the interior, far from the oppressive rule of the colonial society, Africans had a freedom to express their ethnic hostility denied them on the plantations, but the antagonisms were none the less present there. Leslie, writing in 1740, said

“The Slaves are brought from several Places in Guiney, which are different from one another in Language, and consequently they can’t converse freely; or, if they could, they hate one another so mortally, that some of them would rather die by the Hands of the English, than join with other Africans in an Attempt to shake off their Yoke.”³²

As we have seen, the Maroons did manage to subdue these rivalries enough to draw together into larger units, but how they managed to hold their new societies together, given the ethnic differences, is another matter.

Finally, in speaking of the ethnic pools that contributed to the Maroons, we must mention two types of Creoles, those plantation Creoles who escaped to become Maroons and those Maroons who were born in the woods. As to the first, we know of no exclusive groups of Jamaican plantation Creoles who carried out major rebellions and escaped to become Maroon communities in the interior. Doubtless there were many who participated in rebellions, and there were individuals and small groups of plantation Creoles who escaped into the interior, but those who escaped were as likely to become urban Maroons as bush Maroons; their highly developed skills for getting along in the plantation society could provide them with enough cover in the cities.³³ We know that antagonisms between Creoles and Africans on the plantations were high, and plantation Creoles often had an ethnic solidarity of their own; both the antagonisms and the solidarity may have extended into the Maroon societies.³⁴

Creole Maroons, that is, those born as Maroons, were quite another matter. They had never been slaves and knew nothing of the plantation society except what they were told by others, or saw during raids. Having been born and bred among the Maroons, they could not scorn Africans as being too “bush” and ignorant in the ways of the colonial society, as the plantation Creoles did. Nonetheless, among Maroons also, there was an important distinction, accompanied by antagonism and factional cleavage, between African and Creole Maroons. This was illustrated in a dramatic fashion shortly after the treaties of 1739 froze the membership of the Maroon communities and closed them forever to new escapees. A group of Coromantees among the Leeward Maroons, apparently dissatisfied with the terms of their treaty, conspired with Coromantee slaves on nearby plantations “to cast off all those that were born in the woods, or came from other countries,” and establish their own Coromantee society in the interior.³⁵ The Creole Maroons and other non-Coromantee Maroons, led by Cudjoe, who was a Creole, suppressed the rebellion, and its leaders were executed or sent off the island. These Coromantees were obviously more identified with other Coromantees than with other Maroons. Their primary reference group was a group of local Coromantees, including

Coromantee Maroons and Coromantee plantation slaves. But Cudjoe, a Creole Maroon who had a Coromantee father, bore a Coromantee name, most likely spoke a Coromantee language (in addition to Creole English) and shared with other Leeward Maroons a culture that was largely Coromantee-derived—Cudjoe was himself first and foremost a Maroon, not a Coromantee.³⁶ So, we suggest, were the other Creole Maroons in both ends of the island.

It was these Creole Maroons, with no competing or cross-cutting loyalties, who helped to anchor the new ethnic identity of the Maroons; they provided a solid and unquestionable core to which it attached. Whether their ancestors were Coromantees or Madagascars or Spanish Maroons, their common experience could outweigh the differences in their lands of origin far more easily than it could for the Africans who had lived in those lands. For Creole Maroons, those far lands were mythical. Furthermore, since Maroons born in the same societies had grown up together, there was little strain of adjustment. While they might have spoken the various African and European languages of their parents at home, and practised some of their traditions in private, they also learned, from childhood, the Creole English and the common culture of their Maroon society. It was their primary reference group and had no serious competitors for their loyalties.

The Building of Maroon Societies and the Growth of Maroon Ethnicity

The enumeration of ethnic pools that contributed to the Maroon population and the focus on local ethnic groups that arose within these pools may have given a misleading impression of the formation of local Maroon groups and their growth and coalescence into two larger polities; it may have suggested that it was all simply a matter of small cohesive ethnic groups escaping and drawing together, by mutual design or by conquest, to form larger units. Certainly something like that was happening when the Madagascars and the Coromantees merged in the west, or when the descendants of the Spanish Maroons joined with other groups in the east, but the processes that went into these and other types of Maroon growth were actually more complex and diverse. We should like to call attention to several of these processes, and the implications they had for the developing Maroon ethnicity.

