

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND  
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
UNIVERSITY MOULOUD MAMMERI OF TIZI-OUZOU,  
ALGERIA  
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTORATE IN ENGLISH  
OPTION: CIVILIZATION**

**Title:  
Domestic and Foreign Issues in American  
Barbary Captivity Narratives**

Submitted by: Mohand Akli REZZIK

Supervised by: Professor Bouteldja RICHE

**Panel of Examiners:**

Sabrina **ZERAR**, Professor, University of Tizi-Ouzou, Chair;  
Bouteldja **RICHE**, Professor, University of Tizi-Ouzou, Supervisor;  
Hocine **MAOUI**, Professor, University of Annaba, Examiner;  
Med Yazid **BENDJEDDOU**, Professor University of Annaba, Examiner;  
Salah **BOUREGBI**, Professor, University of Annaba, Examiner.

**FOR MY WIFE AND MOTHER FOR THEIR LOVE**

**AND**

**IN MEMORY OF MY FATHER**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to **Professor Bouteldja RICHE** for having generously inspired to me the idea of writing this research, and for having made its achievement possible by his scholarly commitments during all the stages of its execution. This research is as much mine as his as it follows up on research ideas developed in his various projects on Barbary captivity narratives. However, this being said, this statement is not intended to elude responsibility for the final product. I am alone responsible for any errors or shortcomings that the examiners may find. And naturally, in advance I would like to extend my thanks to the panel of examiners, namely **Professor Sabrina Zerar**, **Professor Hocine Maoui**, **Professor Med Yazid Bendjeddou**, and **Professor Salah Bouregbi** for having accepted to examine this research and for the feedback that they might provide to me in order to improve the quality of my research.

I would also like to extend my thanks to **Professor Zineb Ali Benali** for the assistance she had generously provided to me during my eighteen-month stay as a visiting scholar at Paris VIII University.

I extend similar sincere thanks to colleagues and friends of mine, most notably Mr and Mrs Gada, Mrs Benhahamana, Mr Hami, and Mr Grim for all their help and support.

Last but not least, the completion of this research would not have been possible without the moral support and love of the two women of my life, my mother and my wife. To them I have dedicated this research as a sign of eternal recognition.

## ABSTRACT

This research seeks to explore the domestic and foreign issues reflected in Barbary captivity narratives, with a particular focus on American captivity accounts. Methodologically, it draws heavily on a multidisciplinary approach, with an emphasis on historicist and postcolonial theories. Mary Louise Pratt and Edward W. Said are some of the scholars from whom it has borrowed its critical paradigms. Some of these paradigms like “Orientalism” are redefined to make them fit into this research. The latter concept, for example, is redefined primarily as a study of ideological captivity. It follows that this research does not look at “captivity” simply as a harrowing physical experience but also as an ideological phenomenon. In addition to corporeal captivity, one can also be captured by texts. Captivity is also looked at as an epistemological tool reflecting and thinking about issues prevalent in the captive’s society. Consequently, the corpus of this research includes two anthologies of Barbary captivity accounts and a nineteenth century political essay on the Regency of Algiers. The former are respectively edited by Daniel J. Vitkus (*Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England*, 2001) and Paul Baepler (*White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Captivity Narratives*, 1999), and the latter is *Sketches of Algiers* by William Shaler (1826). The British Barbary captivities included in Vitkus’s anthology are analyzed in an introductory chapter, the purpose of which is to underline the continuity in function of Barbary captivities recounted by pre-modern English/British captives and the Barbary captivities narrated by American captives in the colonial and post-independence periods. This research shows that British and American captivities can be placed in a spectrum reflecting the same pattern of thematic and formal development. In accordance with the historical contexts of their publication and the balance of power relations from which these captivities are narrated, one finds on one side of this spectrum captivities dealing with postcolonial themes and on the other side captivities concerned mostly with imperial concerns. In line with the re-definition of the *topos* of captivity, this research devotes a whole chapter to the study of orientalism-cum-imperialism in Shaler’s *Sketches of Algiers* as an ideological captivity.

# CONTENTS

Dedications.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Contents.....	iv
GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....	1
Chapter I: Barbary and Britain Through British Captive Eyes..	12
Introduction.....	12
John Fox's Captivity, the Politics of Plunder and English Nationalism.....	13
Hasleton's Captivity: Algiers in Anti-Spanish Pamphleteering.....	28
Rawlins's Captivity and the Critique of Mansell's Algiers Expedition.....	41
Oakley's Captivity in Algiers as a Reflection of Captivity in Britain.....	49
Thomas Phelps as a Barbary Captive Propagandist for James II.....	69
John Pitts or the Captive Apostate Turned Self-Appointed Secret Agent .....	77
Conclusion.....	84
Chapter II: America and the Barbary Shore Through the Eyes of Puritan and Yankee Captives.....	88
Introduction.....	88
Cotton Mather's Captivity and American Exceptionalism.....	90
The Issue of Identity in American Captivity Narratives.....	108
Algiers as Foil and Mirror Image of the United States.....	124

Barbary Captivity Narratives as Prison-of-War Accounts .....	136
Conclusion.....	166
Chapter III: William Shaler's Captivity in Imperial and Orientalist Ideologies .....	
Ideologies .....	174
Introduction.....	174
Exceptional Republicanism and the Captivity of European Nations.....	180
Demystifying the Barbary Legend for Imperialist Purposes.....	192
The Prophecy of the Occupation of Algiers by the Red Coats.....	204
Shaler's Prescription of Destiny for Algiers.....	221
Conclusion.....	231
General Conclusion .....	234
Selected Bibliography.....	245-253

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

More than two millenia ago, three great Greek philosophers were arguing, who among the just and the unjust man, is the happy individual. At the insistence of one of them that the just man is the happy man, the two others broke in and challenged him to demonstrate the superiority of the just man. Taking up the challenge, the former suggested that they begin with something easier than two individual men (the just and the unjust), something bigger where the just and the unjust can be seen more clearly.” Perhaps there would be more justice in the larger object,” he says. So, “Let us first look for its quality in states, and then only examine it in the individual.” The arguing philosopher finished by describing, what for him is the ideal state, naming philosophers as its ideal rulers. The world will never be justly ruled until rulers are philosophers, and these have to be selected in youth, and be trained accordingly. In laying down his curriculum for such a philosophic training, the philosopher-cum-story teller excludes the poets from postulating to the vocation of training philosophers for their supposed irrationality and whimsicality.

However, as he goes further to illustrate what the ideal of the just state and just man will look like, the philosopher confounds himself, and becomes a poet of kinds by putting across his idea of just man by inventing an allegory. For him, the world as it stands resembles a cave with people untutored in ideal forms to be likened to prisoners chained to one wall, and incapable to look behind them to see the burning fire throwing their own shadows on the wall in front of them. With time, these prisoners grew so familiar with the reflected shadows that one of them escaped to the outside sunny world and came back with the real knowledge and universal light, instead of believing him and breaking out of their entrapping illusions they took him for a maddened man. Resenting his intrusion into their familiar darkened world, they killed him. The irony of it all is

that the philosopher-cum-storyteller himself turned out to be the proof of his own allegory. He showed the truth of what he is saying about the just man by living it and dying for it. The hero of this parable, as readers of Greek philosophy might have already guessed, is Socrates and the allegory in question is the allegory of the cave included as an illustrative argument in favour of the ideal state in Plato's *Republic*.

Plato's allegory, myth, or parable of the cave, as some scholars call it, is a perfect illustration of the importance of captivity in Western thought, in its various aspects. It is the epistemological tool par excellence, and this is true even when one considers the imaginative life in the West. Homer's *Illiad*, for example, begins with Paris's kidnapping of Helen and continues with an epic quarrel between Troy and Greece over her captivity. The same goes for Virgil's *The Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, if one just takes the time to consider the captivity of Aeneas by Dido in the former, and captivity by play and artful manipulation of objects in the latter. In the modern times, to bring the illustration of my argument, closer to my research topic, British and American captivity narratives, the case of Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote* is a perfect example. One can easily remember the proverbial captivity of its hero in the feudal romances that made him foolishly "fight against windmills," which expression came down to us as an adage. One can also remember that captivated, or better, captured by the medieval romances, and living out of the rapidly changing world of his time, our knight is very delighted to listen to contemporary stories of Barbary captivity, which the author himself had experienced and includes as an autobiographical ingredient in his novel. It follows that if literature, as new historicists argue, constitutes one form of knowledge captivity is also deployed as an epistemological tool in it too, exactly in the same manner as in scientifically recognized forms of knowledge such as philosophy.



Captivity as an epistemological tool is so central in Western thought and imagination that some critics have employed it to account for the origin of the novel. On this score, I would argue that it is easy to extrapolate from Mikhail Bakhtin's contention that the novel has its beginnings in the Socratic Dialogues, by qualifying his statement and saying that it is rather in the numerous captivities that inform these dialogues that one can locate the Grecian roots of the novel, if one needs, of course, to go as far back as Greek antiquity to account for the origins of this modern genre. Now if one decides to advance the time of its birth up to the publication of Cervantes's novel at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the novel-captivity connections are so obvious that I do not need to argue over the case beyond what I have already said about it. However, I can refer to Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and Jonathan Swift's *Gullivers' Travels* as British novels where captivity experiences of all sorts are imaginatively inserted in an attempt to grasp the ideological complexities of the British imperial drive. In so doing, I will certainly not contradict Walter Allen's argument that the novel is a bourgeois genre, for the captive heroes in this case are captives of ideologies that initially motivated their quests and eventual fall into the hands of their captors. For the deployment of the epistemological tool of captivity, I can finally mention British sentimental novels such as Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa*, and American historical romances such as the *Last of the Mohicans*.

Various scholars have attempted to account for the attraction that captivity narratives, in its two major subgenres, the Indian and Barbary captivities, have exerted on their audiences over the centuries and their shaping influence on Western culture in general. Gary L. Ebersole (1995), for one, comes out with the psychological suggestion that the popularity of captivity narratives has much to do with people's desire to know what the captives have done and thought under extreme conditions. For scholars involved in

pyschoanalytic studies such as Maria Antonia Garcés (2002), captivity narratives are interesting sites for the exploration of traumatic experiences, and how author-captives overcame them and reconstructed their sense of selfhood. Captivity narratives are also seen as ethnographical sources wherein the reader can get access to the Other, that is the unfamiliar described and narrated by the captive authors. Mary Louise Pratt suggests that authors of captivity narratives, whose productions she places in the popular genre of survival literature, are proto-ethnographers at the service of official imperial circles before the emergence of colonial ethnography at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century.

Captivity narratives have also received the attention of researchers interested in imperial studies. Such is the case of Linda Colley (2003) who deployed the captivity narratives published between 1600 and 1850 for the reassessment of the grand narrative of the British Empire. Contrary to the established history or rather myth of the British Empire, Colley employs captivity narratives as primary sources for sustaining the idea that smallness in the size of the geographic area and population psychologically and anthropologically accounts for the aggressive or extrovert imperial attitude of the British, an attitude arising out of an embedded sense of vulnerability best expressed by author-captives at their return from what Pratt calls the contact zones of Empire. Other critics of captivity narratives such as Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark (1981), Richard Slotkin (1973), Axell James (1975) and Richard VanDerbeets (1972) have explored them from a ritualist or mythic perspectives. For these critics captivity narratives provide illustrative examples of what Joseph Campbell refers to as monomyth, and Victor Turner as the ritual of passage. Their suggestion is that the readers' interest in the experiences of returnees from captivity emerges partly from the former's curiosity in the identity change that the returnees might have undergone and

partly out of the desire of the latter to reintegrate their communities. Finally, there are critics who defend the idea that the craze for captivity narrative is both a commercial and a religious phenomenon arising out of the capitalization by ransomed or escaped captives with the collusion of their editors on their readers' thirst of news at times of crises. Ebersol (1995) and Daniel E. Williams (2006) count among such critics.

It follows that captivity narratives, especially Indian and Barbary captivity narratives, have already received a substantial amount of critical attention. However, this literature written from a wide range of critical perspectives provides valuable insights into the form and functions of captivity narratives, so far there is little critical attention given to these narratives as epistemological tools for the reflection of and on the major domestic and foreign policy issues of the captive-authors' times. I would argue that unless Barbary captivity narratives are looked at as foils and mirror images of the home culture, one will not grasp the importance of these narratives as epistemological tools that the captives have deployed to enter the public sphere. What is crucial to note on this score is that the authors who published these Barbary captivity narratives are not solely from the elite, but mostly from the rank-and-file members of society. Hence, one understands that captivity narratives create a point of entry into the public sphere, which if one takes into Jurgen Habermas's theory (2010) is dominated by the bourgeois class. The fact that such bourgeois genres as the novel have absorbed the popular captivity narratives calls for the revision of Habermas's theory of the public sphere.

It is common today after the contact zone studies initiated by Pratt to speak about transculturality, that is to say the transfer of knowledge from the peripheral zone of contact to the centre of Empire and how that knowledge impacted on its receivers. On this score, this research will investigate how American Barbary captivity narratives, for example, have provided important knowledge about how the Regency of Algiers

manages the gathering of revenue, the elections of the Dey, territorial divisions and so on with a view to participate in the public debate over the Constitution during what American historians call the Critical period. The argument is that captivity on the Barbary Coast shaped not only American foreign policy and the attitudes towards the creation of the American navy as is usually claimed, but also the institutional life of the early American Republic. In addition to transculturality, however, this research also places emphasis on the inevitable culture shock that the British and American captives underwent in their forceful contact with a foreign culture.

So far I have made no reference to orientalism, a critical concept and category, to which critics very often resort when their research concerns are linked in one way or another with the orient. On this score I consider “orientalism” at least as defined by Edward W. Said as perfectly illustrative of the concept of captivity as an epistemological tool. In other words, Said’s *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* provides an analysis of captivity by orientalist texts constituting an orientalist tradition or intertextuality within which orientalist thinkers and authors are strictly confined. Hence, this research does not make a difference between captivity as a physical experience and captivity by texts and the ideologies pertaining to them. I have already suggested this idea right at the beginning of this introduction in my references to Plato’s myth of the cave and Cervantes’s *Don Quixote*. It follows that whilst I continue to deploy the critical concept of orientalism in my study of British and American Barbary captivities, due regard has to be accorded to the above reading of Said’s book.

This leads me to the approach I have adopted in this research. I shall define it as a multidisciplinary approach. Its basis will be historicism since all the captivity narratives under study will put in their historical contexts. The placement of the captivities in contexts will help us both to understand their relationship to their times and the

connections of their times to own day whenever that is possible. In a sense, this historicist approach is dictated by the corpus of captivities selected for my research. The latter consists of two readers of Barbary captivities, namely Daniel J. Vitkus's *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England* and Paul Baepler's *White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Barbary Narratives*, and William Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers*. Each of the anthologies include captivities published at different periods of time, calling for the specification of the historical contexts that inflect the meaning-making of each and the evolution of their meanings with the change of time. So for the British captivity narratives included in Vitkus's anthology the historicist approach will take the contours of what came to be known as premodern studies. In this particular case, my critical categories will be inspired by Nabil Mattar's works such as *Islam in Britain 1558-1685* and *Europe Through Arab Eyes*, as well as Sir Godfrey Fisher's *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*.

My historicist approach will also be given a postcolonial perspective. This postcolonial slant finds its justification in the fact that some of the British and American Barbary captivities can rightly be considered as postcolonial productions due the status of Britain and the United States at the time they were published. Following the lead of some British historians I consider that Elizabethan England, for example, as a postcolony within the predominant sea Empires of the time. The defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 can be viewed as marking the independence of England from Spanish domination. As will be shown in my research into the captivities written during the Elizabethan period, it is the popish and Spanish captors rather than the Barbary ones who are denounced. In some cases, the Barbary shore is looked at as a place of refuge than slavery. Similarly, early independent America may be placed as the earliest British

postcolony. Again, as will be demonstrated later in the course of this research, the captivities pertaining to this Critical Period of the nation raise issues strangely similar to the ones that British postcolonies experienced in the wake of their independence.

However, the postcolonial condition under which the early British and American captivities were published is made more complex by the relations that the two countries as Western countries held with the Orient in this case the North African States known then as Barbary. To deal with this complexity of the resulting issues, I will resort to Said's *Orientalism* for my critical categories, whilst taking care to introduce the necessary qualifications. In reconsidering Said's *Orientalism* in the way I have already suggested above, I somewhat follow in the footsteps of Homi K. Bhabha's revision of Said's theory of orientalism by focusing on the ambiguities and ambivalences of orientalism in British and American captivities. For example, contrary to Said's affirmation that Orientalism is a will-to-power and govern, my research will show that this does not hold true to orientalism as reflected in what I consider as the postcolonial Barbary captivities, for the simple reason that the balance in power relations between the Barbary States and postcolonial Britain and America were not then in favour of the latter. Hence, if orientalism, in Said's terms, is also an illustration of power relations between a strong Occident and a weak Orient, his first affirmation that Orientalism is a Western will-to-power and to govern the Orient, needs to be qualified in the case of postcolonial England and America and the related early British and American captivities. Finally, this interdisciplinary approach will borrow, whenever necessary, critical categories from anthropology as developed by Victor Turner, imperial studies such as the one elaborated by Mary Louise Pratt, and cultural studies dealing with culture shock.

This multidisciplinary approach will be deployed in three chapters. Chapter one will devoted to the analysis of the captivities included in Vitkus's anthology, following the chronological order in which the editor has arranged them. The study of each of the captivities will be preceded by a brief historical background contextualizing the major issues highlighted in each of them. This chronological order of discussion, if it obeys to the editor's critical plan, hopefully will show the evolution in the representations of Barbary captivity from period to period and according to the predominant concerns of each. The second chapter will follow the same chronological order of discussion, but this time with reference to the American captivity narratives compiled by Paul Baepler. In the same way as for the British captivities, I shall contextualize each and every captivity by prefacing it with a historical background. As for the third chapter, it will be concerned with William Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers*. The latter work illustrates perfectly what I call the captivity by texts or ideology, and to which Said refers as modern orientalism. In this sense, I consider that it deserves by itself a lengthy third chapter to illustrate the development in the American representations of Barbary captivity, the textual and ideological foundations of which can be located in British captivity narratives which will be the concern of the coming chapter.

## References

- Axell James, "The White Indians of Colonial America," in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 32 (1975)
- Baepler Paul, ed., *White Slaves: African Masters: An Anthology of American Captivity Narratives*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Campbell Joseph, *Hero with a Thousand Faces*, New York, 1949.
- Davis Robert C., *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800*, London: Palgrave Macmillan,, 2004.
- Defoe Robinson, *Robinson Crusoe*, London: Penguin, 1994.
- Colley Linda, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600-1850*, London: Pimlico, 2003.
- Garcés Maria Antonia, *Cervantes in Algiers: A Captive's Tale*, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002.
- Fisher Sir Godfrey, *Barbary Legend : War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*, London : Greenwood Press, 1974.
- Habermas Jurgen, *The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.
- Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Samuel Butlern, Mineola: Dover Publications, 1999.
- Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*, trans. John Rutherford, London: Penguin, 2001.
- Peskin Lawrence A., *Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public, 1785-1816*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Plato, "Republic," in *Plato: The Collected Dialogues Including the Letters*, trans. Lane Coopers et al, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Richardson Samuel, *Pamela*, London: Penguin, 1985.
- Pratt Mary Louise, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London: Routledge, 1992.
- Said Edward W., *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin, 1991.
- Slotkin Richard, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*, Middletown, Connecticut, 1973.
- Swift Jonathan, *Gulliver's Travels*, London: Penguin, 1994.
- Turner Victor, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- VanDerBeets Richard, "The Indian Captivity Narrative as Ritual," in *American Literature*, 43 (1971-1972).
- Vaughan Alden T. and Clark Edward W.,eds. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption*, Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1981.



Virgil, *The Aeneid*, trans. W.F. Jackson Knight, London: Penguin Books, 1985.

Vitkus Daniel J., ed., *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Williams Daniel E., ed., *Liberty's Captives: Narratives in the Print Culture of the Early Republic*, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **BARBARY AND BRITAIN THROUGH BRITISH CAPTIVES'EYES**

#### **Introduction**

In the course of the 1950s whilst the winds of independence from French rule were blowing strongly in North Africa, an English scholar set out to reassess the relations between England and the Barbary States in the light of unearthed consular documents and eyewitness evidence. For him, the history of the relations between the North African states, particularly the Regency of Algiers, Tunisia, and Tripoli on the one hand, and England on the other had been skewed up by a selective Victorian, imperialist reading of that history. Accordingly, he proceeds to set the record straight by “rectifying,” as he says, that skewed “picture by reference primarily to the evidence of our own archives and the actual experiences of travelers [...] by presenting the Barbaresque point of view as far as it is reasonably ascertainable.” That English scholar of North African studies is Sir Godfrey Fisher and the book that he subsequently published carries the title of *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa, 1415-1830*.

Fisher’s book was published for the first time in 1957 that is to say in the same year when Morocco regained its independence, one year after the independence of Tunisia (1956), and six years after the independence of Libya (1951). Most importantly, its publication coincided with the point of no return in the Algerian revolutionary war, which broke out in 1954. This coincidence cannot be gratuitous in the sense that it defends the commercial and political interests in North Africa that Britain had not known to protect for the period covered by Fisher’s book, and that it had cheaply abandoned in 1830 for the benefit of the French colonizer. Indeed, the polemical turn that Fisher gives to his prose as he debunks the Barbary Legend in the context of the

Algerian revolutionary war might be taken as an attempt to belie the French propaganda war. On the other hand, I would argue that in deliberately setting out to straighten the records of the Barbary legend and investing with a certain romantic glamour the Turkish rule in the Barbary States, one can but suspect, on the part of Sir Godfrey Fisher, a scholarly bid for the rehabilitation of British interests in the newly independent countries in North Africa after the eviction of the French arch-enemy. It is in this sense that the use of Fisher's re-writing of the Barbary Legend is relevant for this chapter of my research. As I argue below, the representation of British captivity in North Africa and the Barbary Legends created by Barbary captivity narratives function according to the major British domestic and foreign issues that came out at the time of the publication of each captivity narrative.

### **John Fox's Captivity, the Politics of Plunder and English Nationalism**

In 1563, *The Three Half Moons*, a lightly armed British merchant ship with thirty-eight men on board set out from Portsmouth on a trading voyage to Seville in Southern Spain. As it went through the Straits of Gibraltar to its destination, it was suddenly beset by eight Turkish galleys. Despite the disproportion of forces, the British crew at the ship owner's exhortation and its master who both appealed to God's providence and British manhood and pride decided to put a brave fight and make the Turkish corsairs pay a high price for their ineluctable victory. Despite the stand for British pride made by the crew, the *Three Half Moons* was finally overwhelmed and its surviving crew was dragged as captives to Alexandria, a Turkish outpost since 1517. The ship owner and the master were soon ransomed while the rest of the crew was declared good for galley service in the Turkish flotilla. This is a brief summary of the introduction to the first Barbary captivity narratives included in Daniel J. Vitkus's anthology entitled *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Narratives from Early Modern England*. The exact

title of the captivity account is *John Fox, The Worthy Enterprise of John Fox, in Delivering 266 Christians out of the Captivity of the Turks*, a captivity taken from Richard Hakluyt's 1589 edition of his voluminous *Principal Navigations* (1589).

The hero of the captivity, as can be gathered from the title, celebrates the successful escape of John Fox from the city of Alexandria in January 1577, after having served for thirteen or fourteen years as galley slave. Of the original crew of the *Three Half Moons*, only two other members "William Wickney of Portsmouth, in the county of Southampton; and [...] Robert Moore of Harwich, in the county of Essex (p.61)" had the hardihood to survive what Fox ironically calls "the gentle entreatance" or kind treatment of the Turks. At that time of the year, the Turkish fleet had joined its fortified naval base in Alexandria for the winter season, when cruising in the Mediterranean basin was particularly dangerous because of unpredictable weather conditions. Apart from the three English captives, Fox tells us that there were other captives belonging to sixteen different European nationalities, all of them chained and imprisoned in bagnios close to the harbor waiting for the clearing of the skies in spring when safe navigation would become possible again and the international galley slaves would be ordered to resume their place in the galleys.

It is during the time of winter recess in the corsair activities that Fox prayed to his God and made the resolution to escape. Having lulled the keeper of the Alexandria bagnios into a false sense of security for 14 long years of captivity, sharing with him the profits that he won as a barber, Fox was given the liberty to walk very freely in the vicinity of the harbor. The resolution to escape could not be a single-handed attempt due to the vast expanse of sea waters separating him from his home country, so he made up his mind to take one Peter Unticaro, a Spanish captive, into confidence. Just like Fox, Untario was free of movement, and had the same deal with the keeper of the prison with whom he

shared the profits ensuing from a hired shop in the harbour. The two agreed to carry out the project of escape and decided to confide it to those of the prisoners who might be trusted.

Once the escape plan was well concocted, the prison breakers passed to action. The unsuspecting keeper was made to visit Peter Untario's house on the false invitation of one of the masters of the city of Alexandria to meet there. It was only when he was fallen in the trap did the keeper fully realize that he was tricked out. The two complicit prisoners took his life with an old rusty sword previously sneaked out of the keeper's armory by Fox. The keeper dead, the two men returned under disguise to the bagnios unmolested by the guards who mistook Peter Untanrio as their master. Together with other 6 complicit prisoners who had filed through their shackles, they stormed the jailer's lodge to recuperate the keys of the fortress and the prison as well as the weaponry that was deposited there. Heavily armed, the band assailed the fortress, freed the rest of the prisoners, and then went immediately to fit the galleys. Before the inhabitants of the city of Alexander became fully aware of what was happening in the slave bagnios, the escapees were already half way on the road out of the harbour, and well beyond the reach of the cannon fire of the other fortresses and the castle keeping watching over the access to the city.

When the escapees were out of the enemy's reach, they met the trials of famine and rough weather for twenty-nine days drifting on the Mediterranean Sea under the guide of Providence. No less than 8 prisoners died before they "fell on the Isle of Candy, (p.66)" present-day Crete. Two hundred sixty-six in total managed to survive the crossing of the line between Turkish captivity and freedom on Christian shore on the south coast of Crete where the ex-slaves were given succor by monks. Refreshed and eased, they resumed their journey to land in Taranto, a seaport in southeast Italy where

they sold out the galley on which they made their way out of Turkish captivity. Each of the ex-captives received their share to buy their way home. Only the name of John Fox as the initiator of the “worthy enterprise” of escape was recorded for memory. His account was authenticated by four testimonials attached to the captivity. One of these was delivered by the “Prior and the Brethren of Gallipoli [in Crete]” where Fox and his company first landed, making mention of the fact that Fox donated to them the sword with which he had slaughtered the Turkish prison keeper, as a “monument and memorial” to his international ecumenical “worthy enterprise”.

The second testimonial to be appended to Fox’s captivity was issued by the Bishop of Rome. In addition to praising Fox, the Bishop recommended Fox to the Spanish court, to grant him right of passage through Spanish territory, and to accede to his desire to land a temporary job as a gunner in his majesty’s naval forces. The third testimonial was made by the King of Spain himself, who expressly instructed his “Lieutenant for the placing of John Fox in the Office of a Gunner. A provision of eight ducats per month were made to him for the whole time that he spent serving the King of Spain. In addition to these three authenticating certificates, the captivity closes with “Verses Written by A.M. to the Courteous Readers, Who was Present at Rome when John Fox Received his Letters of the Pope (p.70)”.

The question that logically follows the above summary of Fox’s captivity is in what ways it stands as a mirror to the domestic and foreign issues of the time of its publication. One can agree with Vitkus when he writes that the captivity celebrates the “virtue of the story’s Protestant hero [John Fox],” but the captivity can deliver a much more complex message than the celebration of Protestant heroism if put into the immediate and remote historical contexts. The larger historical framework of the Spanish-Ottoman imperial struggle offers the first insight into the politics of sea empires

in the Mediterranean basin. Fox's captivity, it has to be noted, started in 1563. Obviously at this time, the Ottoman Empire was powerful enough to send one of its corsair squadrons all the way from Alexandria to the Southern coast of Spain to assail its arch enemy and the ships of all other nations trading with them. From here follows the impression that not only Spain but the whole European countries were encircled by the Ottoman power.

Retracing the events that led up to 1563 will help the reader understand why Turkish corsairs were then cruising the West of the Mediterranean. Among the watershed events in this time span one can mention the fall of the Alhambra in 1492; the exile of the Moors from Granada into what was then called the "Barbary coast" settling in the major cities such Algiers, Tlemcen, Fes, and Tunis; the vengeful retaliation of these exile Moors against former Spanish country men; and the establishment of precarious strongholds along the Algerian coast in Oran in 1509, in Bejaia in 1510, in Algiers in 1512 with the supposed objective of containing the attacks of former countrymen now dismissed as jihadist pirates or corsairs threatening the peace of a conquering Spain in North Africa and South America. The year 1516 marked another turn in the Mediterranean Spanish imperial politics with the arrival of Baba Aruj (the Algerian name for Barbaroussa) and his brother Khayr al-Din in besieged Algiers in response to the appeals of succor launched by its notables. Aruj was to die in 1518 in battle against the Spanish troops in Rio Salado, near Tlemcen in the west of Algeria.

However, Aruj's death constituted only a setback in the Barbarossa brothers' project of carving a kingdom at the demise of the traditional kingdom of the Aghlabid because his brother Khayr al-Din soon went on doggedly to chase the Hafsids from Constantine and coastal regions in the years between 1521 and 1525, and most importantly to evict the Spaniards in 1529 from the Penon, which dominated the harbor of Algiers. The

Ottoman Empire entered into the game of imperial politics in the Western Mediterranean through Khayr al-Din, who in order to secure his victories sought the assistance of the Turks' material assistance by offering his allegiance to the Sublime Porte. His allegiance policy paid off since the latter not only vested him with the prestigious title of Beylerbey (Governor General), but had this governorship reinforced by the services of Janissary contingents of infantry and artillery. (Ruedy John, 1992: 17)

The imperial positions thus being staked out, the imperial war game between the Ottoman Empire and the Spanish Empire for the dominance of the world could start with the Sultan Suleiman and Charles V as their respective champions. The story of these two emperors in perpetual quest of the title of Caesar, the former by seeking coronation as emperor in Rome, and the latter by re-appropriating Constantinople occupied by the Ottomans under the leadership of Suleiman's great grandfather Mehmet II on 29 May, 1453. (Crowley Roger, 2008: 53) What marked most the beginning of these two emperors' reign was the expulsion by Suleiman of the Knights of Saint John from the island of Rhodes in 1523 following their plundering of pilgrims to Mecca and the captivity of the governor of Egypt, and a similar expulsion in nearly the same year to the "Barbary coast" of all the Muslim Spaniards from Valence, who had refused conversion, hence the suspicion of their complicity with the enemy. It took many years for the Knights of St John to find a place to settle in once they were dislodged from Rhodes. For geostrategic reason, in the 1530s the Spanish emperor Charles V offered Malta and the surrounding islands for their relocation with the express duty of halting, securing and protecting adjacent Spanish territories like Sicily from the Ottoman threat. This defensive attitude through the recruitment of what the Venetians called "the Nest of [Maltese] Vipers" because of their disturbance of commerce through their indistinct



piracy activities implies a feeling of encirclement on the part of the most powerful European empire of the time.

That feeling of encirclement grew dramatically over the next three decades from 1530 to 1560s. The 1530s were marked by Spanish attacks on the coast of Greece then considered to be home territory by the Ottomans. These diversionary attacks were carried out under the leadership of Andrea Doria, a Genoese admiral in the service of the Spanish Emperor with the objective of loosening Suleiman's siege of Vienna then part of the Hapsburg Empire under the reign of Charles V's brother Ferdinand. In prompt response to the destruction of the Ottoman fleet in Coron in Greek territory in 1532, Suleiman summoned his own champion Khayr al-din to meet the challenge posed by the Spanish champion Andrea Doria. Given the official title of the Sultan's admiral (Kapudan-i-derya), the elderly Khayr al-Din now over 60 years of age speedily set out to rebuild the Ottoman fleet. Barely two years passed before Khayr al-din's new fleet nosed its way out of the Golden Horn in the direction of Spanish territories in the Western part of the Mediterranean. The first territories to suffer from Khayr al-din's retaliation campaign were the Italian coasts, followed by the military occupation of Tunis in August 1534.

For Charles V, the loss of Tunis until then under the reign of the Spanish puppet Mulley Hassan meant a further threatening encirclement of the Spanish territorial possessions. That is why he decided to lead in person a swift counterattack a year later in 1535 in order to dislodge Khayr al-Din from there. And indeed, part of Khayr al-Din's fleet was surprised and destroyed at the station site in the inner lake of the city of Tunis, which, according to Roger Crowley (2008: 61), witnessed the worst carnage in its history. Khayr al-Din's resilience did not wait long to manifest itself. He slipped free from Tunis and hurried in the direction of Bona present-day Annaba, where the other part of

his fleet was securely waiting for him at anchor. While the whole Europe was celebrating with pomp the debacle of the Ottoman fleet in Tunis and the end of a collective captivity, Khayr al-Din swept through the Spanish territories on his voyage back to Istanbul. His maneuver of the enemy was appreciated so much by the Sultan that he was accorded the pardon of having lost part of the Ottoman fleet, and his duty as the Sultan's admiral was renewed with the express command to reconsolidate the fleet in preparation for another expedition on the Spanish territories.