First, let us look at the composition of groups of slaves that escaped during rebellions. Ethnic rebellions did not always yield Maroons who were exclusively of one New World African group or another; in fact, they probably rarely if ever did. Our earlier discussion mentioned that African ethnic groups on the plantations could not be exclusive groups for most purposes; they had flexible boundaries, changing membership, and their members had close connections with other slaves. Many of the Jamaican reports of African ethnic uprisings state that **most** of the slaves in the rebellion were Coromantees; the group that rebelled also included others who were not Coromantee, but who shared with them the common culture of their plantation. Thus, groups of newly escaping slaves, even when the product of ethnic rebellions, had already begun to integrate into their numbers others who did not share the same African background, and this integration would continue in the bush. Rebellious slaves who were not predominantly of one particular African tradition had to have other bases for integration from the start, and here plantation identity might well serve. Syntheses of all types abounded. The members of an African ethnic group on a plantation already represented a synthesis of tradi-

tions, and the group of escaping slaves in an ethnic rebellion developed another synthesis. Slaves escaping in non-ethnic rebellions represented yet another type of integration. New reference groups were formed as changing social contexts thrust together different collections of people. Culture-bearing groups formed and re-formed, and their developing cultures adjusted accordingly. There was a continual process of expanding and re-defining ethnic identity. It was not such a far step then, nor a new one, to attempt yet another synthesis and to create a new ethnic identity with other Maroons in the bush.

The second process deals with the incorporation of new adult members by communities already existing in the bush. There was a steady supply of new Maroons who were not part of an escaping community: one or two runaways, a handful of slaves the Maroons had carried off in a plantation raid, some Blacks enticed away from parties sent to fight the Maroons, and so on. New members absorbed in any great numbers would, of course, present a challenge to the unity and cohesiveness of the group. Yet we suggest that considerable numbers of new members had to be incorporated by virtually all Jamaican Maroon communities; it was the only way they could sustain themselves, for it is almost certain that they were not naturally reproducing populations.

The idea that Jamaican Maroons were not naturally reproducing before 1739 is supported by census figures from the early post-treaty period. There was a rapid decline in their populations once no new members were allowed to join them. At the time of the treaties, the Windward Maroons, counted “by notches on a stick,” numbered 490.³⁷ Ten years later their numbers had fallen to 303! Some of this decrease was due to a special clause added to their treaty requiring any runaway not out above three years to return to his master; but the Leeward Maroons, who had no such requirement, and who were reported in 1739 to have had “about the same number” as the Windward Maroons, had fallen in ten years to 361.³⁹ Furthermore, the age and sex structure of the Maroon population was not that of a naturally reproducing one. A shortage of women was a chronic problem for the Maroons, and though we have no data on the sex ratio for 1739, the figures of 1749 still show the shortage.⁴⁰ They also show an abnormally low proportion of children, and this is not accounted for by the shortage of women, for even relative to the number of women, the number of children is low.⁴¹ The figures argue strongly that the Maroons were not reproducing themselves in pre-treaty times. The sexual imbalance of their population worked against this; so, evidently, did the hardships of their lives in the bush, pursued as they were by the English. They were able to keep up their numbers only by incorporating new escapees. This, in turn, had important implications for their developing societies.

In order to incorporate large numbers of new adults into their communities, and to take them in as full members, not as lifetime outsiders, Maroons needed a flexible sense of ethnic identity and also some way of insuring that the newcomers did not “swamp” them and undermine their unity. There are several examples of incorporation procedures followed by different groups of Jamaican Maroons. We have already quoted that of the Spanish Maroons, who relegated newcomers to a servile position. Cudjoe’s Maroons imposed a rather harsh method of apprenticeship.

“ . . . when any Negro man deserted from the Plantations and went among them, They would not Confide in them, until They had served a time prefix’d for their

Probation; which made some of Them return to their Masters not liking the usage or treatment they met with. . .”⁴²

The Windward Maroons were anxious for new recruits, and bound them at once with a sacred oath.