The second round of the struggle for domination over the Mediterranean between Spain and the Ottoman Empire was triggered in 1536 when Khayr al-Din unpredictably struck Italy again. In retaliation, the Spanish champion wrought havoc on Ottoman ships off the coasts of Greece. Khayar al-Din came back to the attack of the Adriatic coast of Italy in 1537, sowing such violence that the Pope Paul III was obliged to broker the terms of a Holy League to counter the wave of sweeping attacks launched by the Ottomans. Spain, Venice, Genoa, and the Papal States agreed to halt the Ottoman encroachments, but their interests and strategic goals were so divergent that their commitment to defeat the enemy dramatically sagged when the time came for them to take decisive action against the Ottoman fleet. The Holy League flotilla managed to blockade Khayr al-Din's fleet in the gulf of Preveza in the West coast of mainland Greece for three weeks in 1538, but he was able to outmaneuver it and thus score an unprecedented psychological victory over the Holy League mined by bad faith in their very commitment to fight the Ottomans. Much more will be said about this later in this research.

The psychological victory in Preveza over the divided league ushered in the dominance of the Ottomans over the Mediterranean basin until the revenge defeat of the Turkish fleet in Lepanto by the same Holy League in 1571. Admittedly in 1541, Charles V

attempt to recoup the loss in prestige and material by attempting to descend on Algiers hoping to score the same triumphant victory as the one he had scored in Tunis six years earlier. Undertaken in the winter season, the military operation ended in total humiliation, losing some 140 sailing ships heaved dangerously ashore by an unexpected storm, and the massacre and captivity of some 8,300 a high number of the military personnel drenched and bogged down in the muddy waters of El-Hamma and El-Harrach. Charles V took to his heels ignoring the cries of his abandoned soldiers in the Algerian. Two years later in 1543, to his dismay and that of Christendom as a whole, the Ottoman landed close to home and anchored in Toulon at the signing of a “scandalous” treaty of military cooperation between François I’s France and the Sublime Porte. The Ottoman’s destruction of Nice then a Spanish territory brought Charles V’s imperial Spain to its knees and compelled Phillip II, the successor of Charles V who abdicated in 1546, completely exhausted by unsuccessful wars, to sign a peace treaty with Suleiman’s Turkey in 1547. As Crowley aptly writes it, with this 1547 Spanish-Turkish treaty, “the big maritime expeditions were temporarily suspended, (Crowley Roger, 80)” giving place to another form of war carried out by enterprising corsairs.

The above historical background offers a contextualization of the Turkish corsairs’ presence in the Spanish waters of the Gibraltar Straits, and the capture of the *Three Half Moons*. John Fox and his fellow countrymen were not taken as slaves during those huge military expeditions the Sultan’s Admiral, Khayr al-Din, carried out against the Spanish territories, but they were victims of what historians of the period calls a “politics of plunder” carried out by nearly all the countries of the time. By default of waging war on a grand scale, the institution of the international politics of plunder consisted in undermining the economy of the enemy and sustaining the domestic economy by stealth

and a subtle kind of terror. In this “politics of plunder,” the oared galley to which Fox and his fellow Englishmen were condemned played a considerable importance in pre-modern times since without this devourer of human fodder that politics could not be waged. To all evidence, the Englishmen of the *Three Half Moons* were snatched not for the freight they were in charge of, but for the human labour and muscle power that they could provide to conduct a politics of plunder.

The politics of plunder as John Fox’s captivity shows does not spare any nation. It is international in scope, since no less than 16 different nations were represented in the oaring crews wintering in Turkish Alexandria. In the pre-modern times, Karl Marx had not yet come to life to elaborate his big theories of political economies laying stress on alienation and the dehumanization in the industrial capitalist system, yet obviously no political economy as the politics of plunder of the pre-modern times was marked by so much dehumanization in its factory, the oared galley. The following quote by Cowley illustrates perfectly this pre-modern Moloch of the politics of plunder:

It was the same [raiding] for both sides [of the Mediterranean]: much of the raiding was undertaken solely to make such raids possible. The violence was self-perpetuating. The galleys created their own need for war. (Cowley Roger, 2008: 86)

John Fox, in his captivity, notes a class distinction between the fate reserved for ordinary seamen and the owner and master of the *Three Half Moons*. “Ere it was long, the master and the owner by means of friends were redeemed, the rest abiding still by the misery (p.61),” he points out. Ransoming in the context of the plunder politics looks like a commercial transaction through which money changes hands across countries regardless of their religious beliefs and at the expense of the labour force manning the oar galleys. Not surprisingly, even in this exploitative economic system that does not say its name chivalric treatment is reserved for the well-to-do class.

However, while the issue of captivity is raised in the unique context of the dominance of the Ottomans over the international plunder politics, it is treated within a wider Biblical

framework wherein the Turk assumes the role of tyrant over the whole of Europe. That the captives were snatched to Alexandria in Egypt makes Fox evoke a parallel between the enslavement of the pre-modern European galley oarsmen and their Biblical counterparts. Pre-modern Ottoman Egypt in the eyes of Fox is a no way different from ancient Pharaoh's Egypt in its oppression of the European descendants of the Israelites. This Biblical typological narrative closes with a similar miraculous deliverance by the mighty hand of God:

Alexandria [...] lay on the west side of the road, and a castle which was lay on the north side of the road, so that now they had no way to escape but one, which by man's reason (the two holds lying so upon the mouth of the road) might seem impossible to be a way for them. So was the Red Sea impossible for the Israelites to pass through, the hills and rocks lay so on the one side and their enemies compassed them on the other. (p.64)

In this epic story of Turkish oppression, deliverance, and freedom after a long journey through the wilderness of the Mediterranean Sea, without food and drinkable water, Fox poses himself as a pre-modern Moses. As soon as they were off the coast of Egypt having emerged unscathed from the firing cannons of the Egyptians, Fox conducted a thanksgiving prayer for the miracle that God had performed for the escapees before resuming their voyage across the raging Mediterranean Sea experiencing the same trials of hunger and thirst as the Israelites in the wilderness.

No less than three other Biblical allusions are made by Fox to evoke his deliverance out of the Egyptian bondage and his miraculous victory over his enslavers. The first one is the Battle of Jericho narrating how Joshua conquered the Canaanite city of Jericho. The walls of this city miraculously fell as Joshua Israelite army marched around it blowing their trumpets (Joshua 6:1-27). Through the evocation of this Biblical Battle, Fox turned himself into a pre-modern Joshua leading by his faith the Israelite army of the European captives to their first victory, going safe through the fortified walls of Alexandria's harbour into freedom. Turn by turn, Fox also put himself in the shoes of Daniel miraculously saved from the lion's jaws by God, and "the three children" (also in the

Book of Daniel) who through God's intervention miraculously emerged unscathed from the fiery furnace into which Nebuchadnezzar had thrown them for having refused to worship other gods.

So on the whole, Fox wrote or narrated himself into a multifaceted Biblical figure delivering an international group of European slaves out of bondage. To fully understand this self-proclaimed Protestant heroism on the part of the English, one has to turn to the historical background, particularly the entente cordial between Phillip II and Queen Elizabeth I at the beginning of her reign and the 1560s. As D.M. Loades (1979:246) argues Queen Elizabeth's half sister the Bloody Mary with her husband Phillip II "sowed the seeds of a protestant nationalism" by the forceful restoration of Catholicism under the foreign domination. At the accession to the throne, Queen Elizabeth I capitalized on this "association of persecuting Catholicism with foreign domination, Ibid", brought back England to a homegrown Protestantism by deftly managing both Catholic and Protestant radicals while diplomatically exploiting the conflict between Catholic Spain and France to compel their respective sovereigns Phillip II and Henry II to renounce their claim to the English throne. Hence, with the accession of Elizabeth II to the English Throne, England had, to use Loades's terms, not only had "A New Queen but [also] a New Identity (pp.246-273)".

It is the affirmation of this new identity that Fox expresses in his captivity. At the time of his capture in the Spanish waters in 1563, England had strong commercial relationships with Spain allowing the *Half Three Moons* to sail all the way from Portsmouth through the Straits of Gibraltar to trade in Seville. The temporarily realistic politics of the Spanish Emperor and Elizabeth II had made religion take a back bench. Loades tells us that even after the zealous Pope Pius V promulgated his Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* in February 1570 declaring Queen "Elizabeth a heretic and no true Queen

(p.278),” and the Catholic Ridophi plot against the Queen’s life in the summer of same year, the diplomatic and commercial relations between Spain and England were not ruptured. On the contrary, they grew to such an extent that in 1577 the Spanish Company was chartered. The possibility for Fox the English man not only to travel in the territories belonging to the Papal States and Spain but also obtain testimonies of Protestant heroism from both the Pope and the Spanish Emperor largely shows that at that time politics rather religion occupied the front bench in Anglo-Spanish relationship. Vitkus points out with justice that Fox’s captivity celebrates the feats of a Protestant hero, but the way this Protestant heroism is reported makes it read as a make-up for the non-participation of England and other Protestant countries in the battle of Lepanto in 1571 when the Holy League had at last taken the revenge on the Ottomans for the loss of the Battle of Preveza in 1537. “Lepanto,” as Cowleys writes, “was Europe’s Trafalgar - a signal event that gripped the whole Christian continent. They celebrated it as far away as protestant London and Lutheran Sweden. (Cowley Roger, 289)” Fox remained mute as his participation to this imperial battle on the grand scale while he was recruited as a galley slave by the Turkish corsairs of his Egypt, but to all evidence he reenacted it on an individual scale by posing himself as the hero of a band of galley Christian slaves involving no less than 16 European nationalities.

The individual Protestant virtues in Fox’s captivity assume a national dimension. Above all, Fox is a representative of an Elect nation whose ideology, as Loades remarks, originated with the Protestant exiles during the Marian persecution (Loades, p. 247). His captivity is regarded as a trial testing not only his Protestant faith but his vocation to a special place among the other Christian slaves in Egyptian bondage. This view is most prominently expressed in the deliverance episode when the Christian slaves broke into the jailor’s lodge. The hero’s virtue comes out strongly in his striking indifference

toward the treasure that the rebelling white slaves discovered there. Whilst the slaves of Spanish origin “stuffed themselves so full as they could between their shirts and their skin,” Fox “would not once touch and said that it was his and their liberty which he sought, to the honor of his God, and not to make a mart of the wicked treasure of the infidel (p.63).” This material disinterest singles him out as a virtuous and faithful man amongst the rebelling slaves. It is supported by a reference to the Bible invoking the example of Saul, who breached God’s instructions to exterminate all the Amalekites and their cattle by keeping the “fattest oxen to offer unto the lord (p.63)”, and who as a consequence incurred the wrath of God by giving him up to the Philistines (Samuel, 1: 15).

As prefigured by this Biblical allusion, Peter Unticaro and the two other men who helped themselves to the Turkish treasure met their death whereas Fox survived them to carry on the deliverance of the other slaves out of bondage. This is how the other contenders to the leadership of the rebelling slaves are divinely disqualified to the advantage of God’s English man, Fox:

John Fox was thrice shot through his apparel and not hurt, Peter Unticaro and the other two that had armed them [Sic] with the ducats were slain, as not able to wield themselves, being so pestered with the weight and uneasy carrying of the wicked and profane treasure. (p.65)

The other virtue that makes Fox stand out amongst the other slaves is manliness and English valour. Already at the capture of the *Half Three Moons*, the crew preferred dignity in defeat to easy surrender. Both the master and owner of the ship exhorted the crew to put themselves under God’s mercy and to “win praise by death rather than live in misery and shame (p.61).” Abiding by the principle that nothing could happen without the sanction of Providence, all the members of crew of the *Half Three Moons* opposed a fierce resistance to the overwhelming force of the Turkish corsairs except for the “master’s mate, who shrunk from the skirmish like a notable coward, esteeming



neither the valor of his name nor accounting of the present example of his fellows (p.60).”

Fox was depicted as a man ready to spurn material considerations just to honour his belonging to the English nation. In an age, where many Europeans including Britons were “turning Turk” for securing a happy life in the Barbary Coast, Fox did not let himself caught by the allure of landing a highly paid job in Catholic Spain. He let down such an economic captivity shortly after having made enough money to rejoin his homeland in 1579. The national hero was well rewarded by the court which “extended to him their liberality to help to maintain him now in age, to their honour and to the encouragement of all true-hearted Christians. (p. 67)” Clearly, the nation knows how to honour the heroes who were ready to risk life and limbs to enhance its prestige abroad. The fact that Hakluyt included John Fox’s narrative in his *Principal Navigations* puts him on the same footing as other British maritime heroes such as Hawkins, Frobisher, and Drake.

1579 the year of Fox’s arrival on Albion shores marked a turn in Anglo-Spanish relationships. Until then, a fragile peace underpinned by an undeclared war had prevailed between Spain and England. Legitimate trade and illicit plundering went hand in hand. The line between was blurred to serve political causes, economic, and social problems. So while England legitimately traded in Spain, its merchant gentlemen adventurers preyed on Spanish commercial shipping sailing through the English Channel to the Low Countries then under Spanish domination. John Hawkins the very year that is 1563 when Fox was captured by the Turkish Corsairs was stealing into Portuguese African territories to catch Black slaves to be sold in Spanish America. Queen Elizabeth was openly contesting the 1494 Treaty of Tordesillas through which the Pope divided the newly discovered world between the Iberian countries, Portugal

and Spain by claiming the right of free trade in the high seas, and so tacitly sanctioned her merchant and gentlemen adventurers' breach of the line beyond which trading was forbidden to other European countries. As the 1580s approached, for reasons that would be developed below, the "age of hostile commerce under Hawkins was over [and] the age of Drake's war had dawned. ( Ronald Susan, 2007: 147)" Whilst the Anglo-Spanish relations soured, the relations between England and the Muslim powers went well since England saw herself accorded the famous capitulations by the Sultan in 1577 that ushered her official access to commerce in Muslim Mediterranean countries.

### **Hasleton's Captivity: Algiers in Anti-Spanish Pamphleteering**

This is briefly the context that will serve as backdrop against which the next captivity Richard Hasleton's *Strange and Wonderful Things Happened to Richard Hasleton Born at Braintree, in His Ten Years' Travails in Many Foreign Countries* (1595) will be explored in this chapter. Hasleton's captivity started in 1582 when two Algiers galleys attacked the merchant ship *Mary Marten* near Almeria, in Spain, in its return voyage back from Patras, in Greece, then under Turkish domination to Portsmouth its final destination seaport. He tells us how the master of the ship a certain Eastwoode ordered the crew to fire on the Algiers galley refusing to show the letters of safe conduct which at that time were granted by the Ottoman Sultan to English vessels trading in the Mediterranean as part and parcel of the capitulations accorded to English merchants. The result is that the *Mary Marten* was caught in the crossfire of the two galleys. Deeply wounded in his fight with two Algiers corsairs, one of whom he killed, he was finally able to swim to the galleys for his life just before the ship sank. Three months later, after the Algiers corsairs had successfully completed their harvest, Hasleton found himself sold as a slave in the mart of Algiers for sixty-six doubloons.

For three complete years, Hasleton laboured in the Algiers galleys taking part in their predation on enemy shipping in the Mediterranean. It was during one of the corsair voyages that his galley was caught in a storm and “cast away near the west side of the Island Fermonterra (p.76),” one of the small islands constituting the Balearics, to the South of Ibiza. Hasleton along with some Catholic slaves outwitted the surviving Algiers corsairs who went into hiding in the nearby bushes of the shore while waiting to be rescued by another Algiers galley. They fled to their Christian kith and kin in Formenterra, but one of the Catholic fugitive slaves betrayed his Protestant faith to the hosts. Not surprisingly, he was immediately put in chains as a Lutheran and carried aboard a Genoese ship to Majorca in the Spanish dominions to face the Inquisition. It is this episode of his Spanish captivity that receives the most attention in Hasleton’s captivity as a whole.

At the outset of the Spanish captivity, Hasleton seizes the opportunity of his confrontation with the inquisitor to mount a political defence of Protestantism against the liturgical and doctrinal deviations of the Catholic Church. However, the confrontation goes on, it turns to horror with Hasleton’s refusal to heed the inquisitor’s arguments and recant. The story witnesses an ironical twist as Hasleton recounts how he broke out of the dungeon to navigate the rough waters of the Mediterranean on a small makeshift boat for some 500 miles only to land in the Kabyle territory on the Barbary shore. Though he was returned to captivity on the Barbary shores in the Kabyle Cocou kingdom, this captivity offered a providential reprieve from certain death at the hands of the Inquisition. For some years a captive in Cocou where he was submitted to the allurements of preferment and taking a Kabyle wife in return of his embracement of Islam, Hasleton finished at last to make his way to Algiers under the disguise of a Moor. Once in Algiers, he found out that during his absence England had redeemed its

Barbary slaves. He had no other alternative than returning to his master to be hired as a galley slave for another three years before he was smuggled out of Algiers by the English merchant Richard Staper to whom the dedicatory epistle prefacing the captivity is addressed. Obviously, captivity in Algiers was the least evil in comparison with Spanish captivity given the many possibilities it offered for redemption.

This captivity provides insights into the political relationships not only between Algiers and England but also Spain and England. These insights debunk what Sir Godfrey Fisher calls the “Barbary Legend” making for the notoriety of Algiers as a den of pirates. If one reads carefully the captivity, one notes that the enemy for Hasleton was not Algiers but Spain, and this has much to do with the shifting of political alliances in the Mediterranean basin which be explained shortly. But even without providing the background to this shifting, one might easily note that Hasleton does not put the blame on Algiers corsairs for the sinking of the *Mary Marten*. The blame is rather transferred to the Master of the ship who took the Algiers corsairs for mere pirates and who instead of submitting his ship to control and showing the safe conducts delivered to it by the Sultan, started to fire at their galleys. This comes out particularly strongly in the following statement made at the moment when the *Mary Marten* stood no change against the Algiers galleys: “Now when we saw our shot and powder spent so much, some of our company cried out to our master to show the Turk’s letters; but he would not but commanded the gunner still to shoot. (p.75)”

As Fisher puts it, English ships “may have made their own arrangements with Algiers” (Sir Fisher Godfrey, p.114) as soon as 1581 for safe navigation in the Mediterranean. The transfer of English commercial activities from Spain to the Muslim countries through the Levant Company indeed demands such arrangements. Fisher also notes that the same year when the *Mary Marten* was sunk and its surviving crew enslaved, the

Queen sent an envoy, most likely, John Tipton the future English consul in Algiers to request assistance on behalf of the Emperor of Morocco in order to prevent the “occupation of El Arish by the Spaniards. (Ibid)”

Political alliances had changed and this change is reflected in the comparatively harsh denunciation of the Spaniards who in Fox’s captivity are represented not the true picture evil figure they cut in Hasleton’s captivity.

The next question that has to be addressed relates to the presence of the patrolling Algiers corsairs in the Spanish waters at the time when the Mary Marten was sunk. Perhaps one has to remark that after the loss of the battle of Lepanto in 1571, which to many historians, was the decisive battle it was supposed to be (Crowley, 293), turn by turn Venice in 1573, and Spain in 1574 and in 1580 after ceding such territories as Cyprus and Tunis signed humiliating treaties with the Sultan. The Battle of Lepanto ended in a standstill in the protracted struggle between the Ottoman Empire and the Spanish Empire, giving place to the same politics of plunder as the one to which countries of the Mediterranean resorted to after the Battle of Prevesa in 1537. Frye’s remark that in practice Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis were included in the 1580 Turkish-Spanish treaty needs to be reported for the light it sheds into the important role that Algiers came to hold in the Mediterranean politics after Lepanto where in the opinion of all historians, the Algerian fleet under Ochiali is the one fleet that came to save the face for the Ottomans. This non-inclusion of Algiers in the treaty means that Turkey had definitely subcontracted her imperial duties in the Western Mediterranean to Algiers, and this subcontract largely explains the presence of the corsairs in the sea route taken by the Mary Marten.

Thus, the struggle between Spain and Turkey in the Western Mediterranean had resolved itself into a context between Spain and Algiers. The continuing Spanish

occupation of Oran and the still fresh memory of the crushing of the Spanish Muslims' rebellion of the Moriscos in the Alpujarras region (1567-1569) and other such grievances on both sides made Spain and Algiers wage a protracted war of trenches for nearly three centuries. Beleaguered England could only find a readily disposed ally in Algiers when its turn came to confront militarily the Spanish colossus in the 1580s. Hence, if the escape of Hasleton from Majorca and the Kingdom of Coucou into his "captivity" in Algiers might at first sight look like an irony, it is far from being one if placed in the historical context of the Anglo-Algerian win-win entente against Spain during the rest of Elizabeth's reign. During the 1580s, as it was frantically getting ready to push back the looming attack of the Spanish Armada, England delocalized its commercial activities from Spanish territories to the Levant under the Turkish capitulations granted in 1580 and ratified in 1583; Elizabeth appointed William Harborne as ambassador in Constantinople in 1583, who in his turn under his authority as Queen Elizabeth's ambassador appointed John Lipton as Consul in Algiers probably the same year.

In short, by 1587 or 1588 when Hasleton had escaped back to Algiers from his captivity in Spain and the Cocou Kingdom, the diplomatic relationships between Algiers and England were well-established. He realized that his fellow English slaves had already been redeemed during his short absence, a redemption telling of the excellent relationship between Algiers and England. During the three other years that he spent in Algiers as a galley slave saw the consolidation of English trade in Algiers, since apparently the English merchants enjoyed the confidence of the Algerines that allowed one of them the very prestigious Richard Staper to smuggle Hasleton out of captivity. Obviously, there was no danger of calling at the port of Algiers on the part of English

merchants since England and Algiers shared common political, economic, and strategic interests.

The friendly relations between Algiers and England allow Hasleton to emit sober judgements even as a captive. One finds no impetuous and sweeping denunciations of Algiers as a den of pirates, or to use the notorious French insult of “gens sans loi et sans foi.” On the contrary, he develops a whole reflection deflating all the myths built around the “Barbary legend”. Whilst reflecting on his providential wreckage in the port town of Gigeley, today’s Jijel, after his escape from his Spanish captivity, Hasleton makes the first thrust at this legend by saying the following:

But see now, when I had escaped through the surges of the sea from the cruelty of the Spaniard, I was no sooner landed and entered the mountains but I was espied by the Moors which inhabit the country, who pursued very earnestly to take me, supposing me to come from the Christian shore to rob in their coast. For many times the Spaniards will pass over in small vessel and go onshore, and if they can catch any men of the country, they will carry them to make galley slaves, wherefore the Moors are very diligent to pursue them at their landing, and if it chance they take any Christian, they use him in like sort. (87-88)

When one knows that Gigeley served as the first naval base from which the Barbarossa Brothers had launched in the 1510s their enterprise to carve the most powerful kingdom in the North African coast, Hasleton’s caveat to the Barbary legend receives its full wait. It destroys the idea of the presupposed, gratuitous barbarity of the inhabitants on the Barbary Coast by rationalizing the enslavement of Christians caught there in terms of reprisal to similar encroachments of Christians in general, and Spaniards in particular on the North African coast in order to capture Algerine galley slaves.

Hasleton temporarily succeeded in avoiding capture by the Moorish coastal guard by hiding in a river, coming out of the water only once that guard had departed to make his way to Algiers. But as he was very exhausted by fatigue and hunger, he approached an old Moor “weeding a field of wheat (p.88)” to request some assistance. What one learns here is that the North African Countries at the time did not live on the sole depredations

on Western shipping, though, as developed above, Algiers like European countries participated in the political economy of plunder. It is the wheat grown in such regions as that of the Kabyle Kingdom of Cucoo that was sometimes traded to European countries, including England as part of trade privileges accorded by Algiers, which levied part of annual taxes imposed on its dependencies in terms of a certain number of sacks of wheat. In the captivity, as elaborated below, it is Hasleton who receives the hospitality of the old Moorish farmer.

Hasleton had already lived enough in Algiers to communicate with the elderly Kabyle farmer in the “tongue of Frank,” the lingua franca spoken in the Mediterranean ports. He recounted the whole story of his captivity first in Algiers, and then in the Spanish territory of Majorca, declined his identity, detailed the torments that he suffered at the hands of the inquisition, and he braved the raging Mediterranean and came to be there in his lands. It is interesting to note here the reactions of the elderly farmer and the manner in which Hasleton makes them. Hasleton, as will be made clear shortly, was an English Puritan, so one can expect him to look at every momentous event in his life as a willed providence. However, he makes no such meditation as to the mighty hand of God in the kindness and the hospitality that the old Moor showed him after he had heard his “lamentable discourse”. Nor did he dismiss the Moor’s “mercy as nothing else but cruelty (59)” as John Fox in his captivity had summarily dismissed all such Muslim mercies. By contrast, he brings the most powerful contradictions that can be imagined to the presumed inhumanity of the people on Barbary Coast as the Barbary Legend wants us to believe:

This good aged father, when he had heard my lamentable discourse showing himself rather a Christian than a brought up among the Turkish Mahomestists, greatly pitied my misery and forthwith led me home to his house and caused such victuals as the country yieldeth to be set before me, which was dried wheat and honey, and baked a cake upon the fire hearth and then fried it with butter, which I thought very good meat, for I had not been at the like banquet in six years before, the good father showing me what comfort he could. (p.88)



The false accusation of xenophobia is undermined by statements as the one quoted above. For Hasleton, Muslims like the Old Moor could be as human and as fatherly as Christians excepting the Spaniards at whose hands he suffered the harshest cruelty. Hasleton does not explicitly make a contrast between the inhuman treatment that he had received earlier at the hands of the country man in Majorca during his first escape from prison there, and the kindness and commiseration that the old Moor showed in the Barbary. But reading the two episodes, one can only note the whole world of difference separating the two men regardless of their respective faiths. The Majorcan country man persecuted him and sought to capture him and hand him over to his pursuers whereas the elderly Moor acting just like a father interceded on his behalf and successfully defended his case even when the coastal guard finally found him out in the old Moor's home.

The old Moor even acquiesced to Hasleton's request to conduct him to Algiers, proposing his son as one of his guides. On route the guides were obliged to hand him over to a purveyor of the King of Cucoo, who turned him over to the "lieutenant-general for the wars" to be presented to the King in shackles following his refusal to the proposition to convert to the Muslim faith. The events that he recounted while in captivity in Cucoo land are interesting on at least three counts. First, one learns that the Cucoo Kingdom and its ally the tribe of Beni-Abbas were at that time at a protracted war with Algiers. Hasleton reports that the King of Cucoo and the leader or "king of abbesse" held regular meetings to discuss the military strategy to be adopted in their affirmation of autonomy in relation to the central Turkish government in Algiers. The first questions to be asked Hasleton when he was presented before the King of Cucoo was whether he was a "gunner", a question revealing the urgent need for experienced military personnel in the King of Cucoo. The answer was in the negative, but Hasleton

was obliged to show himself as one by accepting to be “commanded to charge certain pieces” on the occasion of the visit of the “King of the Abbese,” hoping in this way to be granted the freedom to pass to Algiers.

Quite apart from this insight into the domestic conflict between the Cucoo and Abbese Kingdoms and the central government authorities in Turkish Algiers, Hasleton reveals the attitude of the Kabyle artisans towards his skills as carpenter. The least that can be said about this attitude as it is reported by Hasleton is that it is very open-minded to other people’s inventions. After having shown his skill in carpentry by making a carriage for a piece of the king’s ordinance, the latter asked him to teach his carpenters to “frame a house after the manner of English building (p.91)” This task successfully completed, Hasleton was approached by many “artificers who were eager to “understand the fashion of many English tools (as plane irons, gouges, chisels, and such like) for which they showed [him] some favor and gave [him] some money. (p.92)” Clearly, the people on the Barbary shore far from being the brutes that they were made to look like in the Barbary legend were craving for the transfer of technology of even the basic kind.

From the above follows the third interesting element in Hasleton’s captivity. The Cucoo land in Barbary is not a desert land that might be suggested by the Barbary legend but a land of economic opportunity for the English man. Hasleton might well have turned into a master with his own journey men in the Kingdom of Cucoo instead of returning to England, where poverty was so rife that Elizabeth I was obliged to have the Poor Laws and the Statute of Artificers enacted to regulate the job market, to provide relief for the poor, and to stop the vagrancy of the sturdy poor threatening domestic stability. Just as the genre of captivity demands it, Hasleton dissipates the suspicion of having been allured anytime by the economic opportunity to settle himself as master of a trade in

Barbary, determined as he was to save just enough money to buy his way to Algiers from where he hoped to be redeemed in some way and join his country.

Hasleton might even have received that preferment for which the English aristocracy and gentry such as Essex raised in rebellion against the Queen Elizabeth I. The Cucoo King, the Queen and their entourage had desperately tried to make him yield his faith in return for a wife of his liking, a home, and a position in the court, but Hasleton was adamant. His love of his religion, his patriotism, and his love for his children were not there to be bartered for a preferment through whatsoever material gain. The three causes which he adduced for his resistance to turn Moor are formulated as follows:

[O]ne was for the special care I had of my salvation because (as you have heard) there were many temptations laid before me to draw me from a Christian to be an abominable idolater. The second cause was for the love and dutiful allegiance which I owe to my prince and natural country. The third was the regard of the vow which I vowed in matrimony and the care of my poor wife and children. (p.91)

Hasleton's dwelling on the material temptation that he experienced in Cucoo land tells us a lot about the relative prosperity of Barbary in relation to his country as far as the rank and file were concerned. Admittedly, Hasleton's was better off in his Barbary captivity than in the Spanish one. However, ultimately it turned out as threatening to his soul as the Spanish captivity through the material advantages it might offer if he decided to convert. Hasleton's commitment to the Protestant faith, as his dialogue with the inquisitor shows, is firm and not negotiable no matter the material allurements or threats posed to his life.

However, it is important to observe at this stage that Islam in Hasleton's captivity appeared less dangerous than Counter Reformation Catholicism for the simple reason of political alliance of the Barbary States with England against Catholic Spain and the comparatively great geographical distance between Islam and England. In his Spanish captivity, the English man comes out as a reflector of the religious dissensions at home against the background of a possible catholic conspiracy and the threat of Spanish

invasion for over half the period of Queen Elizabethan reign. Vitkus rightly qualifies this captivity as a pamphlet (p. 72), but the short space of his preface does not allow him to extend further his comments to situate this qualification in the context of the fierce propaganda campaigns launched in the 1580s up to the time of the publication of Hasleton's captivity in 1595 by the Catholic missionaries and the Jesuits on the one hand and the ecclesiastical establishment and the various Puritan factions on the other hand.

In this wartime context, Hasleton acted as a militant protestant English man ready to face martyrdom in the affirmation of his identity in the confounding terms of nationality and faith. As Loades argues in his *Politics and the Nation 1450-1660*, by the time England and Spain had come to military confrontation in the 1580s there was a hardening of ideological lines making for the identification of England as a nation-state with Protestantism as embodied by the Anglican Church. Erastianism that is the doctrine justifying the state control of religion, a doctrine given shape in the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity of the late 1560s, was gradually strengthened turning breaches of ecclesiastical and secular law into acts of treason against the Queen and the country. So if Hasleton took a firm stand against the inquisitor in his captivity in the name of religious difference, it is because that difference is constitutive of his national identity as English man.

Hasleton's affirmation of his identity rests on very familiar liturgical and doctrinal differences between Protestantism and Catholicism. Hence when he is brought to a church to be judged, he refused to obey the inquisitor's order to "kneel down and to do homage to certain images which were before me. (p.77)" The first reason for the refusal is that it smacks of idolatry and thus contrary to the Biblical commandments. The second reason is that it is estranged from his Christian upbringing and the manner the

Gospel was “truly preached and maintained by a most gracious princess. (p. 77)” When he was presented the cross for him to reverently lay his hand on it and kiss it, he was so “moved that [he] spit in the inquisitor’s face for which the scribe gave [him] a good buffet on the face. (pp.77-78)”

With the liturgical differences thus established, Hasleton goes on to the affirmation of differences in doctrine between Catholicism and Protestantism in favour of the latter. When the inquisitor enquired into the way Hasleton had received the sacraments of the Eucharist, the latter responded that he received them in remembrance of Christ who died on the Cross and shed his blood to wash away our sins. The inquisitor jumped to the conclusion that these are received in the same manner in the Catholic Church, to which Hasleton hurried to bring correction: ““You,” said I, “when you receive the bread, say it is the very body of Christ, and likewise you affirm the wine to be his very blood. (p.78)”” Hasleton’s denial of transubstantiation on the rational ground that a “mortal man [cannot] eat the material body of Christ or drink his blood (p.78)” was taken by the inquisitor as a blasphemy. Incessant threats notwithstanding, Hasleton goes on to deny the necessity of confession to have his sins pardoned, and that of asking misericordium or mercy from any other priestly authority than that of Christ: “There was no mediator but Jesus Christ, (p.79)” he firmly asserts in the face of the inquisitor. Hasleton scored a victory in his polemical debate about doctrine and the liturgy with the inquisitor, but he paid a high price for that by being submitting to torture to obtain his recantation.

Hasleton’s captivity gives us the full measure of the ferocity of the anti-Catholic feelings generated by such propaganda. The exact time of the Spanish captivity is indicated during one of the appearances of Hasleton in front of the inquisition. To Hasleton’s question why he did not receive the hospitality that a distressed Christian in escape from Barbary could only reasonably expect from fellow Spanish Christians, the

inquisitor's response was that the Spanish "king hath wars with the queen of England. (p. 80)". Hasleton goes with his own comment on this sinister news that he could not have had earlier since he had been in captivity in Barbary since 1582, and that in the meantime the Catholic Mary Stuart had been executed for her involvement in the foiled Spanish-Sponsored Babington plot to assassinate the Queen, giving the signal for military confrontation. Hasleton's comment runs as follows:

For at instant in April 1587 there was their army [the Spanish Armada] prepared ready to go to England. Whereupon they would, divers, give me reproachful words, saying that I should hear shortly of their arrival in England, with innumerable vain brags which I omit for brevity.

Hasleton's survived the torments of the inquisition only to be humiliatingly paraded upon an ass's back while being whipped and bleeding profusely "throughout every street of the city of Maiorque (p.85)". This public humiliation is worsened by the fact that he was in the company of "harlots and whores and other malefactors (ibid)" just as if were a common-law criminal. For the reader, the description of the scene of psychological torment as it is rendered by Hasleton evokes the humiliation of Jesus, giving it a Biblical ring that makes of him a martyr for the Protestant cause. It is in this rhetorical sense that Hasleton's Spanish captivity is inscribed within John Foxe's *The Acts and Monuments of the English Martyrs*. According to Loades, John Foxe's book, which is a general book of martyrs belonging the reformed Churches, was "one of the great propaganda masterpieces of the [sixteenth] century (Loades,288)". First published in 1559, its second expanded version circulated in 1570 it was so widely acclaimed in the context of anti-Catholic feelings of the times that it soon found its way to the Churches to be set side by side with the Bible. (Ibid.)

## **Rawlins's Captivity and the Critique of Mansell's Algiers Expedition**

The intertextuality that Hasleton's Spanish captivity holds with John Foxe's book makes it assume the same propaganda role. Published together in the same year that is 1595 as the Catholic pamphlet *A Conference about the next succession to the Crown of England*, Hasleton's categorical self-affirmation as Protestant Englishman with a double allegiance to the country and the Protestant Church reads as a counter-pamphlet. Its focus on the torments of the Spanish captivity, its constant reminder as to the English identity of Hasleton, and its strong stand for the Queen and the Church of England make it read as a refutation of the Spanish claim to the English throne through the Infanta. This anti-Catholic pamphleteering exemplified by Hasleton's captivity will be re-oriented against piracy in Algiers in John Rawlins's captivity *The Famous and Recovery of a Ship of Bristol* published in 1622 during the reign of James IV. By the time of the publication of this captivity, political alliances had known dramatic shifts making of Spain an ally in the English expedition against "piracy" in Algiers in 1620-1621.

A short summary of the captivity is needed before setting it in context to see what light it throws on the domestic and foreign policy issues of the time. John Rawlins was master of a bark called the *Nicholas*, which on November 1, 1621, together with a bulkier merchant the *George Bonaventure* sailed his ship from Plymouth to the Straits of Gibraltar on trading voyage for the benefit of Master Richard and Steven Treviles. As they entered the Straits of Gibraltar they were sighted by three Algerine corsair ships, the *Callfater*, the *Villa Rise*, and the *Riggiprise*, which soon overwhelmed them and seized them along with two other British ships as good prizes to Algiers where they landed on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November, 1621. The same year, just six after months after the withdrawal of Admiral Mansel's fleet and its failed attempt to set afire the Algerian

corsair ships in the fortified harbour of the mole, Algiers had resumed its protracted war against Britain by mounting reprisal military operations against its shipping.

Rawlins was the last among the new British captivities to be sold as a slave because of a hand disability. He was bought by Villa Rise the captain of the very ship that first seized him for a mere sum of 150 doubloons. When his new master discovered that his slave could not be profitably hired, he warned him that unless he “could procure fifteen pounds of the English there, for his ransom, he would send him up into the country, where he should never see Christendom again and endure the extremity of a miserable banishment. (p.104)” Thus distraught, Rawlins did not know to whom he could turn for assistance, until one of his men by the name of John Davies, enslaved like himself, providentially approached him with the proposal of joining a corsair expedition mounted by two English renegades John Goodale and Harry Chandler. Being well acquainted with John Davies, the latter asked whether he knew of “any Englishman to be bought that could serve as a pilot, both to direct them out of harbor, and conduct them in their voyage. (p.104)” John Davies answered that Villa Rise had put his slave for sale and that the latter, in spite of his disability, was a very good pilot, having worked enough time under his authority as master and commander of the *Nicholas* to judge of his resolution and experience in such a capacity.

The deal being struck, Rawlins soon joined the crew of the “*Exchange of Bristow*” a seized merchant ship bought by John Goodale in order to be transformed into a man-of-war and participate in corsair operations. By the seventh of January 1622, the new man-of-war had been ready for its mission. It hauled out of the fortified harbour of the mole with “sixty-three Turks and Moors, nine English slaves and one French,[and] four Hollanders” on its board. At first, Rawlins had no particular plot to regain his freedom, but once in the open sea, he was driven to distraction by the fact that the other captives



and he had to work as slaves subjecting themselves to such “pains [...] and such dangers and still to enrich other men and maintain their voluptuous lives, returning themselves as slaves and living worse than dogs amongst them. (p.106)” He raved in such a manner that his fellow captives were afraid of being discovered and being condemned for mutiny. He calmed down only after the other fellow captives had reluctantly approved to join him in his conspiracy.

The first circle of conspirers thus formed, several providential occurrences happened, taking the English captives closer and closer to home. One of these occurrences is a disagreement over the spoils among the Turks at the wake of the capture of a Spanish Polack sailing off the coast of Catalonia. The two Algerine ships that seized it parted their way. The unnamed small ship returned to Algiers with the prize, whereas the bigger ship the *Exchange* went through the Straits of Gibraltar into the Atlantic in search of another prize. With captain Chandler resolutely decided to make his own capture to show in Algiers, the *Exchange* continued to sail northward in the Atlantic taking no heed of the warning launched to it by another Algerine ship with which it came across.

The assault on the Turks and Moors had been providentially delayed until the fittest occasion presented itself. In the meantime Rawlins egged on the captain to go still further north for a prey. At last, the captain managed to capture a “Torbay bark,” but in so doing he was obliged to transfer some of the Turkish soldiers from the *Exchange* into it in order to make sure that the prize did not go out of his hand. Having already worked out the Dutch and English renegades to join him in his conspiracy, Rawlins chose the opportunity of a discovered leak in the hull to advise the captain Chandler to remove up to the deck and to have the Turkish soldiers stand on the poop in order to weigh down the ship in a such a manner as to pump the water out. Thus tricked out, Rawlins had the

soldiers on the poop blown away and the remaining ones overpowered, saving the life of the renegade captain Henry Chandler in a return gesture of mercy for the relatively good treatment that he had received at his hands. To close this escape account, Rawlins “arrived at Plymouth the thirteenth of February” 1622 to be greeted with the good news that the English slaves in the “Torbay bark” had also overpowered their Turkish captors and had put to port in Cornwall two days earlier. With this change of fortune, six members of the crew of the *Exchange*, including the renegade captain Chandler were held captive in Britain.

The emphasis in Rawlins’s captivity falls on the escape account, but this heroic part as well as the captivity proper provides insight into the major domestic and foreign policy issues of the time. The heroic part represented by the escape account has to be in the context of the failure of Mansell expedition to Algiers supposedly to suppress piracy. This expedition carried out in two distinct phases started in September 20, 1621 when the fleet left the Downs and ended on July 25, 1622, that is barely three months before the capture of Rawlins at the Straits of Gibraltar in November of the same year. This close correspondence of the date when the Western Mediterranean was presumably cleared out of Algerian pirates and that of the capture of the *Nicholas* of Plymouth is in itself a blatant denial of any claim of accomplishment on the part of Mansell’s expedition. At one moment of the captivity, the reader even catches Rawlins laying the blame on that very expedition for the terrible fate that had befallen him and the cruel treatment that the English captives received at the hand of the Algerines:

Yet I must needs confess that they [the Algerines] afforded us reason for this cruelty, as if they determined to be revenged of our last attempt to fire their ships in the mole and therefore protested to spare none whom they could surprise and take alone but either to sell them for money or to torment to serve their own ends. (p.102)

The “last attempt to fire their ships in the mole” refers to the second assault on the port of Algiers on May 21, 1622 when Mansell attempted to burn the Algerian ships in the

mole. The resistance put up by the Algerines, contrary winds as well as a rain squall led to the total failure of the expedition, with “ten or eleven of Mansell’s men killed and thirteen wounded from ‘both small shot and ordinance [that] played continually upon them’.( David Delison, Hebb, 1994:94)” While the fleet was riding before Algiers, Mansell could not even prevent Algerine ships from coming in and out of the mole. Apart from a few captives who were able to make it to the British ships, Mansell had made no accomplishment to show. On 4 June, he ordered the fleet to quit Algiers once more, this time for Alicante that it reached on 8 June. A month later, it left completely the Western Mediterranean without having the mission assigned to it, i.e., the suppression of the supposed pirates operating from Algiers.

The first significant point to underline in Rawlins’ reference to the debacle experienced by Mansell’s fleet is the blaming tone in which it is made. The second point is that this reference makes the capture of the *Nicholas* read as a reprisal on Mansell’s expedition, which historically was true to facts since the Algerine attacks resumed with ferocity their attacks on British shipping after this expedition. The expedition made by the Exchange on which Rawlins was embarked as pilot represents just one such reprisal action undertaken by the Algerines navigated the Straits of Gibraltar and sailed north in the Atlantic in search of good prizes. It ushered in the reprisal raids of Lundy in 1625, Baltimore in 1631, and Penzance in 1640 the years when the Algerines dared to go ashore in these port towns to take British captives. (Hebb, 1994: 149) Rawlings’s recognition of the Algerines’ assault against British shipping as a retaliation undermines the piracy myth that often justified the animosity of the European powers of the time and later against Algiers.

Except for the indirect reference to Mansell’s expedition Rawlins’s captivity remains silent on the political context in which that expedition was decided upon in the first

place. King James I's aversion to piracy has already been well documented, so there is no need to go over the details in this research. However, to date the reason of why the Algerines turned against their former ally by attacking British shipping in the Western Mediterranean has not the whole attention that it deserves. Arguably, everything started with the Anglo-Spanish peace treaty of 1604. James I who from the very beginning of his reign in 1603 termed himself *Rex Pacificus* wanted to put to terms to that the protracted war between Spain and England. According to David Delison Hebb, "he told his first parliament that of the many blessings he was to bring, peace was foremost and a consequence of his person. (1994: 8)" Hebb explains the peaceful temper of the Stuart king by going into his formative years, the violence of which led him at adulthood to develop a "hatred of men of war. (Ibid.)" Taking himself for the King Solomon of his time, King James sought to put an end to the long-lasting conflict between Spain and the Low Countries, which eventually ceased hostilities through the signature of the Twelve Years' Truce in 1609.

The Anglo-Spanish treaty of 1604, the foiled Gunpowder Plot of 1605 fomented by Catholics, and the "development of a fashionable Catholicism, centring upon the queen, Anne of Denmark, who was a catholic convert (p. Loades, 351", certainly encouraged popular fears of the return of popery to Britain, but the King persisted in his attempts at a rapprochement with Spain through marital alliance. On 14 February 1613 the Princess Elizabeth, James's only daughter married the Elector V of the Palatinate, the leading Calvinist Prince of the Hapsburg Empire. As Loades puts it, "to most Englishmen this was a hopeful sign of a firmly protestant commitment in foreign policy. (p.352)" James I's matrimonial policy, however, did not rest at that since it was conceived as a negotiation tool to influence major political events in Europe in the furtherance of peace through dynastic alliances across the religious divide. So two years earlier in 1611, he

had made his envoys in Madrid suggest the possibility of a match between the Prince of Wales Henry with the Infanta. This suggestion had never come to fruition since the Spanish court disdained it, and Henry, who had been loath to such a match, had died a year later in 1612.

However, James I never despaired of contracting a dynastic alliance with Spain. He had still one card up his sleeve – his twelve-year-old son Charles whom he first employed in a diplomatic overture towards the court of France just in order to bring out a change of heart in the court of Spain. And indeed that change of heart did not wait long to take place since just a year after the marriage of Elizabeth that is in 1614, “Lerma specifically raised the matter [match between Charles and the Infanta] with the English Ambassador, Sir John Digby, and the Spanish envoy in England, Diego Sarmiento. (Loades,p.352” Though as Loades tells us, the negotiations dragged on inconclusively for several years, the rapprochement between Spain and Britain was an undeniable reality. It might be interpreted, as Hebb claims it, a part of strategy for the containment of the rise of the Low Countries into imperial power. However, for Algiers it remained above everything else a declaration of war on the side of the enemy, Phillip III’s Spain. This assailment of British shipping by Algiers corsairs could, therefore, be viewed as a military retaliation against such an alliance.

Though James I posed himself as a self-proclaimed peacemaker in an ideologically and religiously divided Europe, his very aggressive stand towards the Islamic countries, and more particularly Algiers and Tunis belied his claim to the title of *Rex Pacificus*. At least four examples can be provided for his obsession with extirpating Algiers pirates. The first two pertain to the domain of play acting and fantasy. In 1613 a mock sea fight opposing Algiers pirates and the British fleet was staged in the River Thames in celebration of his daughter the Princess Elizabeth, later Queen of Bohemia with the

German Prince, Frederick. Catering to the king's wish-fulfillment, this mock sea fight ended with the crushing victory of the British fleet. The same year, always in an attempt to appeal to James I who delighted in play acting, Shakespeare put on stage *The Tempest*. In this play, Shakespeare imagined the king in the flattering image of a magician-duke Prospero providentially landed in an Island off Algiers following a coup on his dukedom. He beat off the "blued-eyed" Sycorax a pregnant witch exiled from Algiers, enslaved her son Caliban, and in the end peacefully reconciled himself with his plotting brother who was made to wreck in that Island on his return from Tunis through the mediation of Ariel, a good spirit that he liberated from the clutches of Sycorax. This reconciliation materializes in the marriage of Prospero's daughter with his brother's son or nephew.

Much more about the importance of captivity in Shakespeare's drama will be said hereafter. For the moment, there is a third example to give to illustrate James I's hatred of the Muslim world. This ethnocentric hatred is exemplified in his 1,100 lines poem *Lepanto* that celebrates the defeat of the Turkish fleet in the place of that name. In this poem, James I shows himself to be a captive of a racial hatred that later led to his mounting of an expedition against Algiers. What does this Latin doggerel say and in what it prefigures James's aggressive politics towards the "Turks" of Algiers. The poem starts with the description of the confrontation between God and Satan, the former portrayed as admonishing the latter for his incitation of damnable Turks to attack righteous Christians. The confrontation ends with God's willful decision to come in support of the Christians by inspiring the Venetians through the Angel Gabriel to take up to arms in defence of Christendom. It turned out that Venice could not come to terms single-handed with the Satan-inspired Turks. United action on the part of the Christians was needed, and indeed victory smiled upon them when they came together in Lepanto

under the leadership of the Christian hero Don John of Austria. Through a sleight of the hand, the captive of racial hatred James I inherits the mantle of Don John.

### **Oakley's Captivity in Algiers as a Reflection of Captivity in Britain**

I am certain that the fact that the last peace was broken by the English, by whom those of Algiers received many injuries and long-suffered them before they sought the least revenge.

The above citation by Francis Knight for sometime held captive in Algiers is quoted by Fisher (1974: 197) in support of the argument that in comparison with the Britons, Algerines observed much more strictly the terms of treaties. The treaty that is in issue in the quote is Roe's peace treaty ratified in the 1622 or 1623 following the fiasco of the Mansell's expedition. The context of this breach of treaty occurred in 1625, the year of James I's death and the accession of his son Charles to the throne. 1625 was also the year when England started another war against Spain. By that year it became evident that the match with the Infanta Princess Maria would not materialize. According to Edward Krizler, in the summer of 1623, while on the fanciful marital mission to Madrid in the company of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, Charles I had the opportunity to "woo the infanta in the royal garden – strictly off-limits to all but the royal family. (2008: 167)" On this date, "he writes jocularly," the gentle, reverent girl ran off screaming that she'd 'sooner enter a convent' than marry him.(Ibid.)" The very marital mission hatched with the express purpose of averting a pending war with Spain on the Protestant side of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) was the one that precipitated the war after its collapse.

Always according to Krizler, after the rebuff the Duke comforted the Prince by suggesting to return home and to declare war on Spain, and "pursue a treasure that had been spoken since the time of discovery: the lost gold mine of Columbus. (Kritzler, 168)" The prince and Duke had heard about the whereabouts in Jamaica of this hidden

treasure from the Spanish king's secretary, Don Hermyn, who "saw in the apparent collapse of the match an opportunity to acquire a share of the mine for himself. (Ibid.) Historians agree that Buckingham was in the predominant position in the English court since his swift rise from a mere cup bearer to Duke of Buckingham in the late 1610s. Being lover and confidant to both James I and his son Charles, the Duke of Buckingham would grow into the architect of Charles I's foreign policy for four whole years (1625-1628) at the death of the latter's father in 1625. To avenge the slight he suffered during his marital mission to Madrid, and to advance his material interests all the while making himself into "the godfather of the united Europe" by compelling the infant to a marriage with the King, he precipitated the war against Spain. To quote Krizler, Buckingham thought that

He could surprise the Madrid court and make off with the infanta, invade Cadiz, Spain's home port, and seize the treasure fleet, relieve La Rochelle and free the Huguenots. His vision was heroic, but his campaigns were poorly equipped and ill-planned. After every misadventure, his defeated men limped home. (Krizler, 171)

It is during the surprise assault on Cadiz in 1625 that an Algerine ship was seized though Algiers had a still binding treaty with Britain. As Fisher puts it, though James Fritzell continued to function as consul in Algiers, a prolonged war had prevailed over the relations between Algiers and Britain until 1646 when a peace overture was made by Parliament. Cason the special envoy of Parliament signed a peace treaty that very year. Fisher had raised some of the major issues behind this prolonged war. Among other issues, the default of the Levant Company on the payment of an annual tribute to the Bashaw provided for in the Roe's treaty of 1623; the hazy terms in which the treaty was formulated and translated; and the inherently provocative attitude of the British authorities towards Algiers.

However, Fisher does not dwell on problem that Charles I faced in the implementation of a coherent policy due to a lack of finance brought out by his rash decision to rule



without Parliament. As a result of the lack of money, Charles I was not only forced to end the Anglo-Spanish war in 1628 but to disengage abruptly from his major commitments to foreign affairs.

To counter the provoked attacks of the Algerines and redeem the British held captives in Algiers, his councilors proposed three solutions. The first solution consists in reviving the commission of privateers, a commission that his father had suppressed right at his access to the throne. This solution could only antagonize further Algiers. The second solution was to mount an expedition in cooperation with European countries on to blockade the Algerine ships. This solution remained a pious wish because of the intrigues between the European countries. The third solution consists of raising an Algiers Tax or ship money to wage single-handed a war against Algiers and to redeem the slaves. But the funds thus raised were channeled into meeting what was considered as more urgent matters.

For relatives with captives in Algiers, there remained one last course to have them released from captivity: the petition to the King to allow them to organize collections to raise redemption funds. Faced with the distress expressed by the families and friends of the victims held in a long-lasting captivity, the King could only respond to these petitions. Accordingly, collections for captives on “Brief Sundays” were organized at the parish churches. These collections were often preceded by sermons that purposefully exaggerated the cruelties suffered by British slaves in Algiers, and aggravated further the alarmist rumours about Algerine raids on Albion’s shores. It is in this war-time context and popular unrest at home that William Okeley experienced captivity in Algiers. Before going into the major domestic and foreign issues reflected by Okeley’s Algiers captivity *Ebenezer; or, A Small Monument of Great Mercy, Appearing in the Miraculous Deliverance of William Okeley*, a brief summary needs to be provided to

allow the reader to follow the major argument in this part of the research: that Okeley's captivity cannot be categorized as a simple captivity account documenting the cruelties of enslavement in Algiers but a mirror image of domestic captivity experienced by Puritans under more or less similar material conditions on Albion's shores.

As Vitkus writes it so well, Okeley's captivity is "accompanied with a theological apparatus that is much more substantial than any included in the other texts included (p.125)" in his anthology. Everything in his account happens according to a well-defined Calvinistic and providential agenda. The captivity indeed starts on 11 August, 1639 when he was captured by an Algerine man-of-war and lasted for nearly 5 years on 30 June, 1644 when Okeley together with 4 other companions decided to escape on a make-shift canvas boat to Majorca. Two months before his capture in the month of June of 1639, Okeley along with a crew amounting to 60 members put to sea from Gravesend on the ship *Mary* freighted with linen and cloth. His mission was to help establish a new colony in the West Indies to which Charles I had given a charter to "Governors and Company of Adventurers for the Plantation of the Islands of Providence, Henrietta (named after his French wife Henrietta Maraia) and the adjacent Islands." The three beneficiaries of this charter were three leading members of the Parliament that Charles had dissolved 10 years earlier in 1629 to impose his own prerogative government. These members who belonged to the Puritan faction are named by Okeley in this order: "the earl of Warwick, the Lord Saye, and the Lord Brooke. (p.147)" Such details included in the body of the narrative, as will be developed shortly, make the start of the account read as an escape from captivity at home which does not fully spell out its name. Okeley and his companions were in no way different from the Pilgrims and the Puritans who made their exodus from British captivity in 1620 for the former and 1630 for the latter.

All three groups were fleeing from the captivity of religious uniformity that does not allow them to practice their own faith in the way they sought fit.

The irony in the providential plan for Okeley's sacred errand into the wilderness is that whilst Okeley and his companions were thinking that at long last their dream of religious freedom was at hand, they were carried into captivity in Algiers. For five weeks, they sailed around the Western coast, putting at anchor in the Isle of Wight for some time, "stuck fast in the sands" for some other time waiting for the rise of the tide and favourable winds. When the time came and these wished-for winds turned out at last, they found themselves providentially blown into the "mouths of enemies". The first truth or lesson for life was thus delivered: "Ye know not what to pray for.' We prayed for a wind, and we had a whirlwind. If we always knew what mischief the answer would do us, we should be glad to eat our words and pray against our prayers. (p.148)" The convoy of the three British ships fell in with three Algerian men-of-war. Following a reluctant resistance during which "six were slain and many were wounded" the British merchantmen were carried as prizes to Algiers.

Section two of the captivity is devoted to the description of Algiers focusing on the "manner of buying and selling slaves, (p.149)", the usual sensational fare to which all captivity narratives invite the reader to help himself/herself. Among other things, Okeley recounts how the captives were driven to the Bashaw's palace, how on the next market day they were conducted like beasts to the market, how they were auctioned, how it happened that he was sold to a Tagarene, a Morisco from Spain, and how they were finally "trotted once more to the viceroy's that he may have the review of them, and he likes any of them at the prices they went off at, there's no more dispute, they are his own. (p.152)

A slave-breaking scene follows the slave auction. Okeley informs us that soon after being sold, his new patron took him to his home in order show him to his son by “commanding me up into a gallery which looked into the court. (p.153)” The son being a peevish character started to hurl insults at him, disparaging his faith as a Christian and the “person of my Redeemer. Ibid.” Outraged by these slighting and blasphemous remarks, and not yet in command of the lingua franca spoken in Algiers, Okeley turned on him with an offending gesture “imitating the cobbler’s yark. (p.91)” This proffered insult against the prophet Muhamed offensively dismissed as a cobbler who patched up a hybrid religion under the influence of Sergius, a Nestorian monk, and Abdalla the Jew blew the patron’s son’s top in such a way that he lashed out at him. It was until Okeley threatened him with “leaping down the gallery,” and thus would forfeit his right to his own person that he finally cooled down.

However, Okeley’s nightmare is only deferred, for as soon as his patron had heard about his offence, he came to him drawing out his long knife to put an end to his life. Without the intervention of the patron’s wife, he would have lost his life. This first encounter with his Muslim master and his son taught him the first lessons as a slave. The most important is that it is “fair for slaves to enjoy the freedom of their own consciences without reviling another’s religion, though erroneous. (p.154)” Hereafter, he observed a total obedience to the rules set for the Christian slaves. Turn by turn, he was made to work as a *hammel*, or porter by helping in fitting out a man-of-war in which his patron had a share; he was pressed as a crew member in that man-of-war which, after nine weeks, brought only one single poor prize, a Hungarian-French man-of-war, to Algiers; and finally having grown insolvent, the patron ordered Okeley to hire himself out to whoever needed his services, with the obligation of paying him a monthly allowance of two dollars.

Okeleye's captivity took a turn for the better at this stage. While desperately hunting for a job, he fell in with a captive countryman of his, who out of sympathy suggested to him to take a place in his shop and trade in something. An English success story thus got underway in Barbary. Once he had persuaded his master to lend him a sum of money to start a business in tobacco, he had little difficulty to prosper and become owner of a tavern, and a cellar. In due course, his patron took to heavy drinking, and fatally damaged his cruising business by the last ship he put to sea. As a result he was obliged to forfeit his rights to all his Christian slaves including Okeley to pay off contracted debts to previous partners in the business of cruising. Okeley was lucky enough to fall in the lot of an old gentleman of whom he says the following:

I found not only pity and compassion but love and friendship from my new patron. Had I been his son, I could not have met with more respect nor been treated with more tenderness. I could not wish a friend a better condition than I was then in, except my bonds. (p. 168)

The fatherly figure of the old gentleman even suggested him to manage his farm for him. As Okeley's self-irony has it, "I might have been there a petty lord or bashawed it over the rest of my fellow servants, Ibid." but he soon came back to his wits to realize that slavery no matter the fancy dress it wears remains still slavery. Thus Okeley got to know slavery in its many disguises, but none of them had had brought him to make what he calls "the wreckage of faith". It was at that moment when he felt most physically free that he resolved to strike a blow for his spiritual freedom by elaborating an escape plan with seven British friends of his. Eventually, this divinely favoured plan took him all the way from Algiers to Majorca and from there to Spanish mainland before making it to Britain in September 1644.

The above brief summary of Okeley's captivity narrative puts the records straight about the conditions of enslavement in Algiers. These were sometimes compared unfavourably with conditions of enslavement in pre-bellum America. However, if one

can only agree that no one brand of slavery is better than another type of slavery, one can note that Okeley put things right by the reminder that slavery as he experienced it in Algiers was far from being a one-faceted social phenomenon. Even at its worst, slavery in Algiers had offered Okeley the possibility of becoming economically free and independent. As he himself says it he grew to feel himself at home in Algiers. As he tried to rationalize his escape from Algiers he grappled the following thought:

It might be a question in point of prudence; for where could I hope to mend myself? Or better my condition? I might possibly find worse quarter in England where the civil wars were no broke out, and to that height of exasperation that those of the same nation, and perhaps blood, would hardly give quarter of life to one another. If the name of native country bewitched me, if that dazzled my eyes, surely wherever we are well is our country, and all the world is home to him that thrives all over the world. (p.170)

Okeley's second nagging point of conscience is about not being true to the love that his new patron catered to him. For a man with a seventeenth-century conservative mindset like that of Okeley, escaping without due leave-taking was sheer ingratitude to his lord. The third dilemma to be resolved was the fact that he felt so well bonded with his lord that he could not easily make off with his own person as a bonded property. Okeley successfully undermined all these qualms of conscience taking care to cite the Scriptures in support of his resolution to escape, but the fact that he was in a quandary about whether or not to escape destroys the picture painted in all black by some recent historians about captivity in Algiers. (Davis Robert C, 2004; Garces Maria Antonia, 2002)

The other picture that Okeley's captivity debunks relates to the now customary portrayal of Algiers as an economically depressed community completely dependent on plundering for survival. By narrating his success story, Okeley belies such claims. Okeley had not only had the opportunity to make enough savings to feel himself at home, but to transfer some of his savings to Britain by conferring them to the minister Devreux Spratt who smuggled them out in the false bottom of a chest where he

consigned all his valuable belongings before his escape. It follows that Okeley did not come back to Britain as a penniless man obliged to seek charity but as a wealthy man. In other words, captivity in Algiers did not economically devastate him, but on the contrary it offered him the capital to start a relatively comfortable life in a war-torn and ideologically divided Britain instead of looking for it somewhere else in the Americas. Paradoxically, the first impression notwithstanding, Algiers was for him a land of opportunity.

As Okeley shows in the Algiers of his captivity, religious considerations took a back bench in relation to economy. No Christian is reported to have embraced Islam by duress. The only case of conversion is that of a Spanish Friar who impulsively renounced his faith because his name was not included in a list of captives for redemption. This Friar paid with his life for this conversion when he finally regretted it and decided to renege. He was burnt in a manner, which, as Okeley was quick to point, was imported from the Spanish Inquisition. Apart from this observation, religion was not allowed to hinder economic activity. After having pointed out that it is “fair for slaves to enjoy the freedom of their own consciences without reviling another’s religion, though erroneous, (p.154)” he comes back to the same point by stating that “we never had the least disturbance from the Turks or Moors, for whilst we intermeddled not with their superstitions but paid our patrons their demands, we might without disturbance from them worship our God according to our consciences. (p.159)” Obviously, the faith of people did not matter as long as economic contracts binding the Christian slaves to their new masters were honoured.

Okeley did not omit to mention that whilst British slaves were held captives in Algiers, British continued to trade in Algiers. A case in point was Captain Wildy of Ratcliff, who took the opportunity of his presence in Algiers, and with the “assistance of

Leghorn merchants freed our minister [Devreux Spratt] from his patron. (p.159)” Furthermore, whilst the normal economic activities seemed to prosper, that of cruising did not look as being much more profitable than it used to be. The comparison of the economic fates of Okeley’s two masters suggests this idea. His first master, who seemingly used to be a huge investor in corsair activities, was over time led first to compensate for the meager sea prizes by relying on the earnings of his Christian slave Okeley before the “last ship he put to sea broke his back. (p.167)” By contrast, Okeley’s second master was a prosperous farmer in search of a good manager for his farm. To all evidence, the revenues generated by domestic economy in Okeley’s Algiers were much more certain than those generated by corsair activity. Okeley’s commercial prosperity within this domestic economy corroborates further this inferred claim.

It is true that Okeley’s economic success in captivity acquires another meaning if placed within the framework of the Puritan theology that underpins the whole captivity. His acquisition of wealth in captivity is there to be interpreted as a sign of election and saintliness among the British community of slaves in Algiers. It is not surprising that it is Okeley who supervises the recruitment of Devreux Spratt to minister to the spiritual needs of the community of saints that he had reconstituted right in the centre of Algiers. Neither is it surprising that he saw himself in the position of a Moses leading some of the elect out of the bondage of Algiers by crossing the desert sea on a canvas boat. However, in spite of the theological paraphernalia imposed on the narrative, the fact remains that Algiers remains a place where success stories like that of Okeley were often recorded. One of these is the story of an American captive, James Leander Cathcart, who more than a century later made a similar fortune in Algiers, and went on to become one of the consuls in North Africa. This story will be dealt later in this research.



Another point worth underlying in connection with the “Barbary Legend” is that Okeley is the second captive after Richard Hasleton to undermine the myth of the inhumanity of the Muslim masters in Algiers. Generally put within an interpretive Puritan framework, the mercy received at the hands of the Muslim masters as “nothing else but cruelty (John Fox, 59)”. Every action in such captivity narratives is subsumed to be an action accomplished by the intervention of God. Ultimately, God is the agent while the person inflicting the suffering or sympathizing with the captive is just an instrument or manifestation of God’s will. Such actions are also generally punctuated by Biblical citations which frame their meaning. However, it is to be noted that when Okeley speaks about the sympathy that his second master showed him, he did not bracket it within a theological framework by pointing to divine agency through Biblical citation. The striking difference between the rather cruel first master and the much more sympathetic second master has much to human character and their occupation, the first participating in corsair activities and the second being mostly a farmer.

To make the above claim does not mean that the captivity as a whole is not framed by an interpretive theological framework that makes it read as a devotional text. Okeley’s captivity is accompanied by a forward matter, an epigraph and a preface indicating clearly that the captivity is intended to speak to an overall human condition marked by captivity by sin. The forward matter imposes a way of reading the captivity for the contemporary reader, and that today’s reader has to take into account in order to gain access into the world of cultural discourse in which it participates. Addressed to the “courteous reader,” the preface starts with an assurance that the captivity was not intended as an entertainment but as a devotional practice. Contrary to romances, fairy tales, legends, and heroic tales it sticks to factual events and the historical manifestation of God in those events. The captivity was put in circulation not in order to generate

“ignorant and blind amazement (p.135)” but to be contemplated as the manifestation of God’s agency through the survival story of a captive. As Okeley puts it, the captivity was written with the express purpose of making the reader “behold a watchful providence (as well as the being of a deity) over all affairs. (p.135)” In order to make sure that the reader does not deviate from this authorial intention, and in order to “improve the narrative to his best advantage, [he...] submissively lay[s] before him a few directions. Ibid.”

These directions are enumerated under 6 major sections covering more than 6 pages of Vitkus’s anthology. All of these sections emphasized the necessity to “to learn” and “be instructed” by the divinely ordained narrative. The first section puts forward the religious obligation to recognize the omnipotence of God and his supreme agency in all human affairs, big or small. In so doing Okeley in fact re-scripts his captivity by transforming the apparent actors and agents (e.g., the winds that blow him into the mouth of the enemy, the enslaving Algerines, etc) into puppets or adjuncts to the ultimate agency of divine providence. The Bible is authoritatively cited so that the

reader may see (and he sees not, he forfeits his eyes) the same God who in an ark of bulrushes preserved Moses and in another ark saved Noah, in a small canvas sculler (which was our ark, though in a lesser volume) waft us over the ocean and bring us all safe to land. (p.136.