“They give encouragement for all sorts of negroes to join them, and oblige the men to be true to them by an oath which is held very sacred among the negroes, and those who refuse to take that oath, whether they go to them of their own accord or are made prisoners, are instantly shot to death. . .”⁴³

This practice of the Windward Maroons may have been an alternative procedure of incorporation, but since extended periods of apprenticeship seem to have been common in Maroon communities throughout the hemisphere, it is equally possible that this report tells us of only one stage in the incorporation process, and that it was followed by a period of probation as well.⁴⁴

In fact, we suspect that incorporation into Maroon communities everywhere was at least a two-stage process, the first involving initial ritual acceptance, the second, a long period of sociological and psychological adjustment, analogous to boot-camp training. The first stage, as described in the oath-taking ritual among the Windward Maroons, attached the new recruit to the group, and made him subject to the same supernatural sanctions facing other group members if he broke the sacred oath. Outsiders who would not so bind themselves were put to death. By this ritual, the outsider made himself part of the spiritual unity of the group, though he had an inferior social position in it. Sociological incorporation was a longer, more difficult process. This second step, as described in the probationary period served by new Maroons in Cudjoe’s group, was a training period for the newcomer, allowing him to learn the group’s culture. By relegating him to an inferior position, the others prevented him from unduly influencing the political and social organization of the group, while he learned to conform to its norms. Thus a unity and continuity of culture could be maintained in spite of the frequent incorporation of adults. Incorporation may have been handled differently for women, who were a scarce resource.⁴⁵ If this two-stage scheme is correct for Maroon societies in general, then we would also expect, as a final marker in the incorporation process, another ritual marking the transition from apprenticeship to full membership, but we have no examples of this from Jamaica.

A third process that should be considered in this discussion of the building of Maroon societies is the merger of existing communities in the interior, whether by will or by conquest. Incorporation by means of a period of low-status apprenticeship could be used to deal with considerable numbers of newcomers, but only if they came in a trickle, a few at a time, over a period of years. When two groups of relatively equal numbers merged, it was not politically feasible to keep one group in a servile position, even if it had been conquered. That would have required far too many resources from societies at war with colonial Jamaica. The most that could be expected was political control by the dominant group, and this Cudjoe achieved.⁴⁶ And yet the ethnic differences of the various groups that comprised the large Maroon polities must have presented serious problems of integration. *Before they had come together into two polities, there was much warring among them. How were these groups of different “countries” to live together peacefully?*

Superficial integration was relatively simple. The solution generally practised seems to have been some sort of federated structure in which each group maintained its separate identity, either in its own quarter of a single village or in several villages. This type of organization was reported explicitly for a runaway slave village in 1792, some 50 years after the Jamaican Maroons had won their treaties. The settlement was said to contain

“... a great many People both Mulattoes and Negroes, all Countries and each Country had a Division of the Town, and built Houses for the reception of New Comers. . .”⁴⁷

This report may be over-schematized, for we have only second- and third-hand accounts of it from slaves who had never been there, but it is revealing as a model of an ideal Maroon community as a place in which diverse African ethnic identities could be preserved in a state of freedom. Some structure such as this must have emerged after the Coromantees and Madagascars joined in the west, or after the Spanish Maroons joined with other small groups in the east. This structure did not, however, solve the problems of a deeper cultural integration. How were the Maroons to keep these heterogeneous societies from splitting along ethnic lines in times of strain?

Cudjoe himself was aware of the political problems of even superficial integration of two groups of Maroons relatively equal in size. He refused to allow a large group from the east to join him for he claimed they would answer to their own leaders rather than to him, and he insisted on maintaining control over all Maroon operations in his territory.⁴⁸ Within his own polity, he turned himself to the problems of cultural integration. He had a self-conscious policy of minimizing ethnic differences by restricting the use of African languages,

“... having experienced that the Divisions and Quarrells which had hapned amongst Themselves, were owing to their different Countries and Customs, which created Jealousies and uneasiness; He prohibited any other language being spoken among Them, but English. . .”⁴⁹

Among the Windward Maroons Creole English was also used, so that even those born in the woods spoke it, but we cannot tell whether it was enforced as a policy or simply adopted because it was the only way Maroons of diverse backgrounds could communicate with one another.⁵⁰ There may have been other techniques of integration adopted by Cudjoe and other Maroons, but this is the only one of which we have a record.