All the “wonders” that took place during the escape on the canvas boat were ascribed to God’s intervention. All of them were accomplished by the hand of the Almighty in order to manifest himself and win the praise of the faithful. Accordingly, Okeley urged the reader to “admire God with me” by singing psalms in a thanksgiving prayer. Placed within this wider, authoritative intertextuality, Okeley’s captivity turns from sensational literature to a devotional text wherein the reader is invited to meditate on divine works for spiritual improvement.

The second section further emphasizes the revelation of God in human affairs and the necessity for the reader to “fortify his faith” in the divine manifestations recorded in the captivity. In Okeley’s eyes, for the reader to question the validity and the reliability of the captivity will be equivalent to the questioning of the “historical passages of God’s great providences recorded in Scripture. (p.138)” Thus a dialectic relationship is established between the reading of the Bible and the reading of the captivity. To question the truthfulness of one is to question the truthfulness of the other. Warning against the possible abuse of what he took as a devotional text, Okeley in the third section exhorts the reader to meditate on smaller everyday instances of divine preservations such the ones he had experienced, and to give praises to the God for preserving our highly vulnerable lives. The captivity is thus meant to serve as a cautionary tale to those readers who are liable to stray from the prescribed daily observance of the Puritan devotional practice of looking for divine manifestation in their quotidian lives. In this respect, Okeley’s narrative smacks as a jeremiad addressed to those “païdo-gerontes,” or men-children “that gaze upon the surface of God’s works but never are led by them to admire the wisdom, power, goodness, and holiness of God. (p.134)

Section four of the preface, Okeley advises the reader to look at captivity as a deserved god-sent affliction, the purpose of which is to make him/her value the real worth of his/her freedom. No less than two Biblical intertexts, (the Egyptian captivity and the Babylonian captivity) are cited in support of the argument. In the fifth section, Okeley sees the Barbary captivity as a means whereby the reader will learn to know his/her place in the social hierarchy by becoming much more obedient to their social betters if they are mere subjects, and much more gentle if they belong to class of masters. The lessons that Okeley derives from the sixth, seventh, and eighth sections are respectively

as follows: the need for repentance and the standing in humiliation before God, the need for the observance of the ways of God at all times and the faith in the ultimate deliverance of the righteous believer, and finally the reliance on the sole divine will and succour.

The rest of the preface is devoted to the reasons why Okeley had postponed the publication of his captivity for nearly 23 years, from 1642 to 1675. He mentions four major reasons: one, he returned to Britain in a war-time period (the civil war, 1642-1646) when national miseries were such that his captivity could not be expected to capture the attention of the public; two, he did not instantly feel the necessity to narrate his captivity in witness of God's providences; three, he had not thought it worthwhile to talk about his personal captivity until he was urged to do so by the ministers and the laity; and four, he considered it unfit to be delivered the captivity in rough. So he delayed its appearance until "I could prevail with a friend to teach it to speak a little better English". (p.145). In conclusion, Okeley authenticates his captivity as well as the remarkable escape episode by making appeal to Biblical authority and to friends and relatives of his such as Thomas Saunders and Robert Hales.

As can be inferred from the above brief summary of his preface, Okeley's captivity is put within a theological interpretive framework. The huge number of Biblical intertexts that are brought to bear on the captivity narrative transforms it into a devotional, confessional text inviting the reader to join in the author's witness to the remarkable manifestation of God's mercy. The intention to bear such witness is also in the title and the epistle attached to the captivity. As the Biblical intertext of the title makes it explicit, the captivity is meant as an "Ebenezer", an allusion to that "stone of help" that Samuel had erected as a commemorative monument for his victory over the Philistines: "Thus far the lord has helped us, (Samuel 7:12) declares. Okeye bears the same witness

to God's remarkable manifestations by entitling his captivity: *Ebenezer; or, A Small Monument of Great Mercy, Appearing in the Miraculous Deliverance of William Okeley, John Anthony, William Adams, John Jeph, John --, Carpenter, from the Miserable Slavery of Algiers with the Wonderful Means of their Escape in a Boat of Canvas; the Great Distress and Utmost Extremeties Which They Endured at Sea for Six Days and Nights; [and] Their Safe Arrival at Mayork, with Several Matters of Remark During their Long Captivity and the Following Providences of God Which Brought Them Safe to England.*

This intertextual title is followed by an epigraph attesting that

This book is Protestant and hates a lie. /The reader shall find in this breviary/ All pasternosters, not one "Ave Mary."/ If gentleman and Christian may avail/ If honor and religion can be bail/ For this poor pilgrim's truth and faithfulness,/ It may with leave and safety pass the press. (p. 130)

Such declaration offers an additional interpretative framework giving an anti-Catholic slant to the captivity narrative. Through an analogy drawn between the captivity narrative as a paper vessel and the canvas boat on which he had made his escape from Algiers, the author expresses his fear that it will not steer through the Scylla of a readership which had become addicted to fables and the Charybdis of censorship of that "guild of priests [who] will undertake/To make that God who doth all wonders make:/Can make him, bake him, break him, eat him, too,/ And with a thought can all again undo." (p.129)

The issue in Okeley's worry about the reception that would be given to his captivity seems to have been motivated by what looks like the corruption of the Puritan reading practice by a Catholic cultural discourse prevailing both at the time when he set out as a "pilgrim" on board the Mary in 1639 and at the time of the publication of his narrative in 1675 by which time the monarchy had already been restored to power for 15 years under the reign of the Catholic-oriented Stuart King Charles II. As already mentioned,

Okeley was taken off to captivity in Algiers, as a member of a crew of “pilgrims” bound to the Isle of Providence in the West Indies, which Charles I had granted by charter to some recalcitrant, Puritan leaders of parliamentary opposition in 1630. By this year the Puritans as a religious community had become so disappointed with the state of the Anglican Church under the leadership of Laud that a huge number of them agreed with the poet George Herbert when he declares the following in his “The Church Militant”:

Religion stands on tiptoe in our land/ Ready to passe to the American strand./When height of malice and prodigious lusts, /Impudent sinning, witchcrafts, and distrusts/ (The marks of future bane) shall fill our cup/Unto the brim and make our measure up, etc. (Qted by Okeley in his preface, p.141)

According to Avihu Zakai, salvation or ecclesiastical history of migration to the Americas, as develop by Puritan theologians, falls into two broad types. On the one hand, there is the *Genesis* type of peaceful religious migration predicated upon God’s promise to his chosen nation in the *Genesis* to the effect they will be appointed as beneficiaries of the place on earth on which to thrive, and from which they will spread the Gospel to the whole world. On the other hand, there is the *Exodus* type of religious, apocalyptic migration, the hallmark of which is a judgmental crisis that necessitates the departure of “God’s chosen from a sinful past, and corrupt human traditions. (Zakai Avihu, 2002: 7) The former type prevailed as long as the Puritans had hope that they could bring out more substantial reform in the newly established Anglican Church by suppressing the remnants of Catholicism. In the words of D.M. Loades, the Puritans saw in “the restored protestant establishment the dawning of the climacteric age of England’s history, which was to give her unique place in the preparation for the second coming. (Loades, D.M., 1979: 255)”

However, the failure of the Puritan movement to bring out that long-wished-for reform in the last years of Queen Elizabeth’s reign and James I’s early years of reign gradually eroded the vision of England as God’s chosen nation and her singular role in

ecclesiastical history. By the time William Laud had become archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, receiving Charles I's unconditional support for what looked like a papist clerical revival, Puritans were so alienated from the new religious dispensations that they were compelled to revise their ecclesiastical history. In this revision of the ecclesiastical history, a displacement of imagery from the apocalyptic to the demonic occurred as regards the place and role of England. England was judged as having forfeited its glorious role as a place of salvation for the advantage of the New World, and more particularly New England, now envisioned as a replacement sacred space in which God's saints could take refuge before God's impending judgement falls on the sinful world of Laud's England.

It is with the above Puritan vision of ecclesiastical history that Okeley departed from England for the Isle of Providence in the West Indies. That vision seems to have persisted with the failure of Cromwell to realize God's purpose for his people, and the ultimate restoration of the Stuart monarchy under the leadership of a Catholic-prone king Charles II in 1660. If Laud with the unconditional support of Charles I had alienated the Puritans by carrying out religious practices reminiscent of Catholic beliefs and ritual, Charles II did the same by his religious toleration (1672-73) that permitted him to let in popery by the backside door. As John Morrill puts it Charles II was "drawn to Catholicism and twice revealed that preference (in a secret treaty with France in 1670 and in his deathbed reception into the Catholic Church)" (Morrill John, 2000: 65). The religious tensions in Charles II reached their climax in the "Exclusion Crisis" of 1678-81 when Titus Oates and other conspirators revealed a popish plot to murder Charles II and put his Catholic brother on the throne. At the revelation of this popish plot, Parliament attempted to question the divine-right theory, and thus exclude James II from accession.

It is against this second historical background of religious tensions and crises that the publication of Okeley's narrative of captivity has to be put to understand the full meaning of the militant Protestantism shown most strongly in the interpretive theological framework of the epigraph and the preface. The religious tensions during the reign of Charles II were more or less similar as those that prevailed during his father's reign, so Okeley's publication of his captivity experienced in the late 1630s and the early 1640s became a relevant exercise in the context of the revival of the anti-royalist Protestantism of the 1670s. Vitkus argues that "Okeley's narrative includes frequent diatribes against Islam and the Turks of Algiers, much of which derives from a long tradition of anti-Islamic polemic" (Presentation of Okeley's narrative.125). Though one can only agree with this reading, a caveat has to be put on it because captivity and escape in Okeley's narrative have to be looked at from a double perspective. The inclusion of George Herbert's intertext the "Church Militant" with its apocalyptic pronouncement that "Religion stands upon tiptoe in our land,/Ready to pass to the American strand" places the captivity and escape in the British context and the Exodus type of religious migration referred to above.

It follows that if Okeley was too old to undertake another pilgrimage to the New World, it is at least what the intertext by George Herbert and the Biblical references to Babylonian and Egyptian captivities in the preface and the epigraph seem to suggest to the reader. To put it in another way, Okeley projects a similar dream as the one that Christian experiences in *Pilgrim's Progress*, a contemporary book of Okeley's narrative of captivity and escape. This dream is marked by an imaginary flight of liberation from the sins of the City of Destruction (London) to the grace of the New World, or the Celestial City. This intertextuality leads to another interpretation of the Barbary captivity which becomes the mirror image of captivity at home. Okeley's polemics



against Islam is turned upside down by the interpretive framework in which the captivity and the escape accounts are placed in order to serve the militant Protestantism on the author's agenda.

To substantiate the above claim one has to turn to the captivity proper. What is most prominent in this text is arguably the fact that no moment does Okeley refer to the threat of conversion to the Muslim faith in which the other Barbary captivities abound. So whilst Okeley's captivity dwells on slavery and how it functioned in the "fair city" of Algiers and how it made the wealth of its inhabitant, he did not condemn Islam for its intolerance but surprisingly for its duplicitous tolerance. Hence, Okeley devoted a whole section of his captivity to "HOW GOD PROVIDED FOR OUR SOULS BY SENDING US AN ABLE MINISTER TO PREACH THE GOSPEL TO US IN OUR BONDAGE" (p.158). In this fourth section of captivity, Okeley recounts how Devereux Spratt, a Low Church divine, came to be enslaved to Algiers, and how eventually he was allowed by the authorities to preach to some Christian residents there. "To our meetings resorted many, sometimes three or fourscore, and though we met next [to] the street, yet we never had the least disturbance from the Turks or Moors," Okeley writes. He goes on to account for this tolerance by qualifying it as follows: "whilst we intermeddled not with their superstitions but paid our patrons their demands, we might without any disturbance from them worship our God according to our consciences. (p.159)"

The policy of religious tolerance in Algiers mirrors the policy of religious tolerance that Charles II wanted to put into operation in Britain. These two policies were made with the same venal motives in mind. Islam and Catholicism come out as strange bed fellows in the captivity. So what is said about one also applies to the other. The prefatory verse declaring that this "book is Protestant, and hates a lie (p.150)" dismisses both faiths as

superstitions. It is true that the author resorts to the conventional Christian account of the origins of Islam summarized as follows in the captivity:

I confess my meaning was no more but that Mahomet, by the help of Sergius, a Nestorian monk, and Abdallah the Jew, had patched up a cento of Jewish and monkish fopperies, which was now their religion. (p.153)

This rejection of Islam as a patched-up theology inspired by a heretic monk and a Jew to the Prophet Muhammed, dismissed in the same breath as a “religious thief” (p.149) and a “cobbler”, is double-edged. The condemnation of Islam as a plagiarized faith is informed by hidden polemics that Catholicism is also a “patched up cento of Jewish and monkish fopperies”. At least this is what the diatribe launched against the Catholic priests in the epigraph that provides the interpretive framework to the captivity suggests. “How can this little cockboat hope escape, /when the scripture suffers piracy and rape?” Okeley exclaims in the epigraph to his address to Catholic priests before he implicitly dismisses Catholicism as a lie in distinction to the Protestant truth.

The ethnographic details about Algiers are no less revealing of the hidden polemics against Catholicism. In the course of the fifth section devoted to “SOME REMARKABLE OBSERVATIONS THAT I GLEANED UP WHILST I REMAINED IN ALGIERS,” Okleye recounts the story of a Spanish friar who converted to Islam just because his name did not figure in the list of Spanish slaves redeemed every year by the Spanish government. Apart from the striking contrast between Devereux Spratt and this Spanish friar in terms of religious fortitude, one notes the irony in the account the consequences that followed the Friar’s decision to return to the Christian faith after having publically renounced it for the Muslim faith. Out of tormented guilt, the Friar is said to have gone to the “viceroy’s palace and there openly declares himself a Christian and protests against the superstition and idolatry of Mahomet, as a most execrable and damnable imposture. (p.161)” After having tried to reason him out of what is considered as a folly, the Friar was condemned to be burnt at the stake. It is at this point of the

narrative that Okeley inserts his hidden polemics against the Spanish Inquisition which seems to have inspired that type of punishment in Algiers. This is how Okeley ironically closes this ethnographic detail:

But when they saw fixed in his resolution and that neither what he felt or might fear, what they had inflicted or could threaten, did unhinge him from his profession, they proceeded to the last remedy and inexorably condemned him to the fire, a way of punishment which they learnt from the Spaniards themselves, who first set up the Inquisition against the Moors and have now turned the edge of it against the Protestants. (p.162)

Thus, after having traced the origin of Islam to the inspiration of Muhammed by a Nestorian monk, Okleye now finds the origin of its penal code in Catholic Spain. The overt polemics against Islam turns into hidden polemics against Catholicism, which at the time of publication of Okeley's captivity narrative constituted again a looming threat to Protestantism in Britain.

### **Thomas Phelps as a Barbary Captive Propagandist for James II**

The analysis of the captivity narrative by Thomas Phelps, *A True Account of the Captivity of Thomas Phelps*, puts the religious issue under the carpet to treat mostly about British foreign policy with the Barbary States. Phelps was master of the *Success* a merchantman. When he was taken off in 1684 he was sailing for the Madeiras and Montserrat after having unloaded a freight of salt in Ventrey, Ireland. He was intercepted by a Sale ship under Algerine colours. Because Algiers was in peace with Britain at that time, Phelps was easily tricked by the Sale corsairs. Though suspicious at first, Phelps was gradually lulled to send two crew members each time on board the sale ship to be checked for their identity. Under the treaty that Britain had signed with Algiers in 1682, Algiers was granted the right of search of British ships to check for enemy goods and passengers. In return British ships could sail unmolested by Algerine vessels in the Mediterranean. Phelps did not realize that he was duped until all his crew was trapped in the Sale ship to be carried off to Sale, from where he was sent to Meknes

to be recruited in one of the huge construction sites launched by Muley Ismail to build this new city.

After nearly spent as a slave, Phelps together with some other fellow slaves took advantage of the absence of Muley Ismail and his troops busy waging wars against dissidents to escape from Meknes back to the outskirts of the port town of Sale where they went into hiding. They did not wait long before they found a boat moored in a river flowing to the Atlantic. They paddled down the river into the open sea where they luckily fell upon a British frigate, the *Lark*, which, besides the *Bonaventure* and the *Greyhound*, was on patrol along the Moroccan Atlantic coast. After having narrated his escape, Phelps suggest to the Captain of the *Lark* “that if he would accommodate me with his boat and those belonging to the other two men-of-war which were in company, I would undertake to pilot them in and to burn what ships were then at Mamora. (p.214)” Phelps closes his narrative with this proposed military operation, during which he took revenge on the *Plummage Cortible* the very ship which carried him off to slavery. Feeling vindicated, Phelps came back home to receive a hero’s welcome and “the honor of being introduced to his Majesty’s presence, where I delivered the substance of this following narrative. (p.195)”

What distinguishes Phelps’s captive narrative from the narratives that have already been looked into so far is the silence that it observes on issues pertaining to religion. Apart from making some testimonies of divine favour, it provides neither a religious interpretive framework in a preface as Okeley’s, nor does it incorporate a profuse biblical intertextuality as the other remaining narratives do. One can say that the narrative has depoliticized religion by being put under the carpet. The only intertext that appears in the narrative is inserted as an epigraph after the title, an epistle addressed to Samuel Pepys who was then serving as secretary of the admiralty, and a preface to the

reader. This intertext from Virgil the *Aeneid* reads as follows: “Hac olim meminisse juuabit,” which Vitkus translates into English: “One day this may be sweet to remember. (p.195)” This appeal might be interpreted as an attempt at his self-celebration as a national hero of the stuff of Aeneas, the legendary founder of Rome in Virgil’s book.

Phelps’ narrative is constituted of three parts, each of them with distinct functions. One can easily deduce that the first parts serve as a cautionary tale to those who can be duped by the Sale rovers sailing under Algerine colours. As for the second part, it is there to illustrate by contrast with the miserable slavery in Muley Ismail’s Morocco the “immunities and freedom of my native country and the privileges of a subject of England”. (Preface, p.196) It follows that Phelps, unlike the Puritan captives, did not experience his captivity as a God’s visited affliction but as a worldly experience that taught him to appreciate his privileges as a British subject at their true value. As if currying for further favour with James II to whom he was introduced by Pepys, Phelps expands in a high rhetorical style on these political, social, and economic privileges:

Here the government secures every man in the possession and enjoyment of what God’s blessing and his own industry has allowed. Here even the poor and needy, the impotent, and those who the hand of God has touched have a comfortable subsistence and plentiful provision against all extremities. Here the industrious mechanic or country farmer can sit down at his table better provided than many barons of German, marquises in France, and knights of Spain. (Preface, p.197)

It can be gathered from the above quote that Phelps meant his account of captivity to be read as propaganda campaign for James II who succeeded to the throne in 1685 the same year as the publication of Phelps’s account. How true to fact is this pro-government propaganda will be discussed very shortly.

To come back to the third part of the captivity, Phelps sets himself as a model of bravery and heroism. Phelps did not only manage to escape from Meknes, but he made the resolution to return to the very port where he was landed as a slave and to wreck

vengeance by burning the corsair ship that had captured him a year before. The fact that he accomplished this heroic feat under the command of British navy officers, who had delivered him “certificates of our service in the late action, (p.217)” tells of the national character of his heroism. The implication is that he did not act out of pure self-interest but also out of the need to serve the nation and save its honour. Britons could not be enslaved without facing serious consequences.

How far true is this projected image of British relations with the Barbary States, and most notably with Muley Ismail’s Morocco? This issue will be explored in the historical context against which Phelps’s account first saw light. Phelps did not account for the Sale privateers’ attack on his ship. So the reader can be very easily misled into believing that it was just a routine attack by pirates. However, the year 1684 was too significant in the Anglo-Moroccan relationships to dismiss it as such. One has to go back to 1661 and the marriage of Charles II, James II’s brother, to have an overall trend of political events, which makes Phelps’s captivity in 1684 assume its full meaning.

In 1661, that is just one year after the restoration of the British throne to Charles II, the latter married Catherine of Braganza of Portugal, and as part of her dowry he received the colony of Tangier. As Lynda Colley puts in a nutshell this forgotten, brief episode of British imperial history on the Barbary shore, the colony which at first was thought as an inestimable asset for the construction of a permanent imperial foothold in North Africa became a drain on the nation’s resources. Over the years, the limited financial resources and man power of the kingdom proved too short to build and maintain defences against the onslaughts of the powerful Moroccan military forces led by Moulay Ismail. Put under permanent siege from the very beginning, the colony was evacuated by force in 1684 after being totally destroyed by the British themselves. It “continued to be remembered at demotic level as a place of confinement and duress, a

site of captivities” (Colley Linda, 2003: 40) for some time before it vanished from the histories of the British Empire. For Colley, this short-lived imperial experience on the Barbary Shores “was the specter at the imperial feast, a grim and embarrassing reminder of how difficult, in practical terms, sustaining empire at this early stage could be for Britons.(Ibid.)”

In light of the above historical background, Phelps’s intertextual invocation of Virgil’s story of the foundation of Rome in relation to his account of captivity seems to be at best an exaggeration of the national sentiment and at its worst a psychological compensation for a disavowed imperial defeat on the Barbary shores. Contrary to the Virgil’s intertext “One day this may be sweet to remember,” the 23-three year British imperial interlude in Tangier was so bitter that Phelps chose deliberately to skip it in the account of his captivity. The captivity, especially the third part of it dealing with Phelps’s burning of the Moroccan fleet stationed in Mamora functions as a smokescreen for the national disaster at Tangier. At the very end of his captivity, Phelps comes down to earth and urges the reader to give a thought to those “poor countrymen now languishing in misery and irons” in Meknes. Some of these enslaved Britons certainly were snatched from the forts that the Moroccan military forces blasted in 1684. In the light of the match of military forces between Britain and Morocco, it was not surprising for Phelps to fall back on God for once in all the narrative by suggesting to the reader to:

Endeavour their releasement according to thy power, at least by importuning heaven, that during their captivity God would support them with His grace to bear patiently their afflictions and to resist all temptations until, in His good appointed time, He vouchsafe them a happy deliverance. Amen. (p.217)

Even the rosy picture that Phelps paints of James II’s Britain by contrast with Moulay Ismail’s Morocco does not sustain close scrutiny. The Britons during Phelps’s time, as some historians such as John Morrill, were indeed better shod and better fed than their

ancestors at the beginnings of the Stuart period in the 1600s. Trade became more prosperous and the Stuart kings of the Restoration did not encounter similar difficulties as their predecessors in levying taxes. Britain counted amongst France and Holland among the emerging empires with an ambition to impose its own world supremacy with the decline of Hapsburg Spain. However, as Lynda Colley underlines it, Restoration Britain was far from having such man power and the financial resources to maintain even a small colony as Tangier in Muslim territories. In short what Colley says about contemporary historians of the British Empire applies to Phelps's captivity: "the story of this particular colony was quietly covered over and left undisturbed" (Colley Lynda, 2003: 41) because of the shameful retreat. In spite of Phelps's celebration of British nationalism, one takes the hint at the end of the captivity that the Muslim Mediterranean still remained a zone of captivity for Britons.

Britain under the short reign of James II did not fare better even at the domestic level. As many historians contend, James II became king almost by default. For one thing, he succeeded to the throne because it happened that the Portuguese Queen Catherine of Braganza was barren, and that the 17 illegitimate children fathered by Charles II could not lay any claim to the throne. If Charles II had re-married, he might have had an heir, and so the ambition of his brother to be king might have been totally deflated. One has also to remember that for many Britons, James was always considered the odd one out. During the Exclusion Crisis of 1678-1681 when news was circulated about a Catholic plot to murder Charles and put his brother James on the throne, James would not have survived as a claimant to the throne if Charles had not stuck very firmly to the principle of the divine right of his brother to be king. James was spared Parliamentary exclusion from inheriting the crown, but not before Charles had grudgingly accepted a Parliament



Act “forbidding any Catholic to be a member of either the Commons or the Lords. (McDowall David, 2008: 95)”

This lengthy wrangling over succession in the Restoration did not really speak for the social and political stability to which Phelps refers in the preface in contrast to the gloomy social and political image that he gives about Meknes. Phelps accounted for his escape from Meknes by the fact that Moulay Ismail was obliged to take his army out of town to stamp out a rising rebellion to the South of his kingdom. The contrast with Britain does not hold here, for even before his accession to the throne in 1685, James II then governor of Scotland had made carnage on Presbyterian men, women, and children. This episode in Scottish history, as McDowall David writes it so well, “is still remembered in some parts of Scotland as the ‘killing times’. 2008: 94)” If James II’s Britain maintained its social and political stability in the time of Phelps, it is because the Britons had not yet got over the trauma that they had suffered during the civil war of 1642-1646. Moreover, many Britons were still hopeful that his childlessness at the advanced age of 50 might finally conclude his reign with being heirless, and so solve the problem of succession without blood shedding.

However, this “hope,” in the words of McDowall, “was destroyed with the news in June 1688 that James’s son had been born.(Ibid.)” This loss of hope led to the resurgence of grievances against James II such as his manipulation of religious tolerance to bring back the Catholic Church, his replacement of the gentry who strongly opposed him with men of lower social class, and his maintenance of a standing army. The disappointed Tories and the Whigs now felt obliged to join together to look for a Protestant rescue by inviting William Orange to invade Britain. It follows that the liberties that Phelps celebrates in such an exaggerated manner in his preface to his captivity hide in fact the fragile political state of the kingdom. The conflict between the opposing armed forces

might well have turned into a bloody conflict but for the last minute mental breakdown of James II and the resulting failure of his determination to push ahead with his military plans. British history took another course when James II fled from England for France, leaving the Crown for his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange.

The unsaid in Phelps's captivity cannot be limited to this political and social instability that it covers up through the celebration of British liberties. As argued above, Phelps encourages the reader to make a comparison between James I propagandized as the "king of free men" and Moulay Ismail denigrated as the "Sultan of Slaves". (Milton Giles, 2005: 30-50) As the brief of Phelps's captivity above has already shown, the representation of the Barbary States was not painted in uniform somber colours. The reader has to be reminded that if Phelps was duped to captivity, it was because the Sale corsair ship that captured him was flying Algerine colours. It can be easily guessed that Britain and Algiers were on friendly terms at the time and that, therefore, Phelps had no fear of captivity at the hands of the Algerines. To understand this shift in the direction of fear of captivity, one has to put it in the context of Herbert's treaty between England and Algiers in April, 1682. The treaty came after a war of 5 years, from 1677 to 1682, between Charles II's Britain and Algiers, which to quote Colley's "cost the English over £ 800,000, at least 160 merchant ships. (Colley Linda, 2003: 52)". According to Fisher, this treaty inaugurated a new era in Anglo-Algerine political and commercial relationships since it "endured with some amendments for nearly a hundred and fifty years. From the time of its conclusion until Waterloo we had no armed conflict, or I think any really serious trouble, with Algiers. (Fisher Sir Godfrey, 1974: 265)"

By Herbert's treaty, Britain bound itself to provide its subjects' merchantmen with formal passes when sailing "in any of the seas [not] appertaining to his Majesty's

dominions (Qt in Fisher, p. 265)”. Thus, ships without passes might be seized, and the king’s subjects in service in ships belonging to enemy countries could be enslaved. These provisions account for Phelps’s acceptance to be searched for the identity of the crew members of his ship by the captain of the Sale ship under Algerine colours. Put in the general context of Barbary captivities anthologized by Vitkus, Phelps’s captivity indicates a shift in the zone of conflict on Barbary shore from Algiers to Morocco. Britons continued to be made slaves in North Africa. Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, published in the 1720s, bears witness to the enslavement of Britons by Muslim masters since his hero was captured by the same Sale privateers as those who had captured Phelps years before. And yet when all is said and considered, among all the North African states, it is mostly Algiers which continued to be linked with the Barbary legend. As will be seen later in this research this owes a great deal to the American-Algerine Crisis of 1785-1796, the French occupation of the Algerian territory in 1830, and the publication of imperial histories such as Robert Lambert Playfair’s *The Scourge of Christendom: Annals of British Relations with Algiers to the French Conquest* (1884), and Emile Dupuy’s *Américains et Barbaresques 1776-1824* (1910).

### **Joseph Pitts or the Captive Apostate Turned Self-Appointed Secret Agent**

Even quite a long time before the publication of the above works, captivity in Algiers continued to make the news in Britain. Joseph Pitts’s *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mahometans* is one such captivity that managed to survive its first publication in 1704 since it appeared in new editions in 1717 and 1731, and was reprinted in 1719 and 1738 before it found its way into “various compilations of ethnographic materials published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. (Introduction, Vitkus, 219)” Before accounting for such popularity, one has to give a brief summary of the captivity to allow the reader to see in what ways it departs from

the other captivities in Vitkus's anthology and what domestic and foreign issues it mirrors to make it captivating.

Joseph Pitts was an Exeter who claimed to have been captured and taken to Algiers in 1678 when he was fifteen years of age. As already stated above, Britain was at the time at war with Algiers. He remained in captivity until 1693, and claims to have been converted by his second master by force. It seems that his conversion to Islam that made him a subject of Algiers excluded him from the schemes of redemption that were put into operation as a result of the peace treaty of 1782. Pitts also claims to have been sold three times over. As he served his different masters, he travelled all along the coast of the regency of Algiers; he participated in the siege of the Spanish colony of Oran; he went into the Moroccan territory in punitive military operation launched by Algiers against Moulay Ismail for an early attack on Tlemcen, visited Tunis; and together with his third master made the pilgrimage to Mecca. When he was freed by this third master, he embarked on a voyage to Smyrna where he acted on his resolutions of escape with the help of the British Consul there, to whom he was recommended by his fellow Consul in Algiers at his departure.

In the last section of his narrative of escape, Pitts recounts how he divested himself of his Muslim clothes to board incognito on a French ship that took him to Leghorn, from where he travelled up to Germany, and down to the Low Countries to join his homeland in 1693. With Britain being at war with France at the time, he was immediately arrested because he carried no passport and threatened with impressment into the British navy. He owed his release to the intervention of Sir William Falkener for whom he had a bill of credit handed to him by a member of the Smyrna Company when he was in Turkish territories.

What makes this captivity distinct from the other British captivities under study in this research is the fact that it was a testimony by a “renegade” who, if his claim is true, came to be identified as such because of unbearable tortures by his second master. Like most of the captivities, Pitts’ is preceded by an epistle and preface. The epistle is addressed to William Ray, the late British consul in Smyrna. “Next to almighty God, I am indebted to you, who so readily ventured to procure my liberty,” Pitts writes in the first lines of the epistle. Besides giving credit where credit’s due, this epistle is meant to authenticate the narrative. It is in the preface that he comes out with what he distinguishes his account from the other captivities. Instead of intending it principally as a glorification of the God’s actions as is the case in Okley’s, or as a celebration of nationalism as in Phelps’s, Pitts tells the reader that he published it, “hoping thereby to do some good to one or other and also make some manner (at least) of restitution and reparation for my past defection. (p. 221)” He goes on to assert that though he is “sensible it would be but a bad testimony of my repentance for my apostasy [...] the reader may be assured of my sincerity in the following relation. (Ibid.)”

All through the narrative Pitts keeps reminding the reader that he remained a Christian at heart, and that his verbal conversion was just a matter of expediency. To get his name cleared, and so be able to reintegrate the Christian community, he offered his testimony about and against Islam as a token of good faith. Structurally, the narrative of captivity, conversion, and escape is placed of his narrative that he significantly entitled *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohammedans, with an Account of the Author’s Being Taken Captive*. One can understand that the author imagined himself as a spy, a secret agent acting under the cover of apostasy to get an insider’s view about Muslim societies to confirm and infirm what had already reported about them. On the basis of empirical evidence, he details the strengths and most

importantly the weaknesses of the Islamic countries with a view to fortify his countrymen against Muslim religious, military and cultural efforts.

Among the reported details in Pitts's account, one finds reference to the cowardice of the Algerine corsairs consisting of attacking small merchantmen and fleeing before big warships. The Janissaries observed no military discipline and were given up to bloody political intrigue and Sodomy. So, there was no reason why the Britons should be awed by the empire of the Turks in Algiers. There was no reason to be dazzled by the power of the Moroccan king Moulay Ismail then in conflict with Britain either, since even the "degenerate" soldiery of the Dey of Algiers had routed his military forces at Fes and obliged him to pay compensations for the damage inflicted on a previous attack on Tlemcen. Egypt and Arabia were not spared. Alexandria was a famous city in the former times, but now it "lies in ruins". Cairo was full of whores. "There is in no part of the world, I am apt to think, greater encouragement given to whoredom than in Egypt," he remarks. Its ethnic diversity was described as "a mixture of Moors, Turks, Jews, Greeks and Copties." He was impressed by the Nile, but then he affirms that it was infested by boat robbers of all sorts. Similar profuse details are given about Arabia, its population, history, the hajj, the Prophet, and so on. As he reports these details on the basis of what he had seen and experienced, he confirmed and infirmed the information about Islam and Muslim then in circulation in Britain.

It happens that some positive points were included on the credit side of Islam and Islamic countries. But these were mentioned not for the benefit of the latter but of Britain. So he was impressed the way children were made to learn the Koran by heart, and the care with which the adult Algerines surrounded this holy book. Then he adds that he was really sorry that children in Britain were not properly brought up in Christian instruction: "poor ignorant Souls which have turn'd Mahometans, would

never have done what they did, had they been Catechized as they ought.” This seems to be his case. He admired the constancy with which the Algerines observe the rituals of what he thought to have empirically demonstrated as an error, but only to lay the blame for the Christians, that is Protestants, for not doing the same for Christianity, which to his mind represents the true religion.

It follows from the above that as he describes the religion and manners of the Muslim, Pitts puts himself in the shoes of a secret agent in the garb of an apostate. In his book, *Alger et l'Europe et la guerre secrete 1518-180*, Moulay Belhamissi has amply illustrated the types of actors who participated in the secret war of Europe against Algiers, but he has not included the interesting case of re-converted apostates such as that of Pitts. One can argue that Pitts was the forerunner of a great number of nineteenth- and-twentieth century British secret agents. One of these is William Gifford Palgrave. Palgrave travelled in Arabia with a Syrian between 1862 and 1863, and assumed the disguise of Salim Abu Mohumud Al-Ays, a Syrian doctor. Like Pitts, on his return to Britain in 1865, he published his book *Narrative of a Year's Journey Through Central and Eastern Arabia*. Among other British travelers in disguise, one can also mention Richard Burton and Lawrence of Arabia.

However, the case of Pitts as secret agent was a little different from the cases of William Gifford Palgrave, Richard Burton, and Lawrence of Arabia. Their works did not spring from the same position of power because they were writing in different political contexts. When Lawrence, Burton, and Palgrave wrote their books, the British Empire was well under way, so knowledge was used offensively that is in support of the British Empire that had come to impose itself globally, including on the Oriental world. On the contrary, Pitts wrote his account from a defensive position, in other words from a position of weakness. Britain, as said earlier, was not yet capable of even keeping the

colony of Tangier for more than 20 years. If Morocco was a match for her, one can only wonder how it could manage at the time of Pitts' publication of his account to encroach on such a formidable land mass as that of the Ottoman Empire with its huge population with due regard to its lack of man power and financial resources. No matter what Pitts says about the "decline" of Islamic countries and the Ottoman Empire, arguably voiced to allay fears of Islamic power, it is significant that on his return home Pitts was nearly captured to serve in the British navy. His impressments failed, but it qualifies to a large measure what he suggested about the decline of Oriental states since Britain had not got even enough man power to wage its war against France without resort the coercion of mere civilians like Pitts.

This reality of British military power in relation to the Barbary States was still valid even by the time of the various reprints and re-editions of Pitts's account in 1717, 1719, 1731, and 1738. After having been compelled by force of arms to leave the short-lived colony of Tangier, Britain had had no other choice than seizing from Spain two small colonies, Gibraltar and Minorca, in 1703 during the War of Spanish Succession (1701-1714). These two colonies were confirmed as British possessions by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. It is highly significant of the balance of power that in order to protect its commercial and strategic interests in the Mediterranean, Britain had abandoned Tangier for Gibraltar and Minorca. It is also important to note that being at war with Morocco for nearly the first half the eighteenth-century, Britain relied to a large extent on Algiers for the provision of her Mediterranean colonies with the necessary foodstuffs. The fact that the British obtained the Dey's authorization to export wheat from Oran in the 1710s and 1720s during which two decades Algiers had regained control of that Spanish colony shows to what extent Algiers and Britain shared commercial, strategic, and military interests in the Mediterranean.



The balance of power, at least as far as land forces are concerned, accounts for the defensive tone that marks Pitts's captivity account. It is true that Pitts sometimes fall into trap of anti-Islamic polemic, but there are passages in his narrative where he belies his vituperative comments on the "errors" of Islam as doctrine and ritual practice. For example, one cannot pass without pausing and considering such passages as the one below, where an emancipated Barbary slave in Algiers living in Mentz enquired about his former master in Algiers. As soon as this emancipated slave became merchant had heard that Pitts had hailed from Algiers, he invited him to his house. Pitts concluded this episode of his narrative with the following statement: "It happened that this gentleman was a slave in Algier at the same time I was. He inquired of me about his patron, whom I knew very well, and we talked about many other things relating to Algier. (p.338)" The author of the captivity himself had such fond memories of Algiers and his third master that he nearly dropped down his project of escape when he was in Smyrna in order to return to what seems a country of adoption. His economic success, his social status as renegade (renegades as he says are just below the Turks and quite above the Moors in terms of social privilege), in addition to his patron's promises that he would make his heir stood as formidable temptations to remain in Algiers. This is how Pitts recalls his struggle with the pros and cons of escape from Algiers:

And also, in the next place, the loss that I should sustain thereby, in several respects, viz., the loss of receiving eight months' pay due to me in Algier and the frustrating my hopes and expectation which I had from my patron, who made me large promises of leaving me considerable substance at his death, and I believe he meant as he promised, for I must acknowledge he was like a father to me.

After I had my liberty to go from him or live with him, I chose to live with him, and he was so willing of it that he gave me my meat, coffee, washing, lodging, and clothes freely and in short loved me as if I had been his own child, which made sincerely to love him, I acknowledge. (p.332)

Admittedly, Pitts invokes his ties with Algiers and his former master as a "temptation" that he had managed to overcome to return to the Christian religion. In other words, he

portrayed himself as someone who was not ready to trade off his faith for economic and affective reasons, and on this account and that of having taken the garb of a Muslim he deserved to be re-admitted to the Christian fold. However, beyond what seems to have been an unbridgeable religious divide, there is a suggestion that as a zone of captivity, Algiers was also a zone of contact and cross-cultural communication. Looked at from this perspective, Barbary slavery far from evoking just relations of subordination paradoxically becomes a rite of passage that surely tests the faith of the ritual passenger, but who at the time of his re-integration notwithstanding the trauma that he might have experienced assumes the role of *passeur de cultures*. Vitkus is assuredly to the point when he claims that through his *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohammedans, with an Account of the Author's Being Taken Captive*, Pitts seeks to clean his name, but it is also right to add that it is through this account that he also earned a name as an eminent scholar in Islamic/Arabic and Biblical studies. In the cultural context of that time when such studies were beginning to acquire such importance in the eyes of the academia and the Britons as a whole (Nasir J. Sari, 1976: 18-37), it might be said that Pitts had made good returns on his slavery in Algiers in terms of scholarly reputation and financial gains, especially if one takes into account the great number of reprints and re-editions of his book.

## Conclusion

It follows that Elizabethan and Stuart-period Barbary captivity narratives mirror the major political, economic, religious, and social issues of the time. For example, placed within the context of Puritan theology, Okeley's narrative mirrors and inverts Algiers captivity into a sense of a home captivity similar to the one that Christian experiences in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Its Biblical intertextuality makes it read as both a spiritual biography, conversion narrative, and a revision of Protestant historiography marked by

the desacrilization of England's role in providential history and the consecration of Puritan colonies as sacred places instead. This shift in vision is accounted for by reference to the failure of the Puritan movement to bring out the long-wished reform of the Anglican Church. Ross's translation of the *Koran* and the polemics that this translation has raised are brought into discussion in this research in order to show to what extent the English society had become captivated by everything related to Islam. It is argued that Ross used it as an allegory to signify on the captivity of the whole nation, and more particularly on that of the defeated royalists under the rule of Cromwell.

Phelps's captivity shifts from religious to political concerns. His captivity is analyzed as a piece of propaganda for the contested regime of James II. By contrasting English liberties to Barbary captivity in Morocco, and closing his narrative with a feat of heroism, Phelps seeks for disavowed self-interest and self-glorification to bolster the nationalist spirit and create a smokescreen, the purpose of which is to hide the real political, social, and religious situation in Britain at the time of the accession of James II to the throne. With Joseph Pitts the renegade captive, the focus in Barbary captivity was again brought to bear on the matter of religion and related cultural matters such as manners. Though heavily slanted towards Protestantism and British culture and manners, this account marks a shift in the culture of captivity because though it was supposedly published in atonement for the author's apostasy, its publication made a name for Pitts as a scholar in Arabic/Islamic and Biblical studies. In the final analysis, it seems that it is the intercultural dimension of the captivity that made it, in one respect at least, so captivating to the eighteenth-century British reader.

Finally, given the popularity that Pitts's account had reached, one can only wonder whether the insights that Pitts had provided into Muslim societies had not assuaged the fears of the Britons in regards to the power and culture of Algiers, and whether in so

doing he had not contributed indirectly to the consolidation of that more-than-one-hundred-year peace between Britain and Algiers ushered in by the signature of Herbert's Treaty in 1682. Admittedly, captivity in Algiers was brought to forefront of media attention in the Anglo-Saxon world again in the two last decades of the eighteenth century, but the nationality of the captives had by then undergone a change as a result of the independence of America in 1783. The reasons why Americans, as former British subjects, were made captives on Barbary, and the domestic and political issues mirrored in a representative sample in the corpus of American Barbary captivities which will be the central concern of the next chapters of this research.

## References

- Andrews Kenneth R., *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire 1480-1630*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Belhamissi Moulay, *Alger, l'Europe et la guerre secrete 1518-1830*, Alger: ANEP, 2009.
- Crowley Roger, *Empires of the Sea: The Final Battle for the Mediterranean, 1521-1580*, London: Faber and Faber, 2008.
- Davis Robert C., *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast and Italy, 1500-1800*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Fisher Sir Godfrey (1957), *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*, London, Greenwood Press, 1974.
- Garcés Maria Antonia, *Cervantes in Algiers: A Captive's Tale*, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002.
- Giles Milton, *White Gold: The Extraordinary Story of Thomas Pellow and North Africa's One Million European Slaves*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2005.
- Hebb David Delison, *Piracy and the English Government 1616-1642*, Brookfield: Scholar Press, 1994.
- Kritzler Edward, *Jewish Pirates of the Caribbean*, New York: Anchor Books, 2008.
- Loades D.M., *Politics and the Nation 1450-1660*, London: Fontana Paperbacks, 1979.
- Matar Nabil, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Morrill John, *Stuart Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Nasir Sari J., *The Arabs and the English*, London: Longman, 1976.
- Playfair Robert Lambert, *The Scourge of Christianity: Annals of British Relations with Algiers Prior to the French Conquest*, London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1884.
- Ruedy John, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Ronald Susan, *The Pirate Queen: Queen Elizabeth I, Her Pirate Adventuress, and the Dawn of Empire*, New York: HarperCollins, 2008.
- Vitkus J.Daniel, ed., *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity from Early Modern England*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Wolf John B., *The Barbary Coast: Algeria Under the Turks 1500-1830*, New York: Norton, 1979.
- Zakai Avihu, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

## CHAPTER TWO

# AMERICA AND THE BARBARY SHORE THROUGH THE EYES OF PURITAN AND YANKEE CAPTIVES

### Introduction

“L’histoire des relations entre les Etats-Unis et les Régences Barbaresques commença dès le lendemain de l’indépendance Américaine,” writes Alain Blondy in his preface to Emile Dupuy’s book *Américains et Barbaresques 1776-1824*. As this research will attempt to show, this is not at all the case if one takes into account the history of colonial America. Scholars specialized in American captivity narratives, such as Paul Baepler argue the contrary. In his *White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Barbary Captivity Narratives*, Baepler retraces the history of American captivity back to one Joshua Gee, a Bostonian shipwright, whose captivity in Algiers in 1680 was orally evoked by his son also named Joshua from “the pulpit of Boston’s North Church” when he eventually came to share it with Cotton Mather (Baepler Paul, 1999: 1)” According to Baepler the elder Gee set out Boston Harbour on tobacco trading voyage to the Mediterranean when his ship was intercepted by Algerine corsairs and carried into captivity in Algiers. Once there, he was recruited for as a galley slave in the Algerine marine and thus participated though unwillingly in coarsair activities before he was redeemed, seemingly as a result of the Anglo-Algerine peace Treaty of 1682. Baepler tells us that Gee owes his redemption to “the famous judge and diarist Samuel Sewall. (Ibid)”

In retracing the origins of the Barbary American captivity, Baepler suggests that Gee Senior and after him Gee Junior had taken their cues from Mary Rowlandson who, three years before Gee was captured, that is around 1677, had survived her Indian captivity to return to her home in Boston and recount her story first orally and then in the form of a book entitled *Sovereignty and the Goodness of God... Being a Narrative of the Captivity*

*and Restauration of Mrs Rowlandson* published in 1682. To make the suggestion that Gee went on his tobacco trading voyage with Rowlandson's captivity resounding in his brain and came back from captivity to build on the popularity of Rowland's account to circulate his orally before his son recited it from the pulpit seems plausible. Indeed, notwithstanding the difference in gender, one can note a similarity of circumstances and family background between the two captives which warrants Baepler's suggestion that Rowlandson's story had provided a pretext, or rather an intertext for Gee's. Both of them came from deeply religious families. Rowland's husband was a divine and her family was an outstanding family in Boston. The same went for the industrious Gee whose son officiated alongside Cotton Mather. So their social status made the divine affliction of their captivity exemplary for the Boston community. The immediate worldly cause of the affliction was also seemingly the same. "Tobacco" in both captivities points to that moral backsliding in the Massachusetts Puritan community to which was imputed their divine punishment through the agency of "Barbarian" aliens, whether these were close at home and called Indians, or lived in far distant Barbary Shores and were referred as Algerines.

However plausible Baepler's claim, this research will contend that Barbary American captivity were not necessarily an outgrowth of the influence of a homegrown genre, the Indian captivity. The two previous chapters of this research shows to what extent British Barbary captivity narratives, especially the one produced by Okeley were suffused by Puritan ideology and culture. Right before American Puritans were caught captives by Indians in the New World, their ancestors had been made captives into alien cultures on the Barbary Shores. So while one agrees that "Puritans [in America] did not invent the captivity [...and] it is one of America's oldest literary genres and its most unique," one can only bring a caveat to the claim that the New world was the primary and sole

location of this culture of captivity. (Vaughan Alden T. and Clark Edward W. Clark, eds. 1981: 3) It was also a legacy that had one of its roots in the Barbary shores and that the Puritans brought it to the American side of the Atlantic in their cultural baggage alongside Bunyan's Pilgrim's *Progress*.

This chapter defends the point of view that the Puritan culture of captivity and its later avatars were transatlantic cultural phenomena. Whether the captors were Indians or "Barbarians" from the Barbary shores, American captivities just like British ones function as sensors and reflectors or mirrors of the major social, economic, religious, political, and cultural tensions of the time of their publication. First and foremost, one would argue that if American captivity narratives, whether Indian or Barbary, came to acquire as a genre a distinctly American literary identity, it is primarily because they were essentially concerned with the formation, evolution, and more particularly the moment of crises in this identity. These claims will be developed with reference to Baepler's anthology of American Barbary captivities mentioned above.

### **Cotton Mather's Captivity and American Exceptionalism**

*The Glory of Goodness, The Goodness of God, Celebrated; in Remarkable Instances and Improvements thereof: And more particularly in the REDEMPTION remarkably obtained for the English Captives, Which have been languishing under the Tragical, and the Terrible, and the Most Barbarous Cruelties of Barbary. The History of what the Goodness of God, has done for the Captivities, Lately delivered out of Barbary* was a powerful thanksgiving sermon preached by Cotton Mather to a Boston congregation on the occasion of the return of some English captives to Massachusetts Bay colony from captivity in Meknes, Morocco in 1703. This sermon is a captivity narrative told from the third-person point view, and as such shows to what extent, as already pointed out in the previous chapters of this research, how far captivity is closely linked to devotional



literature in Puritan culture across the two sides of the Atlantic. Years earlier, Mather had also written a pastoral letter entitled *Letter to the English Captives, IN AFRICA* to the same American colonials to bolster their morale and religious convictions. For the sake of analysis, Mather's thanksgiving sermon and pastoral letter will be taken as one single biographical document about the American colonials.

Before foregrounding the insights that Mather's *The Glory of Goodness* and his pastoral letter sheds into the distinct Puritan culture of the time, a brief summary of the context in which they were produced is needed to understand what the two documents say about the Puritan mind, culture and identity of late seventeenth and early eighteenth century New England. As noted earlier, the Puritan migration to the New World was made with Biblical parallels or types in mind. These types, as previously underlined, were significantly different from those that were deployed for legitimatizing the Spanish migration and colonization of the Southern parts of the New World as well as the English Protestant settlement of Virginia for that matter. A distinction was made between the Genesis type and Exodus type of religious migrations in ecclesiastical history. The former is linked to God's Promise in the Genesis to his chosen nation to propound the Christian religion worldwide, and provided religious legitimacy for colonization by both Catholic countries (Spain, Portugal and France) and Protestant England notwithstanding their transposition of religious rivalry to the New World. As for the latter, it was patterned on the Israelite captivity in Egypt and the flight across the Red Sea to Canaan as reported in the *Exodus*. It was not meant to transport the prevalent religious home cultures as was the case with the Genesis type, but to create conditions for a flight from Britain (judged as being captive of sin) to the American wilderness to escape the impending judgment of God, and the establishment of free forms of worship

denied to them at home, through both a national covenant as well as a covenant of grace. Much more will be said about this aspect later.

The history of the migration of the Separatists in Plymouth in 1620 and that of the Puritans in Massachusetts Bay ten years later in 1630 will not be rehashed here. It is enough to point out the fact that religious dissensions soon appeared in these two colonies when religious freedom was reneged by those very people who made it credo at the start of their emigration. As a consequence of religious strictures, Roger Williams, a Separatist, who migrated to Massachusetts Bay in 1631, was banished from the colony just four years later for what were then considered as eccentric ideas. Amongst other ideas, Williams advocated that the church and state be kept separate, that the Puritans then in power could not impose their religious beliefs on other denominations, and that the government had no right to dispossess the Indians of their lands in order to be given to settlers. The banishment of Roger Williams led eventually to the creation of the colony of Providence. Anne Hutchinson provided another illustrative case of the challenge of the established Puritan orthodoxy in Massachusetts Bay. Initially, she was a follower of John Cotton, a minister most known for his sermons in defence of the covenant of grace, in other words a covenant whereby God unconditionally or freely accords salvation to unworthy humans. From a fervent commentator on Cotton's sermon to the womenfolk and later also to men at her very home, Hutchinson soon developed her own religious beliefs like the possibility of communicating directly with God, that is without the mediation of the clergy, and the certainty of salvation, thus sparing the believers that state of constant tension in which the Puritan orthodoxy maintained them. The threat to religious orthodoxy, and hence to social stability by a woman in a world of males was judged by the religious authorities to be too serious to be ignored. As a result, Hutchinson was brought before the General Court of

Massachusetts and was sent to exile in what came to be known as Rhode Island in November 1637.

In spite of religious dissent, the New England colonies remained marked by a distinct way of life or character as a geographical region where Puritanism achieved its fullest, least inhibited flowering. This flowering of the New England Way did not happen without crises of growth all through the second half of the seventh century and the first decades of the eighteenth. The expansion of the settlement in New England brought out a collision of interests with the original inhabitants and ensued in Indian wars, most notably King Philip's War (1675-1676) during which an "estimated one-tenth of the able-bodied adult male population [of Massachusetts Bay colony] was killed and wounded" (Katzman Norton, et al, 2007). The abrogation of the charter of the colonies during the Restoration period (1660-1688) and the creation of the Dominion of New England reduced considerably the political autonomy that New England colonies had enjoyed until then. The Navigation Acts (1651, 1663, 1673) followed up by the creation of the Board of Trade in 1696 furthered the mercantilist interests of the mother country at the disadvantage of the colonies. Finally, the emergence of a merchant class on seaboard port towns such as Boston, Newport, and New Haven brought out a social crisis as the old farming interests collided with the emergent commercial interests tied to transatlantic trading system.

Crisis did not spare the established religious way of life as "second-generation Puritans did not display the same religious fervor that had prompted their ancestors to cross the Atlantic. (Norton Mary Beth, et al, 1991: 41-2)" So, in 1662, a synod was convened in Massachusetts to consider in what to give church membership, until then reserved only for those who had experienced the gift of God's grace, could be accorded to these lukewarm Puritans. The result was the so-called Half-Way Covenant whereby the

children of the latter were baptized as “half-way” members in return for their parents’ acceptance of the authority of the church and of their exclusion from communion and participation in voting in church affairs. However, whilst New England re-affirmed its Congregationalism during the 1662 Synod in Massachusetts, the Half-Way Covenant did not put an end the sense of religious crisis around which the other crises referred to earlier coalesced. As Sydney E. Ahlstrom, puts it

Widespread adoption of the Half-Way Covenant solved some important doctrinal uncertainties, but it could hardly be expected to relieve New England’s religious ills. Declension” continued uninterruptedly, the lamentations of the clergy intensified, and their sermonic jeremiads came to constitute a major literary genre. To the generalized woes of declining piety were added the very material facts of royal Restoration, which brought England’s reassertion of governmental authority and the regulation of trade. On top of these developments came other tragedies: an increase of shipwrecks and pestilence, enormous losses of life and property in King Philip’s War, and the devastating Boston fires of 1676 and 1679. (Ahlstrom Sydney E., 2004: 160)

To Ahlstrom’s list of catastrophes can be added that of captivity of American colonials on Barbary Shores. These catastrophes, as Ahlstrom goes on to add, made the General Court call for a synod on 10 September 1679 to “make a full inquiry ... into the Causes of and State of Gods Controversy with us” (Ibid.) This synod which came to be known as the “Reformatory Synod” not only investigated into the reasons why God continued to afflict the colonies but prescribed the adequate cures consisting of a “solemn and explicit Renewal of the Covenant.” (Ibid.)

It is in this context of crises of all sorts, and especially the religious crisis that one has to put Mather’s pastoral letter and the *Goodness of God* for a full understanding of the meaning that he gave to the captivity of the American colonials in Mekness, Morocco. This activity was certainly brought out in the first place by the participation of New England merchants in the transatlantic trade. No indication whatsoever is dropped in the two documents about the circumstances in which the American colonials found themselves in the hands of the Muslim captors of Meknes. But given the principles of

the Navigation Acts one can easily guess that they were crewmembers of either English or American colonial merchantmen involved the international trade network centred on the Atlantic. So the captivity concerns directly or indirectly that growing merchant class, whose open hostility against the Puritan religious leadership for their exclusion from the governing elite led the clergy to “return their hostility in full measure [...by] preaching sermons called jeremiads, lamenting New England’s new commercial orientation. (Norton Mary Beth, 1991: 42)”

Norton *et al*, like many other scholars, qualified the ministers who addressed their jeremiads to the merchant class as a backward looking ministers who “spoke for the past, not the future, because by the 1670s New England colonies were deeply enmeshed in an intricate international trading network. (Ibid.)” Following Bercovitch’s lead, and taking one’s bearing from Cotton’s pastoral letter and *The Goodness of God* one would argue the contrary claim, that the ministers like Cotton also “had their gaze on the future” and so their vision was both a retrospective and a prospective vision. As Bercovitch puts it, “in this sense, there is some justice in Perry Miller’s ironic image of the Old Guard ‘backing into modernity,’ at the end of the seventeenth century, in ‘crablike progress’ from an ‘aristocratic’ order to a ‘middle-class empirical enterprising’.” (Berkovitch Sacvan, 1978: 27) Cotton’s thanksgiving sermon on the occasion of the release of the American colonials from captivity in Meknes and the pastoral letter that he wrote to them during their captivity offer evidence of the minister’s capacity to yoke together the covenant of grace and temporal blessings.

*The pastoral letter to English Captives in Africa* and *the Goodness of Goodness* dwell mostly on that optimistic side of the jeremiad that scholars have often overlooked in their analysis of this American literary genre. That Mather wrote to the captives linked to transatlantic trade and those merchants who showed their hostility to the clergy to

offer his advice and consolation reveals his concern with the spiritual state of even those who strayed away from the ideals of the Puritan tradition. At the outset of the letter, Mather points to the lamentations of “our neighborhood” and their affection and remembrance of them. Then putting himself in the shoes of Jeremiah he writes what follows:

And as the Remembrance which we have of you, causes us, Without ceasing to make mention of you in our prayers, and our ardent and constant cries unto the God of all Grace, that you may have Grace to help you, in your Time of Need, so, it puts us upon Writing unto you, those things, which may help to Instruct, and Strength, and Comfort you, in the midst of your Terrible temptations. Jeremiah the Prophet, thought it his Duty, to write a Letter unto those of his people, that were carried Captives, by a Bitter and Hasty Nation. And from a sense of Duty it is, that we now send a letter unto you, for your consolation in that Captivity, where you are now languishing under Bitter, and Heavy Afflictions. (Mather Cotton, 2016: 3)

Apart from the evocation of Babylonian captivity, Mather also invokes the Egyptian captivity as Biblical intertext to urge the Barbary captives to “hearken to those Admonitions which now must now be given to you. (Ibid.)”

The admonitions are principally concerned with conversion or apostasy. In making his case against conversion, Mather relies on reported experience of previous captives who had wrongly thought that turning Muslim would improve their material conditions. Renegades, he cautioned, forsook their faith only to see their conditions becoming worse with God wrecking his vengeance upon them by confusing their minds, and causing their “oppressors... to sleigh them, and vex them, and more barbarously than ever to multiply Oppressions upon them. (Ibid. 4)” Gradually, Mather modulates his discourse about the dangers of apostasy to Islam sharply contrasted with the Christian faith to make his letter assume the contours of a jeremiad, or at least its major function which is conversion to the discipline of Christianity. In this regard, he advises the captives to meditate on their Barbary captivity or slavery in the following terms:

And it may be, the dismal Affliction of your Captivity, is come upon you to Convince you of, and Convert you to those things in Religion, whereof you were so insensible, when you heard them dispensed unto you, in the Ordinances of the Gospel, which you sometimes enjoyed. Yea, t’wil be an happy Captivity, that is now come upon you, if the

Ears of your Souls be now open to the Discipline of Christianity, of which it may be, the lord from Heaven saves unto you. (Ibid.9)

The gist of the argument is that the Barbary captives were already in the worst sort of captivity, in other terms the captivity in sin. “Every Sinful Child is by Nature so, (Ibid.)” he admonishes them. Physical captivity by the Moroccan corsairs did not condemn to similar torments as spiritual slavery by the “powers of Darkness.”

Mather changes the register of his discourse by counseling the captives to make their profession of faith true to their practice, in other words to repent their backsliding in their time of physical freedom and to practise God’s commandments in order to be born again as new converts to the Christian religion. To comfort the captives, Mather resorts to a profuse Biblical intertextuality pertaining to captivity, all to the effect that it was God’s providence that initially put them in the hands of the Moroccan corsairs and it was the same providence that would eventually buy them their redemption. To bring out that redemption, Mather called the captives to pray truthfully to God. He ends his letter with the codification of the way these prayers had to be made and with the recommendation of selected Biblical passages all of them related to captivity and redemption for meditation. Thus, the captives might have flouted the national covenant in associating themselves with merchant or worldly interests, but their case was not desperate because they were not excluded from benefit of an ultimate redemption from captivity in accordance with the covenant of grace on condition of active cooperation through prayer. It is also interesting to note the irony of the comparison of the colonial American captives in Barbary with Joseph’s captivity in Egypt in these very last lines of the letter:

Yea, if you carry your selves, patiently, and Honestly, and Faithfully, and Industrially, as well as Prayerfully, in the Hard Service, which is by the Providence of God put upon you, the lord may not only Encline your masters to favour you (as Joseph did him, in his Captivity!) but may also make use of you, to do an unknown deal of Good, where He hath now appointed your uneasy stations. (Ibid.p.6)

Through the evocation of the Biblical intertext of Joseph's captivity, Mather promises both eternal salvation as well as temporal blessings for the American Barbary captives.

If in the *Letter to the English captives in Africa* is subsumed under the captivity in sin and so appears as a subspecies captivity, in the *Glory of Goodness* it is human agency that is subsumed by divine agency in the comfort and the eventual redemption of the captives. Placed within the Puritan covenantal theology, captivity in Meknes was not seen as a totally negative experience. It is even qualified as a "happy event", since the suffering that it entails was regarded as a divine affliction that would make the captives by sin reflect on what was wrong with their relations with God in order to be eventually reconciled with him. So the *Letter to the English Captives in Africa* in a way is a welcomed event since it leads the captives to self-examination and reconciliation with God. It turns events over which they originally had no control since they were willed by God to their spiritual and material advantage. God's supreme agency in the capture of the captives is also seen at work in the redemption and improvement of the spiritual state of the captives in *The Glory of Goodness*, which as a thanksgiving sermon was first and foremost a celebration of the "remarkable instances" of the manifestation of God's agency in the redemption of the captives and the "improvements" of that it had brought to their spiritual state.

*The Glory of Goodness* is strictly speaking not a captivity narrative, at least not of the sort of captivity that has already treated in this research, but an interpretation of it in the form of a thanksgiving sermon. As such it offers theological directions about the way the captives themselves would eventually recount orally or in print, or meditate on their redemption from captivity, and the manner these accounts could be received by the listener and the reader as part and parcel of devotional meditative exercise. Mather's sermon put into prominence what other captivity narratives proper suggest through included prefaces that captivities are essentially vehicles for reflections on the meaning or meanings of the captivity represented by the accounts. Modern readership theory generally claims that the meanings of texts depend largely on the reading practice and knowledge that the reader brings to bear on the text. One can say that this holds equally true for the readers of the captivities in their times of production, but the latter are



often cued about what to pause on and reflect on in the captivity. The identity of the ideal reader or listener, as is the case of Mather's sermon, is that of a devout Puritan in search of material for devotional practice. The title, *The Glory of Goodness. The Goodness of God, Celebrated; in Remarkable Instances and Improvements thereof: And more particularly in the Redemption remarkably obtained for the English Captives, Which have been languishing under the Tragical, and the Terrible, and the Most Barbarous Cruelties of Barbary. The History of what the Goodness of God, has done to the Captives, lately delivered out of Barbary* explicitly tags the sermon-cum-captivity for a devout audience.

It is true that *The Glory of Goodness* primarily celebrates the supreme agency of God in the redemption of the captives and that the reader is invited to take the cue from the pastor Mather as to the religious meaning to be derived from the account of God's intervention in the historical fact of the captivity and redemption of American captives from Meknes. However, it is also true that it draws a distinctive picture of the identity of the captives themselves by contrast to both other captives in Meknes and the captors who had reduced them to slavery. This is by no means a contradiction since it is all clear for Mather that the captives are among the elect by the simple fact that they were Puritan. Mather lists three interventions of God as remarkable in fortifying the captives' sense of identity in their resistance to what were considered as both a danger as existential beings and pollution to their souls. The first area in which God fortifies the captive is in "Their Way of Living, (or, shall I not rather say, their Way of Dying)" (Mather Cotton, 61). It goes without saying that this Way of Living was sharply in contrast with the New England Way of Life that had shaped the identity of the captives in the way they eat, dress, observe religious rituals, take rest, and so. This England Way of Life was obviously in crisis at the time of the captivity if one takes into consideration what was made of it in the jeremiads, but still in the process of fashioning it, it had developed into what Bourdieu calls the habitus.

It is the infringement of this habitus or that is a culture-specific identity that makes the captivity particularly stressful for the captivity. Mather relies on two testimonies, one of them a brief by their "late Majesties K. William and Q. Mary (Mather, 61)", and the other by a returned captive, for his description of the Captives' gruesome conditions of life in Meknes, Morocco. Four

details in the quote from King William's and Mary's brief are italicized by Mather as cases of disturbance in the identity or habitus of the captives: the non-enjoyment of "days of rest on the Turkish Sabbath or Ours," "Extreme labor," "diet" consisting of "decay'd Barley, which stinketh so, that the Beasts refuse to eat it" and the fact their task masters were "Black-a-moors". (Mather Cotton, 61-2). In Mather's quote from the returned American captive's account, details related to the captives' horrible housing or lodging are singled out as illustrative examples with a further emphasis that they were overworked by Black-a-moors, this time significantly referred to as "Negroes." Mather gives the final touch to the gruesome conditions of life into which the captives were carried by mentioning the climate "so hot at some times, and so wet at others. (Ibid. 62)"

It goes without saying that captives could not be anything than human beings in extremis. They were, as King William's and Queen Mary's Brief, "peaceably following their Employments at Sea [when they were] taken by the Turkish Pirates of Algiers, Salley, Barbary, and other places on the Coast of Africa. (Mather, 61)" One could easily imagine that they were snatched into an alien world and culture that threatened their physical survival and their identity by being obliged to acculturate by changing their food ways, accommodating themselves to a new climate, accepting new conditions of work under "Negroes". The last detail is particularly interesting since it points to what looks like an abrupt switch, or swapping of identities, with the American captives ironically taking the place of those Black people that New Englanders like themselves had snatched from Africa to be their slaves. Obviously, by the time Mather had made his sermon, slavery had become racially distinctive in New England and in the other American colonies for Mather to refer to the slavery of the white American captives as a traumatic experience. This role reversal was described as being particularly unsettling for captives given their subscription to the Puritan idea of a New Englander a chosen nation. For Mather, the fact that the New England captives had survived this traumatic experience and "outlived their sorrows" that is their emotional disturbance, bear evidence to two gospel truths: "They lived not by Bread alone, but by the Word of God [and] that the

Heart of the King [Moulay Ismail] was in the Hand of the Lord”. (Mather, 63)” Having deduced these truths, Mather calls for the glorification of God for his “Goodness, and for these His wonderful Works unto the Children of Men. (Ibid.)”