While the use of English and the gradual development of a common culture allowed Maroons of different backgrounds to communicate and live together, they did not prevent ethnic factionalism entirely. Coromantees among the Leeward Maroons plotted a rebellion shortly after the treaties were signed. Among the Windward Maroons there was considerable factionalism, splitting and re-grouping both before and after 1739, and while this is not reported specifically as ethnic factionalism, it would seem more than likely that some splits followed ethnic lines in times of stress, no matter the cause of the disturbance.⁵¹

Thus, neither Maroon polity was wholly successful in holding together its diverse elements before the treaties of 1739, but they were able to make a good beginning and to overcome the constant and destructive rivalries of earlier days. They could and did form a common polity in each end of the island. Each polity had a language by which

its members could communicate with all other Maroons, a common ethnic identity, and a developing shared culture. What they had not yet managed to do, by the time of the treaties, was to make the Maroon ethnic identity and culture claim the primary allegiance of all their members. And they were unlikely to be entirely successful in this as long as new groups of escapees, especially new Africans, were constantly forming in the interior, for the problems of complete incorporation of such groups were formidable. The flexible sense of ethnicity, the fluidity of groups, and the cultural creativity of those who became Maroons allowed the formation of new societies with their own ethnic identities and their own cultures, but these had not become, by 1739, the primary foci for all Maroons. Disparate segments were held together by a fairly firm matrix, but they occasionally broke loose from it. It was only the Creole Maroons, born free in the bush, who were indistinguishable from the matrix, and they had not melted into it, but had arisen out of it. As these Creole Maroons constituted a greater and greater proportion of the Maroon population, their societies became more unified. Creole Maroons might still maintain their differences of origin, and the language and some of the customs of the separate groups to which their parents belonged, but they did not pose the threat to the unity of the Maroon polities that the various groups of Africans did. Their primary ethnic identity and culture was that of Maroons.

In the development of Maroon culture and ethnicity, the treaties of 1739 were a critical turning point. They provided a secure environment in which the Maroons could become, perhaps for the first time, naturally reproducing populations. They also closed the membership of the Maroon societies, thus insuring that in time they would become entirely Creole. In addition to this, they created a niche for Maroons in Jamaica, a special position that, by making them unique, further enhanced their developing ethnicity. Thus, time and the treaties completed the unification and ethnic identification that Cudjoe and perhaps other Maroons like him had struggled to encourage among their people.

Conclusions

In these processes we have described, it was inevitable, even necessary, that the strength of the African ethnic identifications and the cultural and linguistic differences of the Africans wane and be replaced, for their descendants, by custom and ethnicity more in tune with the social realities that surrounded them. This meant, of course, the loss of many specific elements of the Maroons' African heritage. In the renewed interest in the African past of Afro-Americans, some would now regret this loss, but had their African heritage been preserved in all its specific diversity, it would have been an insurmountable barrier to the integration of the Maroon societies. Specific African ethnic identities would have competed with a more generalized Maroon identity; particular traditions would have limited the scope of a Maroon common culture; the disparate groups that comprised the Maroon societies would have kept apart, and those "Jealousies and uneasiness" that Cudjoe worked to overcome would have continued. That did not happen, and what arose to replace those divisive elements was different from any specific African tradition, though clearly owing much to some of them. It was itself a new Afro-American creation, a new culture, and a new ethnic identity.