God in Mather’s captivity-cum-sermon is the ultimate or final agent behind occasional acts of kindness on the part of Moroccan captors towards their captives. This is true for all Puritan captivity narratives. The emplotment of the Barbary captors as demonic agents would have made voluntary human kindness out of character and unnatural. These acts of kindness become natural only if they are put within theological Puritan framework wherein God appear the real actor and the captors just his instrument. Hence, when the Moroccan captors allowed the captives to practise freely their religion, Mather ascribed this act of kindness to the “Remarkable *Goodness* of God” (Mather Cotton, 63). In so doing, a theological meaning was given to a seemingly unnatural act without abjuring all the cultural and religious stereotypes heaped on the Muslim captors. One understands that God intervened in history not only in order to chastise, but also to protect and instruct. Mather details this act of kindness as follows:

It was a mighty Relief unto them that the English Captives there formed themselves into a SOCIETY, and in their *Slavery* enjoyed the *Liberty* to meet on the Lords Day Evening, every Week and annually chuse a *Master* and *Assistents*, , and form a Body of Laws, to prevent and suppress Disorders among themselves. The *Good Orders* of their society, were a great *Repastation*, and Preservation unto them. And it afforded them no small Comforts to delight them, in the multitude of the Grievs upon them, that at their Meetings they still had one or other, who by Prayers, and other Exercises of Religion among them greatly Edified them. (Mather Cotton, 63-64)

The quote above contains many elements worth emphasizing. First, it is important that captives were in this case taken as a group and not singly. It is natural therefore for them to form what Mather calls a “Society”. Put in today’s anthropological idiom, one can see this society as a “communitas,” which Victor Turner defines as the “esprit de corps” or group identity resulting from liminal experiences of the captives. Following the lead of Arnold van Gennep distinguished three distinct stages in tribal rites of passage or

ritual processes involved in the ritualized transition from one social position to another: separation, margin or limen, and reaggregation. Captivity narratives, as already mentioned earlier in this research, can be explored with this theoretical framework in mind. Mather's captivity-cum-sermon for example, involves a violent separation of American colonial sailors "peaceably following their Employments at Sea (p.61)" from their own world and culture. Their transfer into the alien culture of Meknes corresponds to the liminal stage. Here all the captives are reduced to a low status by becoming slaves. As slaves they shared the same crisis leading eventually to the formation of a community of sufferers resembling that "kind of normative communitas that characterizes the liminal phase of tribal initiation. (Turner Victor, 1991: 133)"

Richard Slotkin, James Axtell and Richard VanDerBeets, amongst other scholars, have already applied the paradigm of the ritual process for understanding the process of change that actors involved in the frontier and in captivity went through. Slotkin relies on Joseph Campbell's mono-myth theory to talk about what he calls the "regeneration through violence". For him, the frontier experience provides a concrete example of Campbell's monomyth or ritual process of social change. James Axtell and DerBeets have deployed the same paradigm in relation to the "white Indians" and white Americans in Indian captivity. However, these scholars have put little emphasis on the various aspects of "communitas" resulting from the experience of liminality.

Victor distinguishes between three types of communitas: spontaneous or existential communitas, normative communitas, and ideological communitas. Spontaneous communitas is a shortlived experience in the sense that "spontaneity or immediacy of communitas – as opposed to the jurial-political character can seldom be maintained for very long.(Turner Victor, 1991: 132)" Free, direct, and direct human relationships soon develop into norm-governed relationships to form what Turner calls a "normative

communitas.” “Under the influence of time,” he writes, “the need to mobilize and organize resources, and the necessity for social control among the group in pursuance of these goals, the existential communitas is organized into a perduring social system. (Ibid.)” As regards, ideological communitas, Turner associates with the “utopian models of society based on existential communitas. (Ibid.)”

If the description that Mather gives about the “society” of American captives in Morocco is qualified as a “normative communitas” it is because their condition of liminality was not just a short experience. Its long duration had permitted the development of what Mather calls a “Body of Laws” and the emergence of a structural hierarchy of “Master” and “Assistants” to keep “Good Orders.” The communal bonds and group identity was strengthened by “Prayers” and “Exercises of Religion.” What is to be noted here is that the “normative communitas” thus established was not solely a communitas among the captives themselves, but also a communitas of the captives with God. For Mather, this dual communitas is essentially remarkable “support from the goodness of God.” One can say that it is doubly remarkable for Mather who saw in it the regeneration through sacred violence of the national covenant and the covenant of grace that prevailed at home in New England. Thus regenerated or born again into covenantal life, the returned captives could be reincorporated into the community of Puritan believers. The sermon-cum-captivity in one sense is also concerned with the third stage of the ritual process of identity transformation, the ritual re-aggregation of the returnee captives into the primary body of the Puritan community.

The political implication of the norm-governed communitas created by the captives must be underlined. That Mather stresses the fact that the captives lived according to their own laws implies that they refused to give legitimacy to Islamic law. Though they were reduced to slavery, they did not give obedience to the Muslim masters, which

would have been a first step in acculturation or conversion, but to elected masters and assistants among the members of their own religious community. This resistance to acculturation is explicitly developed in the evocation of the third remarkable intervention of God in the life of the captives, which concerns the fact “that none of these our Friends proved *Apostates*, from our Holy Religion, when they were under so many *temptations* to Apostasy. (Mather Cotton, 64)” In this respect, Mather recounts another illustrative anecdote about the solid faith of the American captives. This anecdote has it that an English man and a French man in Barbary captivity were caught after having tried to escape. They were brought before the emperor Mulay Ismail for trial. Mather continues the anecdote as follows:

The emperor (Sic.), upon Examination told them, if they did not immediately turn Moors, he would kill them. The French-man yielded; the Emperour then threatened the English-man, if he did not turn, he would quickly kill him. He made Answer, Gods Power was greater than the Devils, and let him do what he would, he should not make him turn Moor. The emperor called for his Sword, and immediately fell to cutting him ... (Mather Cotton, 65)

This anecdote offers a double insight into the Puritan mind. A Puritan listening to or reading Mather’s anecdote cannot fail to see in the sacrifice of the American captive a case of Protestant martyrdom. For Puritans who were reared upon John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments of the English Martyrs*, “almost a second pillar” of the Protestant faith after the Bible (Loades D.M., 1979: 288), the association would be easy to make. For a Puritan to do otherwise than die for one’s faith in face of the danger of apostasy would be equivalent to cowardice and a testimony of the shallowness of one’s faith. This was the case of the Catholic French man.

Mather’s definition of the religious identity of the English man by contrast with that of the French man was not fortuitous. One has to look at it within the context of the collision of interests between the French and the English both in Europe and America as a result of the Seven Years War or as it came to be called in American history King

William's War (1689-97) followed by Queen Anne's War (1702-13). The French with their ambition to expand what they named New France in America made them the arch-enemy of the English settlers who had similar territorial ambitions. It is significant that it is a religious marker that Mather used to differentiate between the French man and the English man because the conflict between them had much to do with the conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism. Thus, Mather's anecdote states the religious and cultural separateness not only between the distant Muslim captors and the Puritan captives but also between the American captives and their immediate Catholic enemy close at home.

Once Mather had affirmed the solidity of the American captives' faith, he proceeded by offering his own material theory of why other captives by contrast with English American captives easily and readily deserted their faith for Islam. It has already been noted that conversion in Barbary captivity narratives was explained in several ways. Nabil Mattar distinguishes between three types of conversion in English writings: conversion under physical coercion, conversion because allurements by the power of Islam, and conversion because of material advancement. (Mattar Nabil, 2008: 21-49) Mather in *The Glory of Goodness* contends with those captive authors who linked conversion to Islam to physical torture. "One would have thought, that if any thing should have made them turn Infidels, it would have been *Adversity*, and the Hope of getting thereby some Relaxation of their *Adversity*, (Mather Cotton, 65)" he writes. Two arguments are put forward to deny this conversion-torture association. In the first place, God in the case of the American captives "would not suffer these our Friends to be *Tempted above what they were able*. (Ibid.)"

Much more important in the steadfast commitment to one's faith in the eyes of Mather is the national character. He observes that "the Renegade's for the most part enjoy'd

more *Prosperity*, and lived in Gentlemens Houses (sic) with much idleness, and luxury, and liberty, THESE (sic) for the most part were they that fell into the Snare of the Wicked. (Ibid)” Mather traced apostasy to the degenerate character of the converts, rather physical torture that might be inflicted upon them. By contrast with these, “those who were toiling about *Castles* or *Brickilns*, continued steadfast in the Faith of our Lord JESUS CHRIST. (Ibid.)” Thus conversion was ultimately related to sharp differences in character between the renegades and the faithful American captives. It is the Puritan ethic of work that comes uppermost in Mather’s account of the shaping of human character. In the final analysis, personal salvation of the American captives from eternal damnation that might have ensued from apostasy was also due to the cultural value or virtue of work which was part and parcel of New England Way of life.

The importance of the ethic of work in Puritan Salvationist theology and the rise of capitalism has already been fully documented by Max Webber and other scholars, so there is no need to expand on it any further in this research. Instead, one has to note that whilst Mather celebrated personal salvation through work and regeneration through suffering, he retained a Puritan theological frame for his sermon up to the end where he reminds the audience that the redemption of the captives could not finally have happened without prayer. “It was a Remarkable Goodness of God,” he says, “That now the deliverance of these our Friends is accomplished, and in a signal Answer to Prayer accomplished, and this not without Obstructions to the Accomplishments. (Mather Cotton, 66)” Berkotvitch the Salvationist Puritan theology as propounded by the Jeremiad is marked by “a climate of anxiety” and “a sense of insecurity” (Berkovitch Sacvan, 1978: 23) both as an end and a means for maintaining an ongoing pressure for the realization of the lifelong enterprise of salvation both in time and eternity. It is this



climate of insecurity of the captives as to their redemption that is underlined by Mather at the end of his sermon.

He reports that in 1680, the English captives had addressed a petition to the “King of England” for redemption. Accordingly, a captain was being sent over to Morocco and an agreement was signed for their deliverance. But at the very moment of their liberation, it happened that the Moroccan Jews intervened to foil the whole operation by paying the same amount of ransom to the Moroccan king in return for keeping the English in captivity. The objective was to recruit them to “build the Jews town” (Mather Cotton, 66). Mather recounts how the Jew responsible for the prolongation of the captivity of the English was divinely punished by having his “brains horribly trod out, by one who purposely Rode over him. (Ibid)” In this account of Jewish perfidy against the English captives, Mather distances himself from the eschatologist, restorationist beliefs of his father Increase Mather, who strongly believed that the Jews would be restored to Palestine and would fight alongside the Christians against the Turks. The Jewish victory would then be followed by conversion to Protestant Christianity. (Mattar Nabil, 2008: 171-173)

In Cotton Mather’s account of English captivity in Morocco, the Jews were conceived as a divine instrument used to delay redemption until God thought it fit. It is according to God’s temporal scheme not man’s that the captives were finally released. Until divine agency was activated by persistent prayer, all human action was vain. When “the Test Time for favour” was over, God tempered the “Devil Incarnate’s [ Moulay Ismail’s] heart compelling him to deal more truly than he use (sic.) to do. (Ibid.)” The ransom was quickly gathered and the captives were soon brought out of captivity, all thanks to God’s “awaken[ed] Spirit of Prayer in the Churches of poor New England. (Mather Cotton, 67)” Thus, God’s supreme agency was affirmed in terms to both the captivity

and redemption. It was God who afflicted the captives and it was God who released them, and it was to this same God that the returned captives were asked to address their Prayers. Captivity was over but for the returned regenerated captives to be reincorporated into the Puritan community, they needed to meditate on the meanings of their divinely ordained captivity and redemption, to recognize that the “*Lord [...] Hast punished us far less than our Iniquities have deserved,*” to see his role in their release, and make thanksgiving prayers accordingly.

Overall, Mather’s *Pastoral Letter to the English Captives in Africa* and his *Glory of Goodness* were produced at a time of crisis in New England History. Interweaving the historical fact of New England captives in Morocco with sacred history, Mather both affirms the Puritan identity in both its secular and religious facets. The ethic of work, the exceptional religious character of the captives in contract with other nationals, the regeneration of the merchant-inclined captives through a god-ordained affliction, and God’s listening to the prayers of the New England church communities were some of distinctive marks of the New England Way of Life. In the final analysis, Mather’s works contain an affirmation that New England was not a God-forsaken nation, but a divinely favoured one with a promised future. His evocation of Joseph’s captivity as a Biblical intertext towards the end of the *Pastoral Letter to the English Captives in Africa* transforms the captives’ adventure into a rags-to-riches story whilst his Puritan Salvationist vision in *The Glory of Goodness* confirms the renewal of the national covenant and the covenant of grace in an increasingly, commercially-oriented New England. In this sense, Mather spoke not only for the past, but also for the future.

### **The Issue of Identity in American Barbary Captivity Narratives**

Quite apart from Mather’s captivity, Baepler’s anthology does not include any additional Barbary captivity concerned with American colonials. All the other

anthologized Barbary captivity accounts were produced in the post-independence period with an emphasis on those which circulated in the first years of American independence. Baepler accounts for the scarcity of Barbary captivities involving American colonials by the prolonged peace between Britain and the Barbary powers, which reduced the risk of captivity of Britons. However, the same Britons, as Lynda Colley observes, continued to be made captives on Barbary shores in the course of the eighteenth century, most notably in Morocco. Three captivities bear witness to the continued production of Barbary captivity narratives during the course of the eighteenth century. One of them is a classic fiction, which is Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1720), and the other two are nonfictional accounts: Thomas Pellow's *The History of the Long Captivity... of Thomas Pellow* (1738), and Elizabeth Marsh's *The Female Captive* (1769). So, one can agree with Baepler that the number of Barbary captivity narratives, written in the eighteenth century had decreased as a consequence of that enduring peace between the Barbary States and Britain, which in turn had made Barbary less captivating in the eyes of the Britons on both sides of the Atlantic. On the other hand, one cannot completely take side with this claim since other factors such as the lack of involvement of the American colonial in the Mediterranean trade and the availability of Indian captivity during the same period might also be considered as other possible explanations.

The captivity of Americans in Barbary at the wake of independence put Barbary in the limelight for a second time in American history. Among the Barbary States, it was Morocco which began the capture of American shipping. In May, 1784 the *Betsy* was taken by Moroccan corsairs. Though captivity concerned just one ship, public fear grew as exaggerated news fabricated by the British press reporting a huge number of captures reverberated across the Atlantic. The Moroccan captivity was short-lived because Morocco was just seeking to negotiate a treaty with the new republic, which it had

recognized by decree as early as 20 December, 1777. (Parker Richard B, 2004: 40) So as soon as the *Betsy* was brought to Morocco, the Moroccan Sultan, Moulay Muhammed bin Abdallah quickly notified the Americans that he had neither reduced the crew to slavery nor had he confiscated the vessel or its cargo. Hardly more than a year passed when the *Betsy* was released as a result of a treaty negotiated by Thomas Barclay through instruction by Thomas Jefferson in France and William Carmichael the American chargé in Madrid, and on the solicitation of the court of Spain.

One has to underline that if captivity in Barbary came to the forefront of the news in the mid-1780s it was until then that it was able to resume trade in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. Because of the Navigation Acts, American trade in the West Indies was blocked by the British authorities. So the sole outlet remained transatlantic trade with European countries with which the new republic hurriedly sought to make treaties. This did not mean that no consideration was given to the Barbary States. Indeed, even before independence, Congress had tried unsuccessfully to include provisions as to the protection of American shipping in the Mediterranean in the treaties that it had signed with European countries such as France, the Netherlands, Spain, and even with Britain in the Treaty of Paris in 1783 that formally recognized its independence. This reluctance to provide protection for American trade in the Mediterranean was not all that difficult to understand since political amity could not be fostered at the expense of national economic interests that might be endangered by the entrance of a new commercial competitor. It would not be to the economic advantage for the European powers if the new republic and the Barbary States came to agreement because that would mean the removal of one of the impediments to free commerce in the Mediterranean basin. Double dealing in this case inevitably marked the intervention of

European countries in the negotiation of peace treaties between the Barbary States and America.

This research is primarily interested in how American captives responded to their captivity in Barbary at the wake of independence, so it will not dwell so much on the diplomatic aspects of the question as on the cultural shock and domestic issues such as identity. Two captivity narratives, James Leander Cathcart's *The Captives, Eleven Years a Prisoner*, and John Foss's *A Journal of the Captivity and Sufferings of John Foss*, both of them centred on captivity in Algiers will be used to document the history of American captivity in Algiers and the way their captivity reflect national concerns. In the first chapter of his account, Cathcart offers the reader the context in which his captivity took place. Among other pieces of information that he offers, he includes the failed attack of the Spanish on Algiers by Emperor Charles V, in 1541, that undertaken by Don Pedro Castigon and General O'Riley in 1775, and the one by Don Antonio Barcelo in 1784. After these failed attacks, he remarks, Algiers was

resolved to accept a valuable consideration from that Monarchy as the price of peace, and thereby liberate themselves from the annual apprehension of bombardments as well as to obtain a larger field for committing depredations on the commerce of other nations. (Cathcart James Leander, 105)

The peace between Spain and Algiers, contends Cathcart, had long been considered before it became a reality in 1784. Cathcart retraced its preliminaries back to 1777-1778 when the Vikiharche Ciddi Hassan was prisoner in Cartagena, Spain. Ciddi Hassan lived to become Dey of Algiers in 1791. It was through Ciddi Hassan when he was prisoner that secret negotiations were engaged but were temporarily halted because of the Anglo-Spanish war, an offshoot of the American Revolution. For Cathcart, the Dey of Algiers showed "partiality for that nation [Britain] even after peace in 1783. (Cathcart, 105)" Spain was obliged to resort to show military muscle in 1784 before it brought Algiers back to the table of negotiations.

According to Cathcart, until the nomination of Charles Logie as British Consul in Algiers right a short time before the one-hundred-year peace treaty was concluded, Algiers was not aware of the new political situation that prevailed on the American side of the Atlantic. It was Charles Logie who informed the Algerine authorities of the separation of the American colonies from the mother country, thus “declaring that the United States were no longer under the protection of his master [King Georges III]. (Cathcart,107)” With the Straits of Gibraltar no longer under the surveillance of the Spanish navy, Algerine corsairs had not only free access to the Atlantic but permission to capture American vessels. The extent of Charles Logie’s perfidy remains a controversial issue, but for Cathcart he was responsible for the capture of the schooner the *Maria* of Boston on which he was sailing, “three miles southeast of Cape St.Vincent (southeast of Portugal) on the 25th of July 1785 [...] and the *Dauphin* of Philadelphia on the 30<sup>th</sup> of the said month. (Cathcart, 107)”

With these two captures, the American government redoubled its efforts to launch the negotiation of treaties of amity and commerce with the Barbary States. As noted above, Thomas Barclay successfully carried out his mission in Morocco. But the case was different with Algiers. The appointed negotiator John Lamb failed to negotiate even the ransom of the captives. According to Cathcart,

Mr. Lamb’s negotiations with the regency of Algiers [...] proved extremely detrimental to the captives as it fed them [the captives] with false hopes of obtaining their liberty soon, and prevented their friends from exerting themselves to procure their ransom, and by deceiving the Dey with unwarranted expectations he committed the honor and dignity of his country and led the Dey and the Grandees to believe that the government of the United States was trifling with them [...]. (Cathcart, 121)

Lamb’s failure to negotiate a treaty and the ransoming of the American captives was traced to his lack of experience and negotiation skills that made him promise a much more substantial ransom than the then impoverished American government could afford to pay. This failure was followed by several other failed attempts to buy peace on the

cheap, all of them made against the background of John Adams-Thomas Jefferson debate on whether it was worthwhile to negotiate with the Barbary states or use military force instead.

One of the policy lines finally adopted was to pretend that the American government was not concerned with the fate of the captives in order to bring the Algerines to lower the amount of ransom. Practically, it suspended the allowances that it had paid until then to the captives to make the policy sound real, whilst it launched after the election of a new government under the Constitution in 1789 a program for the construction of a navy for the eventual enforcement of a militarily sustained diplomacy. In the meantime, the crisis was worsened by the capture of a second wave of American captives in 1793. Strangely, as narrated by John Foss, the circumstances under which the Americans were made captive in Algiers in 1793 were similar to the ones to which Cathcart adduced his captivity in 1785. Both captivity accounts blame the capture of American ships to the perfidy of the same man, namely the British Consul Charles Logie. Foss was captured on board the *Polly*, “about 35 leagues westward of Cape St.Vincent” on Friday 25 October, 1793 by an Algerine private cruise ship named *Babasera*, owned by Rais Hudga Mahomet. As Foss goes on to relate the circumstances under which he was made captive, he includes the following testimony made by Rais Hudga Mahomet to the captives:

He then informed that Charles Logie, Esq. British Consul at Algiers, had negotiated with the Dey, for a truce with Portuguese, for the term of twelve months, and before that time was expired, they would have a firm peace, and the Algerines could cruise in the Atlantic when they thought proper. (Foss, 76)

By 1793 when Foss was taken captive to Algiers, the American government was able to solve the problem of domestic and foreign debts, and to levy tax revenues to the amount sufficient to run the public affairs in much more satisfactory manner than it had done under the articles of confederation. Foss was particularly grateful to the American

government for renewing the suspended allowances granted to the captives just as he was proud that it had regained the respect of other nations and the government of Algiers for the generosity thus shown. The negotiations that followed between Algiers and a more prosperous United States were reported differently by Cathcart and Foss due to their different positions. A captive since 1785, Cathcart's fortune rose dramatically, as he progressed from the position of a simple slave gardener in Baba Mohammed Ben Othman's palace to the position of "Chief clerk of the Dey [Baba Hassan] and the Regency of Algiers" by 1792. As such he took an active part in the negotiation of the peace treaty of 1796 that put an end to the captivity of the Americans in Algiers. Much more will be said about Cathcart's social ascension in Algiers in this research.

Foss contented himself with the recording of emotions of the captives in the bottom of slavery at the resumption of negotiations in the "month of July 1795, when we were informed that David Humphreys Esq. and Joseph Donaldson jun. Esq. had arrived at Gibraltar, and that Mr Donaldson was ordered to Algiers to make a peace, for the United States. (Foss, 97)" Among other things, he describes the deep feelings of joy that the slaves had at the arrival of Joseph Donaldson in Algiers on Thursday the 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 1795, their impatience with the delay of negotiations for holiday reasons, and the patriotic pride to see the American flag hoisted and to hear the salute at the conclusion of the agreement on the terms of peace and liberation on Saturday the 4<sup>th</sup> September. Following the conclusion of the negotiations, Foss tells the reader, that the Dey had affected him alongside two other American captives, as servants in the house of Donaldson. As a good servant, Foss did not blemish the reputation of Donaldson as Cathcart would do in his captivity account. He skipped Donaldson's horrible character and his failure to lead the negotiations to a successful end, and moved directly to the report of how O'Brien his former captain on the *Dauphin* was sent to Lisbon to bring



the money; how “about the middle of March 1796, the Dey got impatient with the delay in the money and had ordered Donaldson to leave the place” (Foss, 98); and how Joel Barlow arrived in Algiers on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March of the same year to save the situation by making new arrangements with the Dey to prolong the deadline of payment; and how the same Barlow “procured money for our redemption from Mr Machio Baccari, a Jew belonging to Algiers” to get the captives freed on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September, 1796.

Overall Cathcart’s and Foss’s accounts of captivity reflect the key issues that faced the infant American republic in the early years of independence. The presence of the American shipping in the European waters of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean immediately after the war could be accounted for by the fact that Britain, France, and Spain had restricted American trade with their colonies. As Norton et al rightly point out “though Americans reopened trade with northern European countries and started a profitable trade with China in 1784, neither substituted for access to closer and larger markets. (Norton Mary Beth, et al., 1991: 115)” In his captivity Cathcart was outraged that the Confederation Congress had allowed John Lamb, a previous horse trade dealer in Morocco, to damage the reputation of the new republic by negotiating for it in financial terms that it could not honour. A change of mood can be observed in the way Foss records his captivity, which happened under new political circumstances. Cathcart’s outrage at being forgotten in “exile” by a government without independent revenue is replaced in Foss’s captivity by the celebration of the generosity and the commitment of the government under the Constitution to the liberation of the captives. The trials of the captives were in a way proportional to the trials of the new republic in its early years of independence. Foss’s confidence in the American government under the Constitution reflects the confidence of the infant nation as it overcame the pangs of birth by gradually regaining control over financial matters, foreign trade, domestic and

foreign debts, and the enforcement of treaties and so on. However, no matter their differences in attitude towards their enslavement, Cathcart and Foss tended not to accept their captivity passively as providential fate as was the case of the captives in Mather's *The Glory of Goodness*.

Cathcart's and Foss's captivities emphasized the suffering that they experienced, but from this suffering was not dismissed as a divine affliction. As recorded by Cathcart and Foss, suffering in the new political context is closely linked to the issue of identity and the cultural shock that ensues from a forceful crossing of the frontiers to another culture. Self-hood and by extension nationhood, as Frederick Hegel theorizes it, is the result of a life-and-death struggle of the "Self" and the "Other" ending with the mutual recognition of the protagonists. Anthropologically, it is signaled by cultural markers such as the food ways, the dressing fashion, religious beliefs, and the customs and manners. As for culture shock, it is "thought to be a form of anxiety that results from the loss of commonly perceived and understood signs and symbols of social intercourse. (Adler Peter, 1972: 8)" It emerges as the cultural cross-over feels the impingement of images of the differences of the confronted culture on his image of self and security. Rhetorically, it manifests itself in the complaints about the local customs, traditions, and manners that the cultural crossover addresses to his community of origin in his/her quest to find a way out of his predicament.

The introduction of the issue of culture shock in this research is meant to be read as a caveat to the postcolonial theorists who tend to look at descriptions of oriental cultures from an orientalist perspective. On the contrary, the culture shock as it is conceived here speaks of human disorientation in cultural contact zones, especially when the crossing over from one's culture to another culture happened under forceful conditions as was the case of Cathcart and Foss. Cathcart offers another insight into the difficult of

acculturation of the American postcolonial captives whose national identity was in the process of construction, and so not yet stable enough to sustain a confrontation with a foreign culture. Writing about the checking the identity of the crew of the *Mary* by the Algerine corsairs, he drops the following remarks:

On being boarded the Mahometans asked us for our flag and papers. Of the first they had no knowledge and the papers they could not read and Mediterranean pass we had none; consequently they conceived us to be a god prize but my feelings were very different from the rest of my fellow sufferers. I understood the Spanish language which they all spoke and was the only person on board who had any knowledge of the Barbary States. (Cathcart, 107)

This comment by Cathcart reveals the Algerine's non-recognition of the American flag as a symbol of the national identity in the concerts of nations. The papers did not announce the identity of the crew and ship either, as these were written in English. As for the pass, they had none because Britain had ceased to deliver them to its American post-colonials. So in terms of identification or identity markers, the latter were still ciphers. Having stated he was the only American post-colonial who knew something of the Barbary States, Cathcart prefigures the degree of culture shock or disorientation that his fellow monolingual and monocultural Americans would experience in their forceful entrance into the foreign culture of Barbary.

Though Cathcart self-represented himself as a person knowledgeable in the Barbary culture and skilful in the major languages spoken in Algiers, he revealed himself as being very sensitive to the cultural markers of which he was divested during his captivity.

The first cultural or identity marker to be erased in captivity is clothing. Cathcart recounts the traumatic experience of being stripped nearly naked by the Algerine corsairs as follows:

We were then driven into the boat without being permitted to go into the cabin and taken on board the Cruiser and conducted to the quarter deck, every person having a pull at us as we went along, in order to benefit by our capture. Our hats, and handkerchiefs and shoes were the first

articles that were taken from us and which we most wanted as we could not endure the sun on our heads nor were our feet calculated to bear the heat of the deck. (Cathcart, 107-08)

So before the Rais of the Algerine cruiser, described as a sympathetic venerable old Arab, announced to the American crew that they were made captives and slaves, they had already been forced out of the cultural trappings that constitute their individual and national identities as American free men functioning within a social hierarchy. Articles of clothing such as hats, handkerchiefs and shoes are cultural indicators as to what and who they really were. Being divested of these cultural markings, they were virtually reduced to the state of nature and their bodies were being readied to be signified upon by their captors.

Cathcart comes back to the imposed cultural presentation of his body, that is to say the forceful wearing of the cultural identity of the Other later in the captivity when he was officially installed as a gardener-slave in the Dey's palace. He recounts that the captives from the *Maria*,

were now taken to the hot bath by the other Christian slaves and cleansed from the filth of the Cruiser, our old rags were changed for a large shirt with open sleeves and a large pair of cotton trousers, a pair of shoes and red cap, all made in Turkish fashion, in which no doubt we made a curious appearance. (Cathcart, 111)

In being forced to change his American shirt for a large Algerine shirt with open sleeves, his American hat for an Algerine red cap, his American breeches for a large Algerine pair of trousers, Cathcart was virtually fashioned into a “new” person. The hot bath that he had taken before wearing his Algerine clothes reads like a ritual preparation for identity transformation by encasing the body in new identifying cultural markers. Cathcart was not only taken into an alien culture and cut off from the normal support systems of existence such the family and society at large, but also obliged to alter his identity by taking off his immediate cultural markings and forcefully putting on other cultural markers to enter into a signifying system of an alien culture.

For Roland Barthes, fashion, just like language, constitutes a culture-specific system of meanings and communication. This system is inflected by variables like gender, class, age, and occupation peculiar to the culture. For Cathcart to enter into the signifying system of the Barbary culture is quite disorienting because of the psychological dissociation between the inside and the outside of the self. In imagining himself in the Turkish accoutrements, Cathcart thought that he “no doubt made a curious appearance”. By laughing off the change of look in this way, Cathcart was in fact just defending himself against the encroachment of alien cultural identifiers on his original outside cover of his identity. That Cathcart had developed such a defensive or escape mechanism to reduce the trauma of a forceful acculturation confirms his previous claim to language skills and cultural knowledge about the Barbary States. Human beings, as cultural relativists argue, perceive alien cultural environments through the filters and screens of their own world, and it is on their perceptions that they take action. The perceived social distance between cultures and the attitude they observe in cultural zones of contact are largely determined by the knowledge they had of the cultures that came to confront them with their differences.

The perceived social distance is greater in the case of Foss who did not enjoy the cultural and linguistic background of Cathcart as regards the Barbary States. As a result, the culture shock that he experienced might be expected to be felt much more acutely. The contrast between Cathcart’s and Foss’s reaction to the alien culture in Barbary was evident right from the start of the contact, at the moment that the American crew discovered that they had fallen in with Algerine corsairs. The Algerines who were flying Englished colours had used an English man as a decoy to approach the American vessel. “The man who hailed us, was dressed in the Christian, and he was the only person we could yet see on the deck,” he writes. But as in a nightmare, this friendly and familiar

decoy gave place to uncanny figures. As the quote below shows, the uncanny was identified by the way the corsairs were dressed, and the beards they were wearing:

By this time the Brig was under our stern, we then saw several men jump upon her poop, to haul aft the main sheet, and saw by their dress, and their long beard, that they were Moors, or Algerines. Our feelings at this unwelcome sight, ate more easily imagined than described: she then hove too [sic] under our lee, when whe heard a most terrible shouting, clapping of hands, huzzaing, etc. (Foss John D., 75)

The “unwelcome sight” that the corsairs first offered did not wear out even after Foss had lived for a considerable time with the Algerines. Whilst Cathcart came to laugh out cultural differences and even cross over the boundaries of cultures, though not with risk, as will be demonstrated shortly, Foss rejects them offhand as monstrosities. Hence, in the course of his narratives he comes back to the Algerine fashion of wearing their beards and their clothes to underline it as a cultural monstrosity: “The Turks are a well built robust people, their complexion not unlike Americans, tho’somewhat [sic] larger, but their dress, and long beards, make them appear more like monsters, than human beings. (Foss John D., 92)” Obviously, the Algerine fashion was a mode of signification that Foss could not enter and the basis on which he excluded the Turks from the human species. As a signifying system of differences, the binary difference in American and Turkisk fashions was what defines the humanity of one race against the inhumanity of the other.

Foss was shocked not only by unfamiliar sights that the Algerines offered to him but also by the fact that the same Algerines had divested him of his identity by taking off his clothes. He recalls that after the corsairs had plundered their belongings found below deck, the corsairs, “then came on deck, and stripped the cloathes [sic] off our backs, all except a shirt and pair of trousers, (myself being left with no shirt at all). (Foss John D., 75)” The identity markers being removed, the American crew was presented before the Rais Hudga Mahomet, Salamia to be declared as captives that is to say as his own private property. On reaching Algiers, the captives were obliged to submit to a radical

transformation of identity by having their names registered in the list of private slaves and being offered Turkish garments:

The christian [a slave in the bagnio] asked each man his name, and then wrote it in the book, and as passed, the Turk gave each man a small bundle. On examining it, we found it contained a blanket, a capoot, (which is a sort of jacket with a head,) a waistcoat, made something like a frock, to draw on over the head, it not being open at the belly, with neither collar or writ-bands, a pair of Trowsers [sic], made something like a womans [sic] petticoat, (with this difference,) the bottom being sewed up, and two holes to put the legs through, and a pair of slippers. (Foss John D., 79)

As one can remark, Foss does not laugh out at the curious sight that he offers in the way Cathcart does when he is made to wear the same Turkish suit. He does not describe himself already in the suit, nor does he imagine himself as performing a theatrical role as Cathcart does. What one has instead is an imagined gender switch that would make of Foss a forceful transvestite. Putting on a woman's identity symbolizes new gender power relationships. Foss imagines himself as being toppled down from his pedestal as a dominant male to the position of a dominated female expected to abide by the rules of Turkish masculine domination. The reversal in gender identities and their linked roles is meant to be as culturally shocking to the author as well as to his readers.

Food was also a contentious area for the affirmation of identity. Just as we are supposed to be what we wear we are also assumed to be what sorts of food we eat and do not eat and, the manner we consume them. One does not need to emphasize the recent literature on the relationships between cultural belonging and food ways. As the reader on food and culture edited by Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterick (2013) shows, the culture-food relationships have already been explored by scholars, such as Roland Barthes, Levi Strauss, Mary Douglas, and Pierre Bourdieu. In Foss's and Cathcart's captivity narratives, food was the main cause of complaint alongside clothing. The complaints are concerned as much with the type of food the captives were served, the way it was cooked, boiled or roasted, as the time at it was served. One would argue that if food were shocked by this culinary aspect of their encounter with the alien culture on

Barbary shores, it is because by being forced to digest foreign foods to which they were not accustomed they were in fact culturally polluting their bodies and bringing an alteration to their original identities.

Several examples from Foss's and Cathcart's captivities can be brought to sustain the above argument. Hence, once made captive by the Algerine corsairs and stripped of his identity, Cathcart was invited to help himself to a diet that he described in very disgusting terms:

We were permitted to come upon deck and were regaled with some very bad olives, mixed with a small quantity of rank oil, and some vinegar to which was added some very coarse bread and water, which was corrupted, and which we were, literally, obliged to strain through our teeth, and, while we drink, to stop our noses. (Foss John D., 108)

As can be noted the diet of the corsairs was described not only as poor but as disgusting to all the senses. When the captives were later served the Turkish national dish the "burgul" the same rejecting attitude was observed by Cathcart "notwithstanding the calls of nature". Cathcart considered it a "charitable" act when some Turks had ventured to offer him instead familiar types of food "some onions, oranges, raisins and figs from their own private store. (Cathcart James Leander, 108)"

The culture shock of meeting with food ways belonging to Algerine culture is expressed much more starkly at Cathcart's arrival in Algiers. Though the American crew members of the *Maria* were reduced to mere captives and ritually recognized as such by the grandees of Algiers, their Master, out of sympathy perhaps for his special guests, wanted to show them courtesy by offering a courtesy dinner. Cathcart recounts that

At our owner's house we were all put into any empty room, on the ground floor, where we all sat or laid on the bare bricks. In the center of the area was placed a large cauldron [What in Turkish language is called a kazan] in which clothes had lately been boiled, filled with water, and a quantity of coarse flesh, which we supposed to be ordinary beef, but afterwards was informed was camel's flesh, which prevented us from tasting. This enraged our Master considerably and he declared he never would put himself to so much expense again to accommodate Christian slaves. (Cathcart James Leander, 109)



Obviously, food ways were culturally divisive. The Barbary master wished to be courteous notwithstanding the subordinating status of the captives. But to these special guests, he served a wrong sort of meat, camel flesh instead of beef, and to make matters worse this camel flesh was cooked neither in the right kitchen utensil nor in the right manner, being boiled instead of perhaps being roasted. The culinary, but also preeminently cultural, encounter ended with a culture shock on both sides. The Master was hurt by the captives' lack of politeness whilst the captives went to sleep with empty bellies because of their cultural incapacity to digest unfamiliar foods.

Foss offers the same insight into the culture shock caused by the stark differences in the food ways between Algiers and the United States. However, the emphasis here falls much more on the poverty of the diet and the quality of the bread served to the captives than anything else. Foss recounts that the captives were kept starving by being served a poor diet consisting of a loaf of sour brown bread at midday and another loaf of the same poor quality and small quantity in the evening. His condition as a public slave doomed to hard labour in the quarry of Algiers did not make it possible for him to pass the same judgment on Algerian food ways as the more fortunate Cathcart. Cathcart, as observed earlier, came into contact with all the social hierarchy of Algiers, and so had much more to say about Algerine food and cuisine than his fellow captive Foss. For a man belonging to the lower ranks as Foss, the fact that the captives did not eat white bread to their satisfaction is sufficient enough as a condemnation of the Algerine culture.

Overall, the disorientation of Foss and Cathcart has much is expressed in the complaints with the manners and customs of Algiers. The intensity of their culture shock might be accounted for by their postcolonial condition. It is proportional to the degree of identity affirmation as new nationals who had just earned their independence from Britain. As

Hegel and Bakhtin, each in his own manner, have argued the description of otherness is crucial for self-definition. This is particular the case of in postcolonial conditions wherein nations and individuals are necessarily involved in the quest of cultural belongings that are likely to consolidate the newly acquired sense of self-identity. This self-identity as argued below is defined by the contrast that Cathcart and Foss implicitly set between America's "civilization of manners", the expression is by Norbert Elias, and the manners and customs on the Barbary shores. Barbary, that is to say Algiers, in Foss's and Cathcart's captivities at times ceases to be a geopolitical territory to become synonymous with a retarded state of social development.

### **Algiers as Foil and Mirror Image of the United States**

The rhetorical function of the description of the manners and customs of Algiers is that of foil. The description of Algiers is meant to be a contrastive affirmation of what the infant nation was not. The United States of America had just made a successful revolution in the name of customary English rights liberties against political tyranny. These liberties and rights were later confirmed in the Bill of Rights attached as the ten first amendments to the Constitution. It is these liberties and other republican virtues that are assumed to constitute the background standard against which the manners and customs of Barbary are described in Foss's and Cathcart's captivities. That Foss and Cathcart were harshly critical towards the British Consul Charles Logie for his presumed complicity in their captivity arguably owes a lot to his association with British tyranny, which if defeated in America, was still active in the Mediterranean through the utilization of Barbary powers as a punishing rod for the post-colonial American captives.

Arbitrary power is one of the social and political aspects of life of Barbary that Foss contrastively foregrounds against the implicit standard of democratic power in the new

republic. As a slave, he had first-hand experience of arbitrary punishment of the captives by the task-maskers. He dwells on the custom of punishment called the bastinado that he describes in detail for the reader to show its barbarity. Law in Algiers of Foss's time was in the hands of the one who is in power. This starkly contrasts with the liberty of trial by jury that is guaranteed by the Constitution. To strike the reader with the arbitrariness of punishment in Algiers, Foss recounts the arbitrary laws that were applicable at different levels of society starting from those applied to the Western captives to those meted out to Turkish criminals. Hence, for arriving late in the bagnio after hard labour in the quarries, the slave:

is driven before a task-master, to the marine, and the Vigihadge, (who is the Minister of the Marine) orders what punishment he thinks proper, which is immediately inflicted, by the task-masters. He commonly orders 150, or 200 Bastinadoes. The manner of inflicting this punishment is as follows, the person is laid upon his face, with his hands in irons behind him and his legs lashed together with a rope. – One task-master holds down his head and another his legs, while the others inflict the punishment upon his breeches, with sticks somewhat larger than an ox goad. After he has received one half in this manner, they lash his ankles to a pole, and two Turks lift the pole up, and hold it in such a manner, as brings the soles of his feet upward, and the remainder of his punishment, he receives upon the soles of his feet. (Foss John, 82)

Obviously, the bastinado as a manner of inflicting punishment is not a civilized manner. It denotes the barbarity of the whole system of punishment in Algiers. If the slave receives such cruel punishment for a petty breach of the rules of the bagnio, capital offenses such as having a sexual affair with a Muslim woman could lead to his being burned alive or impaled. His Algerine counterpart would be beheaded put into a sack filled with rocks, and carried to the open sea and sunk with a trace.

The Algerine system of punishment as detailed by Foss is marked by brutality of execution indicating a lack of human refinement. He tells us that in cases involving the murder of a slave by another slave, the murderer is summarily beheaded. In cases the murder concerns a Muslim, he is “cast off from the walls of the city, upon hooks” to dash into pieces on the ground or to hung on the hooks for a long time before he passes

away. The master class no matter the social echelons of the offenders was not spared the brutality of punishment. Turks were strangled in a brutal manner for serious crimes, and Arabs and Moors convicted of theft had their right arms “cut off and hung about [their necks] and paraded on asses through the streets of the city. As noted above, Foss gave these gory details against an implicit legal standard which the American readers of his time had at their own disposal.

However, in order to fully understand the excessive brutality of punishment in the right way, one has to set it not only against this implicit legal standard, but also the expected response of the reader. In his preface to his captivity, Foss is very clear that his work is addressed to the sentimental reader of his time. For example, he expects that the “The tears of sympathy will flow from the humane and feeling (Sic.), at the tale of the hardships and sufferings of their unfortunate fellow countrymen, who had the misfortune to fall in the hands of the Algerines – whose tenderest mercies towards Christian captives are the most extreme cruelties”. (p.73) The end of the quote “their tenderest mercies towards Christian captives are the most extreme mercies” is an allusion to Rowlandson’s Indian captivity, but the first part of the quotation in its emphasis on tears of sympathy also sets Foss’s Barbary captivity narrative within the context of sentimental fiction, which in the early period of the American novel was best represented by Susanna Haswell’s wildly popular novel *Charlotte Temple*. There is no space here for providing illustrations from the text. So I shall simply go into the peculiar practice of reading sentimental and gothic fiction at the time. Readers of Barbary captivity narratives often forget to set this reading practice within the prevalent cultural discourse of the time, whose hallmark according to Michel Foucault was comparison. In his development of this idea, Foucault writes: “Comparison then [the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries] can attain to perfect certainty: the old system of similitudes, never

complete and always open to fresh possibilities could it is true through successive confirmations, achieve steadily increasing probability, but it was never certain. [...] The activity of the mind will therefore no longer consist in setting out on a quest for everything that might reveal some sort of kinship, attraction or secretly shared nature within them, but on the contrary, in discriminating, that is establishing their identities.” (1970:55)

It is this comparative cultural discourse that today’s reader has to keep in mind when reading Foss’s Barbary captivity narrative. In other words, the contemporary reader has to step into the shoes of the readers of early independent America to retrieve this comparative discursive attitude at the heart of all types of texts. This necessity of tuning up our contemporary reading practice to that of the readers of captivity narratives is underlined in the following quote from the *Spectator*, a journal that can rightly be considered as a guardian of the taste for the eighteenth-century readership. In one of its editorials, it was written that “When we read of torments, wounds, deaths and the like dismal accidents, our pleasure does not flow so properly from the grief which such melancholy description gives us, as from the secret comparison which we make between ourselves and the person who suffers. Such representations teach us to set a just value upon our own condition, and make us prize our good.” (Quoted in Ebersole Gary L. 2003: 113) It is this didactic function that we find at the core of the comparative cultural discourse of Foss’s captivity narrative. Through his narrative, Foss invites the American reader of early independent America to “set a just value on their own conditions and to prize their own good”. Thus when it comes down to the final justification for making public his experiences in Algiers, it boils down to an ostensive self-definition by negation. In simple terms, for Foss, early independent America was everything that Algiers then was not.

Cathcart lived in comparatively better conditions than his fellow American captive Foss, because he was initially recruited as a slave gardener in the Dey's palace and eventually came to occupy the position of chief clerk of the regency. However, like Foss he gives details about the cruel treatment of the slaves. Some of these details are inserted in anecdotes about Mohamed Bashaw whom served in the capacity of gardener and Hassan Bashaw in the capacity of chief clerk. To illustrate the tyrannical character of Mohamed Bashaw, whom he considered to be "the least tyrant of any Dey that ever reigned in Algiers. (Cathcart, 114)" To illustrate the arbitrary system of punishment of Algiers, Cathcart, unlike Foss, resorts to examples of injustice that he witnessed at the highest level of society, that of the Dey's palace which is supposed to be the centre of civility and courtesy. For him cruelty and injustice spread from the head of the state down to the task-masters to form a generalized system. As an illustration of this system he recounts the following anecdote:

A Genoese on his redemption, kissing the hand of Mahomed Bashaw, Dey of Algiers, inadvertently said, 'thank God I have been your servant ten years and never received the bastinado once.' 'Did you not,' said the Dey? 'Take this Christian and give him one hundred blows on the soles of his feet, that he may not have so great a miracle to tell his countrymen when he returns to his home. The poor man, thunder struck, exclaimed 'I am free! Surely your excellency will not punish me for not having committed a fault in ten years' captivity.' 'Give him two hundred blows,' replied the Dey, 'and the infidel says a word more, send him to the works again and inform the person, that has redeemed him, that he may have anyone of the same nation in his room. (Cathcart, 114)

Thus, unbridled arbitrary power is identified as a salient characteristic of Algiers which, as claimed above, is meant to stand as a foil to the democratic exercise of power in the United States under both the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution. To raise the sympathy of the readers of his age, he makes parallels between the humiliations that the Post-colonial American captives suffered under the rule of the Dey and those to which they had been submitted at the hands of British monarchs before the revolution. Charles Logie, the British Consul of Algiers was seen as one of the avatars of British tyrannical rule. At the capture of the second American ship on the 12<sup>th</sup> of August 1785, the

Dauphin, O'Brien, and a passenger by the name of Coffin were permitted to live in Logie's house to serve as his domestics. For Cathcart, to be reduced to the status of domestics by a person representing the ex-colonial tyrannical power was the worst humiliation or punishment that could ever be imagined. Cathcart tells us that slaves in the Dey's palace were allowed only two days out for recreation during the whole year. During one of these days off, he recounts that he was permitted by the Dey to pay a visit to his fellow American captives in Logie's house. Putting himself in the shoes of the readers, Cathcart writes that one could not refrain from shedding tears out of sympathy to the dismal conditions under which Captain O'Brien, a representative of the American government, was put to work as a domestic servant in Logie's house:

We found Captain O'Brien with a hoe digging a hole to plant a tree in the Consul's garden; Stephens, with the capote given him by the Regency tied round his middle with a straw rope, driving a mule loaded with manure for the root of the tree, and Coffin who was consumptive, feeding hogs and poultry. (Cathcart James Leander, 117)

The quote above establishes a parallel between the tyrannies exerted by the Dey on Cathcart and those to which Captain O'Brien was submitted by Logie a representative figure of a previous tyranny. Tyranny, it must be underlined, was the system against which the American revolutionaries rebelled in the name of denied English rights and liberties. To evoke it in association with the ex-colonial power provides the best means of moving those feelings of sympathy expected of the reader at the misery of a paradoxical reversal of fate.

Imagining or narrating the infant nation by posing a foil for it on Barbary shores involves other manners and customs of Algiers all them described in comparative and contrastive forms. Foss was struck by the cosmopolitan character of Algiers. He observes that the "present inhabitants of the territory of Algiers are composed of many different nations (p.87)" that he classified according to the power that they held and the types of buildings they lived in and the religion that they practiced. For a man belonging to an infant nation proud of its Anglo-Saxon origins, Foss could not see the

cosmopolitanism of the territory of Algiers with a favourable eye. In this territory, Foss remarks that revenue was gathered in the form of forceful tribute paid to the Dey by the Beys, i.e., the governors of the regions. It was at the peril of their life that the governors could refuse to pay the amount of money demanded by the Dey. This manner of collecting revenue contrasts sharply with the civilized manner of gathering revenue provided for by the Constitution.

Foss goes on with this contrastive drawing of the picture of the manners and customs of Algiers by detailing the dress fashion, the marriage conventions, the table manners, and urbanization. As can be expected, he always finds something missing or barbaric in each of these social aspects of life in Algiers. Among the oddities in dress fashion, he refers to children who are “suffered to go naked, ‘till eight or nine years of age”, “to the common sort of people, [who] seldom wear shoes”, and to males who wear “breaches, something like a woman’s petticoat.” (Foss John D, 88-89) In contracting marriage, the man never sees the woman before marriage, but “accepts her upon the description of his father”. Marriage is not a love match but a financial transaction between the husband and the wife’s parents. All of this is far removed from the companionship marriage then prevalent in the United States.

As for the table manners, Foss observes that dishes even in the Dey’s palace were set with “neither plates, knives, or forks [...]. They sit always on the floor, as chairs are entirely among them. The common people only differ from the Dey, by having no table whatever, their dishes being set upon the floor. (p.91)” In other words, the common people had no table manners whatever. They were at degree zero of civilization as it was conceived by Foss. In these observations, one suspects an antithetical self-definition, which it was necessary to read treaties and essays on civility like Erasmus’ *De civilitate morum puerilium* to understand its function as a foil to presumably more



civilized American table manners. Foss's construction of identity passes not only through the description of table manners but also engineering works like the construction of bridges and streets. For Foss though Algiers had several navigable rivers, none of them was managed for that purpose and no bridge worth citing was built over. The streets were too narrow for carriages of any sort, so that slaves were used as beasts of burden instead. For Foss the observed lack of civilized urbanization reflects a lack of urbanity.

In his "The Barbarbarous Voice of Democracy: American Captivity in Barbary and the Multicultural Specter," Jacob Rama Berman has analyzed the American Captivity as a zone of contact that enabled the captives to contest the "racial nationalism of white citizenship claims or the monocultural ethos of 'ruthless democracy' [...]" and to identify with the disfranchised back in the United States. (Berman Jacob Rama, 2007: 2)" Berman's idea that the Barbary shores provided the American captives with what Mikhail Bakhtin calls "the enabling conditions" for the development of a refracted double-voiced democratic discourse is to the point in the light of the textual evidence that could be marshaled in its support. However, Berman has overlooked to pay attention to the New England origins of the American captives who came to make public their captivity, and the way these captive authors looked at both the United States and Algiers through the lenses of the regional culture of New England. Therefore, one would argue that the cultural criticism that the New England Captives leveled against the civilization and manners in Algiers was also applicable to the American South. It is in this sense that one could claim that the discourse on the civilization of manners-versus-barbarity in Foss and Cathcart had a double juxtaposed geographical referent: Algiers and the American South.

In *Creating an American Identity, New England, 1789-1825*, Stephanie Kermes argued that “historians of the early republic still need to define to what extent New Englanders imagined the nation in terms of their own culture” (2008: 3). Having made this assumption, Kermes went on to demonstrate how New Englanders proceeded with the “New Englandization” of the infant nation by substituting the image of their small community for the image of the entire nation. This placement of the image of the entire nation in a regional framework was not effected without economic, political, cultural, and social judgements on other regional and national identities. New England’s Puritan heritage was historically reinvented as a shared American heritage alongside the Revolution. This heritage comprises such republican virtues as the ethic of work, piety, an embryonic form of Manifest Destiny, equality, benevolence, selflessness, and industry. The viability of the infant republic was in the eyes of New Englanders largely dependent on these homegrown virtues. Such a regionally focused construction of national identity was made by juxtaposition with the South and Europe as anti-images or foils, i.e., all that the infant nation should not be imagined as standing for. Kermes further argues that the imagining of the infant American nation in the image of New England did not rely solely on print culture, though it played a substantial role, but also on depictions of New England landscapes and ways of life in “paintings, mourning pictures, boxes, clocks”, (Kermes, 2008: 25) and other household goods.

Foss’s captivity is the one narrative that offers the most pertinent examples of the overlapping descriptions of the Regency of Algiers and the South. Describing the geographical location of the former, he writes that “Algiers is situated between thirty-two and thirty-seven degrees of north latt. (sic) which corresponds to that of the United States, from Virginia to Carolina, inclusive. (Foss John D, 89)” The geographical correspondence between the Regency of Algiers and the two Southern States might at

first sight seem to have been made for purposes of illustration by comparison, but when Foss came to overlay the demographics with the corresponding territories the authorial intention to make Algiers a mirror-image of the American South becomes clear. After having noted the fact that the Cologlies, Moors, and Arabs outnumber the Turkish power holders, and that hybridization makes a great number of Algerine inhabitants unclassifiable, Foss categorizes the rest of the population according to skin pigmentation and physical stature:

The Turks are a well-built robust people, their complexion, not unlike Americans, tho' somewhat larger, but their dress, and long beards, make them more like monsters, than human beings.

The Cologlies are somewhat less in stature than the Turks, and are of a more tawney a complexion.

The Moors, or Morescoes, are generally a tall thin, spare set of people, not much inclining to fat, and of very dark complexion, much like the Indians of North America.

The Arabs, or Arabians, are of a much darker complexion than the Moors, being darker than Mulattoes. They are much less in nature than the Moors, being the smallest people I ever saw, very few arrive at the height of five feet tho' they are generally of a size. [...] They are obliged to be drudges to their superiors, to gain the hard earned morsel on which they subsist. (Foss, John D., 92)

The racially mixed Algerine population and the colour-based social hierarchy thus noted make the connection between the Regency of Algiers and the slave-holding states of Virginia and Carolina much more convincing than the connection of the Regency with America as a whole.

At the level of discourse, the geographical and demographic connection between the Southern States and the Regency of Algiers becomes a subtle entry point for the discussion of the controversial issue of slavery and freedom at home. What the New Englander Foss says about Barbary, its presumably savage customs and manners is thus given an ironical twist in order to apply equally well to the American South. So if the Regency of Algiers is viewed as an industrially backward country inhabited by a lazy people, this is supposed also to be equally true to the American South. Similarly, the despotic regime in Algiers is supposed to be a reflection of the despotic plantation

regimes in the slaveholding states. The daily harrowing experiences that Foss underwent in Algiers under cruel task masters rehearse similar experiences of the black slaves in the American South.

Foss betrays his hatred of slavery no matter the skin pigmentation of the victim comes in a gruesome anecdote about one Scipio Jackson, a black man Foss says, who was a fellow American captive in Algiers. He recounts that this Scipio Jackson fell sick and was taken to hospital belonging to a Spanish charity. Feeling that he had slightly recovered, he walked around his room just to stretch his legs. Unfortunately, his task master came in at just that time and suspected him that he had fully recovered and had been just faking illness in order to get out of doing his chores. Scipio Jackson and the doctors tried unsuccessfully to convince the task master of the contrary, at which he “gave him several strokes with sticking,” before he drove him back to work in the marine. Shortly after having resumed work, Scipio fell down insensible. He was sent back to hospital, but this time he fatally succumbed to the second stroke of his disease.

In recounting this anecdote, Foss underlines his fellow feeling with a man having a different skin pigmentation but with whom he shared a similar experience. One might suspect that Foss staged the death of Scipio Jackson to emphasize that slavery in Algiers was even more cruel than slavery in the American South in order to get them interested in his fate, but it is more likely that this is just another discursive strategy to draw the attention of those readers not yet interested in the controversial issue of slavery at home to get them drawn to its rejection as a cross-racial evil for the new republic. Foss the New Englander is as harsh in his denunciation of slavery as he is celebratory of the infant republic and its virtues. Making his own the rhetoric about the virtues of the republican system of his times, he enthuses over the concern that America had shown towards its captive citizens in Algiers:

This generosity of the United States [the allocation of an amount of money for the captives] to us their enslaved countrymen was of inestimable value. It was more precious from being unexpected. No nation of Christendom had ever done the like for their subjects in our situation.

The Republican government of the United States have set an example of humanity to all the governments of the world. – Our relief was matter of admiration to merciless barbarians. They viewed the character [sic] of Americans from this time in the most exalted light. They exclaimed, that “Though we were slaves, we were gentlemen;” that “the American people must be the best in the world to be so humane and generous to their countrymen in slavery.” (Foss John D., 95)

In Foss’s framed narrative, the “American people refer” first and foremost to the people of New England set as model republicans and true Americans. For Foss the American republic and its association with freedom are antithetical with slavery abroad and at home.

Overall the complaint against slavery in Foss’s and Cathcart’s captivity narratives is a leitmotif. This leitmotif has both a personal and national dimensions because the captivity of Foss and Cathcart also signifies the captivity of a postcolonial infant nation as a whole. It is true that Cathcart celebrates in his own the ingenuity of New England by turning the situation of a postcolonial slavery to his economic advantage, working his way up from the position of slave gardener to that of Christian chief clerk in Algiers. However, he still looks at himself as as a long-forgotten “exile” in Algiers due the eleven years that he spent in slavery. It is significant that he describes the captives as “victims of independence”. Such a post-colonial or early independence disillusionment comes from the realization that the new nation was not strong enough to impose itself in the concert of powerful nations. One can note a difference in degree of the national and individual victimhood in Cathcart’s and Foss’s narratives. This difference is as striking as the difference between the weaknesses of the confederation republic as the strengths of the Constitutional republic that came to replace it.

## Barbary Captivity Narratives as Prisoner-of-War Accounts

However, it has to be noted that in spite of their differences in tone, both Cathcart and Foss narrated their captivity narratives from the position of weakness rather than power. They posed themselves as victims and slaves of a fledgling republic not yet able to fully live up to the Constitutional ideals of the pursuit of happiness and protection of its citizens abroad. This case of posed victimhood shifts in the captivity narratives that came to be written after the Tripolitan Crisis (1801-1805). Two of these captivity accounts, namely *American Captives in Tripoli; or, Dr. Cowdery's Journal in Miniature. Kept during his late captivity in Tripoli* (1806) and William Ray's *Horrors of Slavery, or the American Tars in Tripoli* (1808) are included by Paul Baepler in his anthology. As will be argued below, the difference in the circumstances in which Dr Cowdery and Ray were taken captive in Tripoli and the fact that they belonged to the emergent American navy rather than the merchant navy as was the case with Foss and Cathcart changed considerably the way they recorded their captivity. If the captivity narratives by Foss and Cathcart came to take the contours of slave narratives, Dr Cowdery's and Ray's assumed, notwithstanding the claim of the titles of their narratives, the shape of prisoner-of-war accounts.

Since the Tripoli Wars (1801-1805), according to many scholars of this chapter of American history in Barbary, arose principally from the resolution of the Algerine-American treaty of 1796, a brief summary of the events that led to them is in order. It will help understand how America came to build its navy, and how the subsequent increase in American naval force inflected its foreign policy and the discourse that the American captives held about their conditions in Barbary. As already noted, the Continental Congress unsuccessfully sought to resolve the Barbary States issue at the signature of the 1778 Treaty of Amity between France and the future United States by

inserting a provision that France would provide protection for her merchant shipping in the Mediterranean. The United States tried to insert the same provision in the Paris Treaty of Peace with Britain in 1783, but the prevalence of commercial interests over political considerations made Britain refuse to extend the protection that it had provided for the Thirteen Colonies before the War of Independence.

As the dating of the American captivity narratives show, there were no American vessels seized by the Barbary Corsairs in 1783. The reason is that until 1784, and more precisely until 1785 few, if any, American ships had already resumed trading to the Mediterranean after the devastation of war. As previously mentioned, if American ship owners and merchants had returned to the Mediterranean so soon, it is because for mercantilist reasons their trading with the French and English colonies in the West Indies was shut off for them. To make matters worse, the United States government under the Articles of Confederation had no power to make treaties of commerce with other countries since commerce was under the jurisdiction of each state separately. The consequence is that the American government stood helpless while the domestic market was glutted with all sorts of imported goods from those very countries which forbade the American merchants access to their colonial markets.

So on the whole the American government at the wake of independence stood on its own for the resolution of the issue of Barbary corsair activity that hampered the one trading route that remained open for her in Southern Europe and the Mediterranean. As the Writings of *Thomas Jefferson, Vol. 5* show, the United States had hopes to resolve the problem as early as 1784, i.e., before its merchants had resumed trading in the Mediterranean, by instructing Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson, three among its first diplomatic corps in Europe, to enter into treaty with the Barbary States through the interposition of friendly European nations and at the least expense.

These first hopes remained a pious wish, for soon the looming fear of the seizure of American merchantmen in the Mediterranean became a dark reality. The *Betsy* was captured by the Moroccan corsairs in the same year. The hopes for negotiating treaties with the Barbary States at affordable prices for an impecunious government without a real executive branch returned in 1785 when the Moroccan government, already anxious for entering into diplomatic relations with the new republic, readily accepted to sign a peace treaty through the auspices of the Court of Spain. The irony is that the same country that helped the American government have a treaty of peace with Morocco indirectly contributed through her cessation of hostilities with Algiers to the seizure of two American merchantmen the *Maria* and the *Dauphin*, both from Boston, at six days interval between the 25<sup>th</sup> and the 31<sup>st</sup> of July in 1785.

The treaty with Algiers turned out to be as difficult to negotiate as the one with Morocco was easy to obtain. As Jefferson's writings show, as one strategy after another for the liberation of the captives and the negotiation of an honourable peace treaty was being tested and failed, the dirty game of international politics that obeyed to no other principle than narrow national interests came to the open and the blatant weaknesses of the confederation government was revealed to the dismay of all American citizens, particularly those in captivity in Barbary. More importantly for this research, the crisis showed how foreign policy issues were closely intertwined with the domestic ones. In the hands of Jefferson, John Jay, David Humphreys, and to a lesser extent in those of John Adams it turned into a tool for digging the graveyard of the confederation government by getting the states and their respective citizens to accept a strong central government despite their historical suspicion of such forms of government. In the process of debating over the protracting Algerian crisis, a burgeoning party system constituted of the Federalist and Anti-Federalist or Republican parties emerged into the



public sphere. The fears that a strong government would become tyrannical were diffused through the system of checks and balances consisting of the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the national government on the one hand, and between the states and the nation on the other. Thus reassured, the Constitution was finally ratified in 1788 by all the delegates of the states, but not until an additional security for individual rights and liberties was inserted in the Constitution in the form of ten Amendments, constituting the bill of rights.

The crisis of the Algerine crisis continued even after the installation of the first American government under the Constitution in 1789. In 1788, Jefferson planned to liberate the American captives by asking the French branch of the Trinitarian order, the Mathurins to intercede on their behalf. However, as history would have it, the French Revolution decided otherwise. In 1789 religious orders including the Mathurins, were dissolved in France, and Jefferson, who had been recalled to the United States sometimes earlier in the same year, to hold the position of Secretary of State in Washington's administration, washed helplessly as his plan petered out. As Secretary of State, Jefferson took other initiatives such as the call to rescue addressed to John Paul Jones, the naval hero of the American Revolution, through Thomas Pinckney, the new minister affected to London after John Adams. John Paul Johns died before the arrival of Pickney in London in August 1792, and so he never received Jefferson's instructions to accomplish his diplomatic mission in Algiers. The instructions were tardily forwarded to Thomas Barclay as a replacement to John Paul Johns. However, as misfortunes never come singly, Barclay also died on January 1793 in Lisbon just when he had finished with the arrangements to go to Algiers. Thus was closed the first chapter of the story of the Algerine crisis.

The second chapter in the history of the crisis began 10 months later on 8 October 1793 when Algerine corsairs until then bottled up by the Portuguese in the Mediterranean were allowed, under the terms of one-year Portuguese-Algerine truce, to sally past the Gibraltar Straits into the Atlantic and seize the American ships the *Thomas*, the *Hope*, and *Dispatch*. The spectacle of Americans brought to chained slavery and hard labour in Algiers received another darker shade as other ships came to be captured during the following days of October and November of the same year. The capture of a total of eleven American ships and the enslavement of over one hundred officers and men in Algiers came to occupy the centre stage of American politics as the Federalists and Anti-Federalists or Republicans debated over the necessity to build a navy to ensure national security. The issue was complicated further as Britain was suspected of having masterminded the Algerine-Portuguese truce to harm American commercial interests in the Mediterranean in the same way that it sought to harm its interests in the North West Territory by fomenting Indian attacks. Two alternatives presented themselves to solve the problem. The first one defended mostly by the Francophile Anti-Federalists consisted in negotiating the redemption of the captives and buying a peace treaty with the Barbary States at the least expense and to apply commercial restrictions on the Western powers which did not respect its rights to trade freely with other nations. The second alternative defended mostly by the Anglophile Federalists was geared to the building of a navy to enforce the rule of international law on Barbary States. These alternatives were debated against the background of the deep-seated fear of a standing army in the American subconscious. The latter was allayed by the argument that the navy would serve as a reinforcement of the fortifications of port towns and while guaranteeing homeland security, it would in no way be a threat to the liberties of the Americans living in inland towns.

On the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 1794, Congress passed a law for the construction of a fleet of six warships with a stop clause to the effect that the construction of these ships would be stopped in the case the United States managed to redeem the captives and to sign a peace treaty with Algiers before their completion. However, though the United States government was authorized to build a navy, out of lingering weakness it simultaneously made peace overtures both in the direction of Algiers and Britain to avert a war that would have embroiled it in the conflict between revolutionary France and its ex-mother country, to the detriment of the commercial interests that might be reaped from observing a neutral attitude to the conflict. Indeed, hardly a year passed before the United States government negotiated the Jay Treaty (19 November, 1794) which Congress ratified in (24 June, 1795). As Norton *et all* writes it, under the terms of the Jay Treaty,

Britain did agree to evacuate the Western forts and ease the restrictions on American trade to England and the West Indies. No compensation for lost slaves was agreed to, but Jay accepted a provision establishing an arbitration commission to deal with the matter of prewar debts owed to British creditors. A similar commission was to handle the question of compensation for the seizure of American ships. Under the circumstances, Jay did remarkably well. The treaty averted war with Britain. (Norton, *et all*, 1991: 130)

Similarly, Congress authorized the American government to redeem the American captives in Algiers and to open negotiations for peace. In 1795, through Joseph Donaldson, the American government signed a treaty with Algiers under which terms the United States accepted to pay around \$ 642,500 plus an annual tribute in the form of naval stores in return for the liberation of the American captives and the maintenance of peace between the two countries. Because of the difficulty of the treaty payment of such a large amount of money, and the long distance between the two countries, the treaty took effect only on the 11<sup>th</sup> of July, 1796 when part of the agreed payment was made, and the American slaves, according to Foss, were officially delivered redemption certificates by the Dey.