In a sense, the entire Afro-American population of Jamaica can be said to have gone through a similar process, though in very different circumstances; the fact that it had to occur largely on the slave plantations put severe constraints on it not present among the Maroons. The process of developing an Afro-American culture in Jamaica began as soon as the Africans began arriving with the first English settlement, but cultural differences and ethnic rivalry among African groups and between Africans and Creoles developed also. The loss of those specific traditions and identities as the population of the island became progressively, and then entirely, Creole was also a loss of divisive elements, and it may be seen positively as a broadening and redefinition of ethnic identity and the creation of a new Afro-Jamaican culture. Behind, or beneath, or besides their specific traditions and regional characteristics, all the Africans in Jamaica can be said to have comprised an ethnic pool when contrasted with Europeans or East Indians. Besides their obvious physical similarities, they shared certain very broad cultural themes that are present throughout sub-Saharan Africa: similarities in conceptions of the nature of social relations, the uses of ritual, the arts, cosmology, personal style, and so forth. The presence of such cultural themes means that communication and cultural merger is always likely to be easier among Africans than between, say, Africans and Indians. In 18th century Jamaica, specific traditions stood in the way of a more general integration of Africans in Jamaica, as they often do in African states today. In Jamaica as a whole, as among the Maroons, it was the waning of specific African traditions that allowed the integration of the Afro-American population. Had the specific cultures and languages of the ethnic groups survived, had the groups themselves survived, the ethnic rivalries and hostilities would have survived also. The problems that some Caribbean countries now face in integrating large Afro-American and East Indian populations would have been multiplied many times and we would see among Afro-Americans the kind of ethnic tensions that lie just beneath the surface in virtually all the states of Black Africa. Instead of that, in the Caribbean, what has been retained among Afro-Americans is a melding of all the African heritages and of others as well, into a blend that does not contain the divisiveness that strong African ethnicity can imply, and once did for the Jamaican Maroons.⁵²

BARBARA KOPYTOFF

The research on which this article was based was made possible in part by a Predoctoral Research Grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, No. 12282-01.

FOOTNOTES

1. The obvious exception that springs to mind is the Ras Tafari cult of Jamaica. See Smith, M.G., Roy Augier and Rex Nettleford, **The Ras Tafari Movement in Kingston, Jamaica**, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, Mona, 1960.
2. See Schuler, Monica, "Ethnic Slave Rebellions in the Caribbean and the Guianas," **Journal of Social History** 1970: 3:374-385; Patterson, Orlando, **The Sociology of Slavery**, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Rutherford, New Jersey, 1969 (1st ed. 1967), pp. 152, 265-273; for an introduction to Maroon societies throughout the New World, see Price, Richard, **Maroon Societies**, Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, N.Y., 1973.
3. For an introduction to reference groups, see Hyman, Herbert H., "Reference Groups," in **International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences**, Macmillan, New York, 1968.
4. For an introduction to this approach to culture and to ethnic groups as defined in this article, see Barth, Frederik, "Introduction," **Ethnic Groups and Boundaries**, Allen & Unwin, London, 1969. For a stimulating discussion of the uses of this concept of culture in re-creating Afro-American history, see Mintz, Sidney W. and Richard Price, "An Anthropological Approach to Afro-American History," Paper given at a conference on Creole Societies at the Johns Hopkins University, Spring, 1973. The approach used in this article owes much to the latter paper.
5. See, for example, Cohen, Abner, ed., **Urban Ethnicity**, Association of Social Anthropologists Monograph No. 12, Tavistock, London, 1974; Wallerstein, Immanuel, "Ethnicity and National Integration in West Africa," **Cahiers D'Etudes Africaines** 1960: 1:129-139. The processes discussed here occur not only in urban settings, but are very widespread in Africa; however, the restructuring of ethnicity following migration to urban settings is most analogous to what we find among Africans in the New World.
6. Long, Edward, **The History of Jamaica**, 3 Vols. T. Lowndes, London, 1774, Vol. 2. p. 472.
7. Mintz and Price, *op. cit.*
8. The "Eboes" on Matthew Lewis' plantation lived in their own quarter of the village, and on several occasions came to Lewis in a body with their complaints. Lewis, Matthew Gregory, **Journal of a West Indian Proprietor**, John Murray, London, 1834, pp. 188-194.
9. For a discussion of the formation of the two Maroon polities, see Kopytoff, Barbara Klamon, **The Maroons of Jamaica**. . . , Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1973.
10. Herbert T. Thomas, **The Story of a West Indian Policeman**. . . , The Gleaner Co., Kingston, 1927; Joseph John Williams, **The Maroons of Jamaica**, Boston College Press, Chestnut Hill, Mass., 1938. Some Maroons now assert that they are "pure Ashanti."
11. Francisco Morales Padron, **Jamaica Espagnola**, Escuela de Estudios Hispano-americanos de Sevilla, Seville, 1952, p. 267.
12. See Long, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 343-344; Philip Wright, "War and Peace with the Maroons, 1730-1739," **Caribbean Quarterly** 1970: 16:20; Frank C. Cundall, **The Governors of Jamaica in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century**, The West India Committee, London, 1937, p. 146.
13. Robert C. Dallas, **The History of the Maroons**, 2 Vols., T. N. Longman and O. Rees, London, 1803, Vol. 1, pp. 31-33; James Knight, **The Natural, Moral, and Political History of Jamaica**. . . to the Year 1742, British Library, Add. MS. 12, 419, p. 93.
14. Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 31-32. Dallas is confused by the appellation "Madagascar" as he knew of no slaves from that island having been landed in Jamaica, but slaves were being shipped from the Madagascar channel during that period. See Philip D. Curtin, **The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census**, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisc., 1969, pp. 125, 144. There remains the question of whether the slaves in this case would have been the Bantus or Nilotics from East Africa, or true Malagasys, or even, possibly, Dravidians from Ceylon or India, trans-shipped in Madagascar. The description virtually rules out the Africans, favours Malagasys except for the "deeper jet" colour, and would fit Dravidians.

15. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
16. Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 32-33.
17. Orlando Patterson, "Slavery and Slave Revolts, A Socio-Historical Analysis of the First Maroon War, Jamaica 1655-1740," *Social and Economic Studies*, 1970: 19:289-325, p. 299; George Bridges, *The Annals of Jamaica*, 2 Vols., John Murray, London 1828, Vol. 1, p. 407. Bridges mentions that the survivors of a shipwreck of a Madagascar vessel became Maroons, but does not say when or where the wreck took place. The documents cited by Patterson tell of the wreck on the easternmost part of the island, the approximate date, and the fact that the survivors became Maroons, but do not mention their ethnic background. Presumably they refer to the same shipwreck.
18. The number is my own calculation, and the reasoning behind it appears in Barbara Klamon Kopytoff, *The Maroons of Jamaica*. . . , Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1973, pp. 9-10.
19. There were clearly several groups of Spanish Maroons before 1670; what is less clear is whether they joined again at some later time. Knight (*op. cit.*, pp. 92, 93) says that Spanish Maroons were in both ends of the island, but all became part of the later Windward Maroons. Most later sources also claim that they became part of the Windward Maroons only. See, for example, Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 26.
20. Knight, *op. cit.*, p.93.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
22. *Ibid.*
23. Morales, Padron, *op. cit.*, p. 273.
24. See Schuler, *op. cit.*; Patterson, "Slavery and Slave Revolts. . .", *op. cit.*
25. Long, *op. cit.*, Vol.2, pp. 445, 470.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 445, ff.
27. See, for example, David Dalby, "Ashanti Survivals in the Language and Traditions of the Windward Maroons of Jamaica," *African Language Studies* 1971: 12:31-51; Williams, *op. cit.*
28. Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 31. There is a suggestion of a lineage organisation here, but we have no real evidence of corporate lineages among the Jamaican Maroons as we have for Guiana Maroons (see, for example, A. J. F. Kobben, "Unity and Disunity: Cottica Djuka Society as a Kinship System," reprinted in Price, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-369). Certainly there is nothing like that among present-day Maroons, and Katherine Dunham's report of "clans" among the Accompong Maroons sounds like family name lines with no corporate status. Katherine Dunham, *Journey to Accompong*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1946.
29. Molesworth to Blathwayt, 2 November 1686, Colonial Office (hereafter C.O.) 138/5, Public Records Office, London.
30. Joseph John Williams, *Psychic Phenomena of Jamaica*, The Dial Press, New York, 1934, p. 114; Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 101; "Examination of a Negro Man named Jumbo," encl. in Balcarres to Portland, 31 December, 1795, C.O. 137/96.
31. Anon., "History of the Revolted Negroes in Jamaica," C. E. Long Papers, British Library Add MS. 12431.
32. Charles Leslie, *A New and Exact Account of Jamaica*, (R. Fleming), Edinburgh: 1740, p. 327.
33. See Price, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
34. See Patterson, *The Sociology of Slavery*, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-147, 152.
35. *Journal of the Assembly of Jamaica*, Vol. 3, p. 594.
36. Cudjoe's father led the rebellion of Coromantees at Sutton's plantation in 1690. Since Cudjoe was a vigorous leader 50 years later, we assume that he was born some time after 1690, which would mean he was a Creole Maroon. Anon., "History . . .", *op. cit.*

37. Trelawny to Newcastle, 30 June, 1739, C.O. 137/56.
38. Long, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 350.
39. Trelawny to Newcastle, 30 June, 1739, C.O. 137/56.
40. Long, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 350. The Maroons were reported to be "Industrious in finding out Negro Women and Girls to carry with Them" when they raided the plantations. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
41. Long, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 350. Once the peace had been established and the sexual imbalance of the population had had a chance to right itself, the figures show a healthy and vigorous upswing. The proportion of children climbed from 27% in 1749 to 37% in 1773 and 47% in 1793. The ratios of children to women (no ages given) showed a similar rise from .58 to 1.06 to 1.64. By 1773 the population as a whole had nearly recovered its losses from 1739, and during the next twenty years, 1773-93, the Maroons showed a very vigorous annual growth rate of over 2% a year. In 1749, women number between 42% and 44% of the adult population in each of four Maroon communities. In 1773 and 1793 they number between 54% and 56%. The percentages in these cases may be elevated by the fact that women are sometimes counted as adults at an earlier age than men.
42. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
43. "Further Examination of Sarra . . ." enclosed in Hunter to Board of Trade, 13 October, 1733, **Calendar of State Papers (Colonial), America and the West Indies**, Vol. 40, pp. 215-216.
44. See Price, *op. cit.*, p. 17. Price relates the long probationary period to the need for strict security in societies at war. Indeed, the external threat increases the dangers of having many newly incorporated members in a society, and calls for more thorough enculturation procedures to insure loyalty than would be necessary for societies not in a state of war.
45. The death penalty for crimes was evidently applied normally only to men among the Windward Maroons; this may have been the case with the initial oath of membership too. "Further Examination of Sarra . . .", *op. cit.*
46. See Kopytoff, "The Political Organization of Jamaican Maroons . . .", *op. cit.*
47. "Minutes of the Examination of a Negro man named Glamorgan . . ." Taken January 5, 1792, C.O. 137/90.
48. See Kopytoff, "The Political Organization of Jamaican Maroons . . .", *op. cit.*
49. Knight, *op. cit.*, p. 95. It is likely that Cudjoe allowed Coromantee to be spoken too; Dallas reported that Coromantee became the language in general use among the Leeward Maroons. Presumably, he meant in addition to English. Dallas, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 33.
50. Hunter to Board of Trade, 20 September, 1732, C.O. 137/20; Lamb's Journal, enclosed in Draper to Hunter, 25 June, 1733, C.O. 137/54; Philip Thickness, **Memoirs and Anecdotes . . .**, 3 vols. Printed for the Author, London, 1788-91, Vol. 1, p. 121.
51. See Kopytoff, "The Political Organization of Jamaican Maroons . . .", *op. cit.*
52. We are not trying to argue that, given the structure of the plantation society, there was any way that African ethnic groups could have been preserved in Jamaica, but only to indicate what it might have been like, had it been possible. It may be argued that class and colour groups have become the new ethnic groups of Jamaica, but these are far less cohesive than African ethnic groups were in the island. Their boundaries are far more fluid, and it may be the social scientists' categories as much as the people's self-perceptions that hold these together and separate them as discrete units. See Adam Kuper, **Changing Jamaica**, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976.