The terms of the Algerine-American treaty of 1795 had short-term positive consequences but long-term negative consequences. As Foss points out in his captivity, soon after his release from quarantine in Marseilles, he signed as first mate on the very ship that carried them there. The purpose was to sail for Bona in Eastern Algeria, present-day Annaba, to take an authorized load of grain to be sold in Marseilles. One can understand that American commercial activities stood to gain from the treaty. These commercial activities included for the first time in American history the sale of military equipment to a foreign country, then under practically military embargo. In addition to the delivery of the naval stores in payment of treaty obligations, the Dey as Richard B. Parker underlines it, “ordered a brig and a schooner at his own expense. (Parker Richard B, 2004: 124) ” Thus, the naval programme started partly by the Algerine crisis and partly by the conflict with Britain was not completely halted as it was initially stipulated by the Congressional law of March 1794, once peace treaties were signed with Britain and Algiers. For some historians the continuation of the naval programme was essentially accounting for by the fact that the implementation of the stop clause would mean the loss of expenses already engaged in the construction of the programmed six war ships. But this explanation, though containing a lot of economic sense, does not take in consideration the undeclared war with France, known as the Quasi war, provoked by the signature of the Jay Treaty of 1794, which literally violated the terms of the 1778 Treaty of Amity still in effect between France and the United States. So whilst the Quasi war, which continued for nearly six years, from 1794 to 1800, made for the expansion of American military industry, Algiers constituted the first commercial outlet for the exportation of the products of that emerging military and naval industry. However, as already pointed in the long terms, the Algerian treaty contained the germs of future conflict with the Barbary States. In the first place, the United States acceptance

to pay a quite substantial annual tribute, to proffer consular presents at the accreditation of new consuls, as well as the installation of the ex-slave O'Brien as General Consul in 1798, for his acquired field expertise with the customs and manners in the Barbary, put the United States in the rank of those less prestigious Western nations that could be commanded at will. For Algiers, the United States continued to be a subordinate nation, whose citizens could be made slaves in the case of breach of treaty. Thus in 1800, in the wake of the quasi war with France, the United States government ordered for the first time in American naval history the jewel of its naval industry, the *George Washington*, put under the command of Captain Bainbridge, to enter the Mediterranean. This maiden voyage to the Mediterranean turned out into a national humiliation for the American government, for as soon as the *Washington* was stationed in Algiers harbour under the guns of the marine, it was requisitioned by the Dey Mustapha to transport under the Algerine flag an "impressive tribute, including a hundred slaves and various livestock and zoo animals, to the Ottoman sultan, whom he had angered by concluding peace with France while Napoleon occupied Egypt. ( Parker Richard B., 2004: 126)" With no chance to escape safe and sound from the Algiers harbour, and with the fear of repeating the traumatic experience of 1785- 1795 captivity, the Consul General O'Brien and Captain Bainbridge had no other viable choice but to swallow their national pride and comply with the Dey's orders. So symbolically at least, one can say that the Americans entered the capital of the Ottoman Empire as captives of Algiers.

The Algerine-American treaty of 1795 had long-term negative consequences in another respect than the servile treatment of American nationals that it continued to inspire to the Dey of Algiers in 1800. Its terms and secret clauses laid the ground of future conflict with Tripoli and to a lesser extent with Tunis. As Baepler puts it in his preface to Jonathan Cowdery's captivity narrative:

As part of the 1796 peace accord, the Algerian Dey agreed not to disclose the high price he had won from the Americans so that U.S. diplomats could negotiate comparatively inexpensive treaties with Tunis (\$107,000) and Tripoli (\$ 56,486). Eventually, however, this strategy backfired. The bashaw of Tripoli grew increasingly angry over the discrepancies and delays in tribute, and on May 14, 1801, he had the American flagstaff chopped down, officially declaring war on the United States (the Tripolitan War of 1801-05). (Baepler Paul, 1999: 159)

According to Parker, Yucef Karamanli the Bashaw of Tripoli had two additional grievances against the treaty of peace that he signed with the Americans in 1796. The first relates to the fact that the U.S. government did not keep an alleged promise of the delivery of a ship, the *Sophia*, in addition to treaty money payment, that O'Brien would have made to the Bashaw during the negotiations of the treaty. The other grievance relates to the wording of articles 1 and 12 of the treaty through which Algiers acknowledges her obligation to guarantee the preservation of the terms of the treaty with Tripoli and to assist in the resolution of conflicts that might eventually arise with it. What whipped up the anger of Yusuf Karamanli is the fact that these articles practically put Tripoli under the guardianship of Algiers.

In February 1801, Karamanli could no longer nurse his grievance against the United States, so he demanded that new negotiations for a new treaty that he suggested to contract at the payment of the much more substantial sum of \$250,000 in addition to an annual tribute of \$20,000. (Parker Richard B, 2004: 135) The least that can be said about Karamanli's excessive demand is that it was untimely. By the time he made his demand in February 1801, the presidential election in the United States had returned into office Thomas Jefferson, who had always favoured the use of armed force in his dealing with what he regarded as "delinquent" nations. In his July 11, 1786 correspondence to John Adams, he marshaled six major arguments in obtaining peace by war rather by treaty payment and tribute. These arguments run as follows:

Justice is in favor of this opinion. 2. Honor favors it. 3. It will procure us respect in Europe; and respect is a safeguard to interest. 4. It will arm the federal head with the safest of all the instruments of coercion over its delinquent members, and prevent it from

using what would be less safe. I think so far, you go with me. But in the next steps, we shall differ. 5. I think it least expensive. 6. Equally effectual. (Thomas Jefferson, 1904: 127-28)

As soon as he took office, Jefferson put in application this long-held view about the right way to obtain peace with the Barbary States by sending a squadron of “three frigates – the *President*, the *Essex*, and the *Philadelphia*, a schooner, the *Enterprise*, under Captain Richard Dale as commodore. (Parker, 2004: 135)” By the time, this squadron had arrived in Tripoli in July 24, 1801 Karamanli had already declared war against the United States. Over the next four years, the military confrontation grew from embargo to short naval engagements and heavy bombardment by the U.S navy on Tripoli. The climax of the war was reached with the foundering of the *Philadelphia* on an uncharted reef in the harbour of Tripoli on 31 October, 1803, and the decision of its captain Bainbridge to surrender the ship and its crew of 306 officers and mariners. The United States was on its way to relive what it feared most, the capture of its citizens in Barbary and the repetition of the Algerine crisis.

However, neither the circumstances nor the actors involved in the Tripolitanian captivity were exactly the same as those of Algiers. The change in the circumstances is signaled by the use of what in American history would later be called gunboat diplomacy instead of the very timid or timorous diplomacy deployed in Algiers in order to release, not helpless civilians as was the case in the Algerian crisis, but military prisoners. The change can also been in the deployment of military force in combination with this gunboat diplomacy. Whilst the American navy was bombarding Tripoli, William Eaton led a shock group of armed men across the Western desert from Alexandria to Derna to topple down Yusuf and put in his place his exiled brother Ahmad. The Eaton military campaign also provides the first case of the U.S. government intermeddling in the domestic affairs of other countries to further its national interests. As Parker remarks, the United States navy in combination with a

land-based military campaign for a change of regime amenable to the interests of the United States were not “able to force Yusuf to sue for peace” (2004: 145), but it certainly influenced him to be more reasonable in his demands when he was forcefully brought to the table of negotiations on the 4<sup>th</sup> of June, 1805. Karamanli settled for the modicum sum of \$ 60,000 instead of the one million six hundred thousand dollars that he had demanded at the capture of the *Philadelphia* two years earlier.

The Tripolitan War brought out a radical change of mood in the reporting of events from Barbary. For one thing, the Americans did not sue for peace as was the case in Algiers, but they practically dictated its terms at gun points. The independent nation was finally spared the disgraceful tribute payment, and the treatment of American captives as POWs, that is prisoners of war rather than slaves. Much more importantly, the Tripolitan War, the first American War in foreign territories produced heroes such as the naval hero Decatur, who in a daredevil night cover action blew up the *Philadelphia* in the Tripoli harbour, and Eaton who crossed the desert with his shock group of armed man for hundreds of mile to corner the Bashaw of Tripoli in Derna. His exploit in the “shores of Tripoli” is today celebrated in the Marines’ Hymn.

This heroic mood of a battling nation reverberates in Dr. Cowdery’s narrative of captivity written in 1806, just one year after his release. The least that can be said is that Cowdery’s captivity does not keep all the promises that it makes to the reader in the editor’s announcement of its forthcoming publication. Among other things, the editor promises the usual fare for entertainment and instruction tagged to Barbary captivities such Foss’s and Cathcart’s accounts, i.e., a geographical account of Tripoli, the customs and manners of its inhabitants, its curiosities, in addition to an appendix including the treaties and a history of the United States in Barbary. However, when Dr. Cowdery’s account came out in the Belcher and Armstong’s edition of 1806, the editor fell short on



all his publicity promises under the pretext that the “Particulars of the unfortunate capture of the *Philadelphia* frigate, by the Tripolitans, have already been before the public. (Editor in Cowdery, Jonathan, 161” The reader will have to content himself/herself with selected day-to-day entries of Cowdery’s war-time journal and a mere one page of “further Particulars” attached at the end of the journal, treating of the Roman and Greek antiquities in Tripoli, the marriage customs of its inhabitants and the “principal articles faith” of Islam.

It follows that Cowdery’s journal contains no postcolonial orientalist tableau of the kind one finds in Foss’s and Cathcart’s accounts. First-person narration in the past of the hero’s experience prevails over mere orientalist description. Meant to provide first and foremost an inside view of the Tripolitan War, from an actor who had experienced it from the Tripolitan side necessarily implies a reshuffling of the conventions of the captivity narrative. The agency regained by the nation as a whole through the waging of a naval war reflects on its major official actors, among which figures Dr. Jonathan Cowdery. The one change in the conventions of the captivity narrative concerns the degree of violence at the first contact with the Tripolitans. In reporting this episode, Cowdery does not indulge on the violence on his person as his predecessors Foss and Cathcart did. The focus is put instead on the attempt by the Tripolitan chiefs who “collected their favourites, and with drawn sabres, fell to cutting and slashing their own men, who were stripping the Americans and plundering the ship [the foundered *Philadelphia*]. (Cowdery Jonathan, 161)” Not only did he keep his clothes on, but he was also helped by a Turkish officer on board a vessel reserved for the American officers to be brought safe and sound to the shore. Moreover, unlike Foss and Cathcart who showed themselves as panicked helpless victims, Cathcart was up to the standards of manhood demanded by the circumstances of war and his social rank. He did not

depend entirely on the protection of Turkish officers for the keeping of his clothes. For the records, he notes that before he joined the boat reserved for American officers, he “met a little fellow, who seized me, and attempted to take off my coat; but I hurled him into the bottom of the boat, and jumped into the one which was waiting, among my fellow officers, where I thought the Turks more civil. (Ibid., 162)”

When Dr. Cowdery and his fellow officers came ashore, they were not shamefully paraded in public but were conducted directly by the guard of the palace to be presented before the Bashaw. The formal introduction being made, they were led to another room where they were served dinner in a European style. Cowdery confirms his heroic stature in recounting how he became a de facto intermediary between the Bashaw and William Bainbridge the captain of the *Philadelphia*. After dinner, Captain Bainbridge fearing that Dr. Cowdery’s fellow surgeon Dr. Harwood was killed, asked him to check with the Bashaw. He found him in the company of the carpenter before the Bashaw “stripped off of everything but their shirts and trousers. (Ibid., 163)”. The implication is that Dr. Harwood was neither lucky nor heroic in his self-defense, since unlike Cowdery he fell in with less civil Turks, who after have divested him of his clothes throw him overboard to drown or swim for his life. He was lucky enough, because after recounting his story, the Bashaw’s servant gave him dry clothes for a second official presentation of the captives before the Bashaw.

As can be gathered, the captured officers were not treated in the same manner as Foss and Cathcart. They were not obliged to put on Turkish clothes, so they did not experience the emasculating indignity of wearing another racial and gender identity. As prisoners of war with recognized official rank they were received as very special guests by the Bashaw. Cowdery’s representation of the latter also knew a similar upgrading in

comparison with the paltry figure that the Dey of Algiers in Cathcart's and Foss's accounts. Cowdery tells us that in their formal presentation, the Bashaw was

seated on his little throne, which was decorated in the Turkish order, and made a handsome appearance. He is a good looking man, aged about 35. He counted us, viewed us with a smile, and appeared highly pleased with us. – We were then conducted by the Minister of exterior relations and a guard, to the house formerly occupied by the American consul – a very good house, with a large court, and roomy enough for our convenience. (Cowdery, 162)

It follows that the American captives were received as respectable representatives of their country. The respect shown to the captured American officers was no doubt due to the Bashaw's commitment to the principle of reciprocity in the treatment of the prisoners of war. All through the account the Bashaw was reported as being very mindful of the way the Tripolitan prisoners in the hands of American were treated and sought to reciprocate the treatment of American prisoners, most notably the officers, accordingly. The Bashaw seems to have understood this principle of reciprocity so well that even the common American seamen captives received redress for the cruel treatment meted out by at taskmasters through a petition to him in this regard. If the Bashaw cuts a fine figure in Cowdery's account, it is also due to the rhetoric of heroism that marked the reporting of the Tripolitan War. A ridiculous figure as military adversary would have diminished considerably the American exploit in Tripoli. American history records the Tripolitan campaign as the first victory of the American marines abroad, so it is necessary to create an enemy commensurate with the American armed forces to make that victory worth an object of both celebration and remembrance. Apart from the upgrading of the representation of the Bashaw in Cowdery's captivity, one has to note the de-emphasis of the theme of suffering by contrast with the Algerine captivities. One would argue that this de-emphasis is an offshoot in the shift of the representation of captivity from the sensational and sentimental to observation. Lawrence Peskin is to the point when he claims that American author-captives in the

wake of the Tripolitan War did not seek to “forge emotional contacts with their readers (Peskin Lawrence A., 2009: 179)”. However, in accounting for this paradigm shift, he contents himself with the invocation of the gradual empowerment of the nation since the Algerine crisis. One cannot but agree with this relation between representation and national power, but the explanation cannot be limited to military might alone. Suffering in Algiers captivity narratives, especially in that of Foss, has much to do with corporal punishment. To use Mary Louise Pratt’s words about Peter Kolb in another context, “readers of Michel Foucault’s study of corporal punishment [...] will recognize here the sensuous, sensationalist discourse of torture that predated the coalescence in Europe of institutional forms of social control such as prisons, clinics, and schools. (Pratt Mary Louise, 2006: 48)”

It is arguably important to point to the position of physician from which Dr. Cowdery recounts his captivity. It is as a doctor with recognized skills that he imposes himself on the Tripolitan elite, the indigenous population, as well as the American fellow captives, both ordinary sea men and officers. One witnesses here the extension of Western domestic institutional forms of social control to foreign territories such as Tripoli. Dr. Cowdery self-consciously registers how he was gradually empowered by his social entourage and regained free movement. For example, he tells us that as a reward for curing the Bashaw’s deadly sick child, the latter “offered me a horse and servant to go to his gardens, about two miles from town.” He preferred instead to walk there in the company of his “drogerman”. He further recounts that after passing by a cemetery,

I came into a well cultivated country which was laid out in squares from one to six or eight acres, each surrounded with date trees, interspersed with orange, fig, olive, lemon and other trees. On coming to admiral Lysle’s garden we found him there, and he invited me in. It was very beautiful. He loaded us with its fruits, and offered me access to wherever I chose, and said I was welcome to anything growing in it. I concluded to postpone going to the Bashaw’s garden until another day. (Dr. Cowdery Jonathan, 166)

Here is a representation of what Spratt calls the “anti-conquest hero”. By anti-conquest, Spratt refers to the “strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony. (Pratt Mary Louise, 2006: 7”. Its major figure is what she calls the anti-conquest hero or the “all-seeing man [...] he whose imperial eyes passively look out and possess. (Ibid.)”

What is important to note in the case of Dr. Cowdery is that it is medicine which opens up for him the hidden country of Tripoli which until then had been closed to Western eyes, except to those of renegades like the Scottish-born admiral Peter Lysle.

Thus, would one would argue that Dr. Cowdery inaugurates the imperial discourse that would be consolidated later in Shaler’s *Sketches of Algiers*. His vision is no longer predominantly that of a postcolonial writing back to the empire as was the case with Foss and Cathcart but of a self-appointed agent opening new perspectives for his country to participate in the imperial Western game. It is important in this regard to set Dr. Cowdery’s account within the historical context of Jefferson’s Louisiana Purchase from Napoleon in 1803, and his secret appointment in the same year of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark for the exploration of Western routes to the Pacific Ocean through the Missouri and Columbia rivers. From 1804 to 1806, whilst Cowdery was entering his visits to the hidden gardens of Tripoli in his journal, Lewis and Clark were heading to the West “the nearly fifty-strong ‘Corps of Discovery,’ which was aided by trappers and American Indians along the way. (Norton Mary Beth, et.al., 1991: 144”

Always during Dr.Cowdery’s captivity, and following the lead of Lewis and Clark, Lieutenant Zebulon Pike for two years between 1805 and 1806 led a group of explorers in search of the source of Mississippi river to reach the Rocky Mountains. What these explorations into the American West by Lewis and Clark, and Lieutenant Pike on the

one hand, and those of Dr. Cowdery into the outskirts of Tripoli on the other hand had in common was commercial development.

It follows that Cowdery's captivity journal could be placed partly in the nascent American exploration literature of his time. From this perspective, what Pratt says about the "imperial eyes" in this type of literature can also be applied to those of Dr. Cowdery in his account of captivity. The critical claim that Spratt makes about John Barrow's *Travels into the Interior of South Africa in the Years 1797 and 1798* in the extensive quote that follows can be easily widened to Cowdery's description of the interior of Tripoli:

In Barrow's account, more so than in those of his predecessors, the eyes scanning prospects in the spatial sense knows itself to be looking at prospects in the temporal sense – possibilities of a Eurocentric future coded as resources to be developed, surpluses to be traded, towns to be built. Such prospects are what make information relevant in a description. [...] The descriptions presuppose – naturalize- a transformative project embodied in the Europeans. (Spratt, 61)

Cowdery's captivity is equally prospective. The changing face of the interior of Tripoli that it offers to the reader points to the possibility of a prospective trade between the United States and Tripoli once hostilities would cease. The vision of gardens or orchards of fig trees, pomegranates, dates, oranges, apricots, lemons, squash, cucumbers and other such vegetables and fruits contrasts sharply with the miserable view that Foss had elaborated about the state of agriculture in the interior of Algiers nearly a decade earlier. Obviously, the inhabitants of Barbary of Cowdery's time were not as ignorant and lazy as Foss had made look like. On the contrary, the developed state of their agriculture re-imagines them as industrious as the Jeffersonian ideal man, the yeoman, and this wealthy Barbary country as a potential market for American commodities once the war was over.

Dr Cowdery's emphasis on the prosperity Tripolitan agriculture and gardens might be due, as Peskin argues, to the "fears that American farmers in the early nineteenth

century were abusing the land by using outdated practices. (Peskin Lawrence A, 2009: 179)” For Peskin, such a proto-ecological concern had generated a scientific agricultural movement wherein gentlemen “joined together in agricultural societies to spread information and technology that they would convince common farmers to save their fields by adopting a more scientific approach to their work. (Ibid)” The suggestion here is that Cowdery was one such gentleman farmer, whose focus on the prosperous agriculture of Tripoli could be accounted for by the inspiration that Cowdery thought American farmers could draw from such an agricultural model.

While one would agree partly with Peskin’s argument, one has also to put a small caveat in this regard. Cowdery, we would argue, could not just be a gentleman farmer with concern for the abuse of agricultural land by farmers who used outdated techniques of production. He has also to situate him in the broader context of what Pratt calls the bourgeois systematizing- of-nature movement whose source of inspiration was retraced to Linné’s *Systema Naturae* (*The System of Nature*, 1735).” One of Pratt’s contentions is that the mapping or systematization of nature was driven by a “planetary consciousness” with both global and local impact. At the same as many naturalists were elaborating their systems of nature beyond the borders of Europe, some of their fellows were busy doing the same projects at home in the countryside. Urban bourgeoisie that capitalized on the scientific knowledge thus gathered about the systems of nature “began to intervene on a new scale in agricultural production, seeking to rationalize production, increase surpluses, intensify exploitation of peasant labor, and administer the food production on which the urban centers depended. (Ibid.)” The colonial discourse and urban discourse built on a recuperated science discourse about nature systems overlap. This discursive overlapping accounts for the fact that in the eyes of

European urban bourgeoisie “subsistence societies of any kind appeared backward with respect to surplus-oriented modes, and as in need of ‘improvement’. (Ibid.)”

Evidence in Cowdery’s captivity journal supports the above argument as to his characterization as an amateur naturalist. For example, in the entry for December 8, 1804, he registers that he “received several natural curiosities of Tripoli from Mr. Nissen,” the Danish consul acting by proxy for the United States government after the departure of the American consul, James Leander Cathcart, just a few months after the start of the Tripoli crisis. (Dr. Cowdery Jonathan, 165) It follows that Cowdery was a naturalist-collector, at least, by hobby. His admiration for the Tripoli gardens can be compared to the admiration that Western naturalists of his kind had in botanical gardens which as, Spratt puts it, “began springing up in cities and private estates all over the content [Europe] (Spratt, 27) ” following the dissemination of Linné’s idea of the “botanical republic”. One would further argue that Linné’s promotion of the idea of a botanical republic had a better implementation in New England where a “middle landscape between landscape and civilization and wilderness” came to be idealized in sharp contrast with an “unnatural and overcivilized Europe. (Kearns Stephanie Kermes, 2008: 25) ” Unsurprisingly, as the extensive quote below show, the captive-naturalist cannot resist making comparison between the landscapes that offered themselves to his eyes in Tripoli with those that he had left behind him in New England:

A party of us, under escort of four Turks, walked to the desert about four miles from our prison. We ascended a large bank of sand, where we had an extensive view of the country. The deserts have a singular and grand appearance. [...] The sand is in heaps, like snow drifts in our country. There was not a house nor any other object to be seen. [...] On our return we visited several gardens, where we got oranges, lemons, apricots, and a variety of flowers. We were treated with sap of the date tree, which tasted much like mead. (Dr. Cowdery, 169)

As suggested earlier, the naturalist perspective from which Dr. Cowdery recounts his captivity is not ideologically innocent. His image of Tripoli as some sorts of botanical republic was in concordance with the commercial interests of his country. In the light of



the 1803 Congressional decision to abolish slave trade by 1807 and the suppression of the reference to slaves in the Tripoli-American treaty of 1805, one could claim that Cowdery's natural history of Tripoli bodes well for another legitimate form of trade with (North) Africa in general, and with Tripoli in particular. One has to observe that Cowdery was not the sole American observer to bring out a shift in the representation of Barbary. As Peskins contends Tobias Lear, the American consul in Algiers, follows Cowdery's lead in his praise of North African agriculture by noting among other positive things in his natural history that "fruits of the tropical and temperate climate [are] abundant and very fine[and] the grapes exceeded by none in the world. (Tobias Lear, Qted by Peskin, 178) "

Dr Cowdery does not content himself with the promotion of Tripoli as a botanical garden, he also shows the Bashaw in a much better light than Foss and Cathcart did that of the Dey in Algiers. All through his text, the Bashaw appears as a sympathetic figure, and is on the whole true to his function as a dignitary figure. For example, he renders justice regardless of religious considerations. A Turk who killed an English man by the name of Mr Church on behalf of a Spanish carpenter's wife was tricked out of a marabout tomb where he had taken asylum to escape justice, and brought out to the castle in chains. Cowdery continues the narrative by saying that "the next day the Bashaw called his divan, when it was decided that the prisoner was guilty of willful murder, and ought to suffer death. (Cowdery, 174)" During the trial of this case, it is found out that "Mr Church had pressed the Spanish carpenter for payment; and that the carpenter's wife hired the Turk to kill Mr. Church for forty dollars. The villain took his watch from his pocket after he had shot him. (Ibid)" What is important to note here is that the Bashaw did not comply with the Islamic law as it was then practiced in Tripoli.

Even Turks were brought to justice, which is another way for Dr. Cowdery to affirm that Tripoli was a safe place for American business.

The Bashaw distinguishes himself on many other occasions, and always in relation to the religious order of the Marabout that had a lot sway on the minds of the people in Tripoli. Dr. Cowdery recounts that on Sept 9, 1804, the Bashaw took him on a visit to the country in order to cure an itinerant old marabout in whose prophecies he had great faith. Among other things, he predicted that the “Constitution [one of the warships blockading Tripoli] would never return to America; that she would either be blown up, or run on shore [...]. (Cowdery, 176)” The approach to his holiness seated on a mat in the shade a mulberry tree was very ceremonious. According to Cowdery, the Bashaw ran to him, kneeled before him and kissed his extended hand. One by one the Bashaw’s horsemen followed his lead in doing homage to the Marabout. After being he and his horsemen had seated in a circle on the marabout’s mat, the Bashaw ordered Dr. Cowdery was “called and ordered to take off his shoes and feel the Marabewt’s pulse. (Ibid.)” However, he had hardly started to feel his pulse, and make the prescription when the Marabout “put his hand against me, and gave me to understand that I must go off the holy ground. (Ibid)” As a reward for his prescription of a bleeding, the Marabout “shook his head and gave me to understand that he wanted nothing of the *kelp* (the dog) (Ibid.)”.

Dr. Cowdery could have ended the above entry at the point when the Bashaw ceremoniously took his leave of the revered Bashaw. However, he went further to illustrate the distinction between the members of religious order of the Marabouts and the Bashaw by reporting the latter’s disapproval with the former’s fanaticism. He tells the reader that the “Bashaw apologized for the impoliteness of the Marabout, and said that they had a foolish antipathy to all but Mahometans. (Cowdery, 177)” The

suggestion here is that the Bashaw had the necessary civilized manners that allow him to communicate across the religious divide. Religious bigotry had not the same hold on him as on his subjects. While, for example, he is said that he condescendingly and comically wore amulets to protect himself against the bombs and shells falling on Tripoli, he also took the additional measure of building a bomb proof room in the castle to which he fearfully withdrew at each bombardment of the city. On the whole, as reported by Dr. Cowdery, the Bashaw did not show as a gratuitous tyrant, or as a religious bigot, but something of an enlightened man capable of weaving ties of cross-cultural friendship. At the peak of crisis, when he threatened of executing all the prisoners, he had the moral force of patting Dr. Cowdery's shoulders reassuringly and comforting him by saying that he would spare his life for the sake of having saved his child.

To sum up, what remains after all the criticism that Dr. Cowdery launches against his captors is the fellowship or fellow feeling that he came to develop with the Bashaw. This fellow feeling is underpinned by what one might call a cross-cultural elitism. One would argue that this cross-cultural elitism accounts for a large measure to the positive picture that Dr. Cowdery gives of Tripoli and the Bashaw. It is primarily motivated by prospects of commerce after the war. Once the Bashaw was made to toe the line, he could serve as a potential ally for the promotion of American interests in Barbary. One could also contend that the emphasis on the Tripolitan elite in Dr. Cowdery's account betrays his Federalist ideological conviction as to the "need for national leadership by a disinterested elite. (Norton et al, 1991: 120)" Dr. Cowdery seems to make a case for the implementation of this Federalist political conviction at an international level by recruiting the Tripolitan elite in the person of the Bashaw.

This cross-cultural elitism outraged Dr. Cowdery's fellow American captive William Ray. William Ray published his captivity entitled *Horrors of Slavery, or the American Tars in Tripoli* in 1808, that is to say two years after the publication of Dr. Cowdery's account, *American Captives in Tripoli; or, Dr. Cowdery's Journal in Miniature...* . As can be noted, the two accounts make it clear that these two captivities were written from strikingly different class perspectives, that of a physician and that of a tar, an ordinary seaman. On reading Ray's captivity, one immediately becomes aware that it was written principally as a corrective response to Dr. Cowdery's. In chapter VIII of the narrative, "Remarks on Dr. Cowdery's journal" laughably dismisses the inaccuracies of his fellow captive's account, denouncing his false heroism, his supercilious neglect of the poor American prisoners, the unfair class-based differences in treatment of the tars by the military hierarchy, and the sufferings that the ordinary seamen experienced at the hands of the Tripolitan captors. In short in writing his captivity, Ray meant it as an overt polemic against Dr. Cowdery, and in so doing respected the conventions of captivity narratives that the latter had breached in his defence of a cross-cultural elitism.

Going over the episode of the capture of the *Philadelphia*, Ray says that the Tripolitan chiefs and their favourites did not protect the captives from the own men as affirmed by Cowdery. Accusing him of exaggerating the facts, Ray writes that "It is true there was a sort of mutiny and clashing of arms amongst them; but for my part I never saw any hands amputated, nor do I believe there were any lives lost. (Ray, 188)" He also sets the record straight by denying that under the circumstances Dr. Cowdery could challenge single handedly the "horrific brigands" to save his belongings. Irony turns into ad hominem attack as in the following quote: "And when the Doctor mentions 'hurling the little fellow,' the reader, not acquainted with the person of the said Doctor would really suppose him to be a mammoth of a man – quite the reverse. (Ray, 188)"

He ends his polemics by reminding the reader of the elite perspective from which Dr. Cowdery had recorded the hospitality that the Bashaw extended to the officers:

Although the Doctor here makes no discrimination between men and officers, it must not be understood that he includes the former when he says *we*, excepting the servants – no, no, it was only the officers who were treated to a supper, and lodged in this comfortable mansion, and had the mats to sleep on. You will, therefore, please remember, that when the Doctor says *we*, it is very the same as if he had said, *we the officers only*; for he does not think proper to descend to the task of relating how the crew were provided for, or whether they were half alive or all dead. (Ray, 189)

Status and rank determined the difference in the treatment of the captives and the way American captivity was narrated. Once the records were set straight, Ray went on to recount the suffering of the crew from the perspective of one of its members. The captives were huddled into boats after being stripped of all their clothes. Near the shore, they were thrown overboard into cold foaming waves to swim or sink. At their arrival on shore, they were met by a row of armed men, and immediately ran the gauntlet by passing along the castle gate, ascending a “winding, narrow, dismal passage, which led into a paved avenue, lined with terrific janizaries, armed with glittering sabres, muskets, pistols and tommahawks [sic]. Several of them spit on us as we passed. (Ray, 190)” This is far removed from the courteous manner with which the Bashaw had previously received the American officers. In the eyes of Ray, the Bashaw was not the same dignified figure that Dr. Cowdery describes in his account. For him, “he made a very splendid and tawdry appearance. (Ray, 190)” The walls of his palace are “too finical to be called elegant. (Ibid.)” Ray castigates him further by noting the following:

When he had satiated his pride and curiosity by gazing on us with complacent triumph, we were ordered to follow a guard. They conducted us into a dreary, filthy apartment of the castle, where there was scarcely room for us to turn round. Here we remained an hour or two dripping and shivering with the chills of the damp cells, and the vapors of the night. (Ibid.)

The Bashaw appears, in the light of the two contrastive captivity accounts, to be motivated in his behaviour towards the captives by considerations of status and rank. There is some sort of cross-cultural operation of power that makes him much more

courteous in his manners when he meets with captives of the same social rank than those who belong to another social category. This class complicity accounts for Ray's suggested comparison of the Bashaw with an Indian chief at the beck and call of an "old sorceress [...] with a complexion of a squaw, bent with age, ugly by nature, and rendered frightfully by art. (Ray, 190)" Obviously, the Bashaw is not the human, sympathetic figure that Dr. Cowdery had painted for the reader, but an irredeemable tyrant who reveled in the cruelty that he exerted over the captives and his subjects.

How one could account for this difference in Ray's and Dr. Cowdery's representations of the Bashaw and his Tripoli? As already argued, Dr. Cowdery's positive depiction of the Bashaw had something with the transfer of his Federalist political conviction of the role of elite to another political setting. One would argue that in Ray's case the despicable picture that Ray drew of the Bashaw was influenced by the Republican or Anti-Federalist suspicion of power under whatever form it disguises itself. Right from the start of his narrative, proclaims himself a disciple of the "peerless Jefferson". In doing so, one could say that he subscribes to the Anti-Federalist or Republican political agenda. In this regard, one ought to refer to the fact that it is the Anti-Federalist who militated for the inclusion of a bill of rights as a condition for the ratification of the Constitution. The bill of rights lists the rights that should be protected, such as the freedom of speech, freedom of the press and religion, the right of trial by jury, and guarantees against unreasonable search warrants. These rights and liberties knew a severe curtailment in the three presidential Federalist terms, two by Georges Washington and one by John Adams. In the spring of 1798, following the Citizen Genêt and XYZ affair that nearly triggered a war against, the Federalist-controlled Congress took the opportunity of prevalent anti-French feelings to pass a set of four laws known as the Alien and Sedition Acts, in a political move to suppress dissent and prevent the

further growth of the French-prone Anti-Federalist or republican opponents. In this regard, Mary Beth Norton *et al.* write that

Americans sympathetic to France formed more than forty of these Democratic-Republican societies between 1793 and 1800. Their members saw themselves as heirs of the Sons of Liberty, seeking the same goal as their predecessors: protection of the people's liberties against encroachment by corrupt and evil rulers. To that end, they publicly protested government policies and warned the people against impending tyranny. Like the Sons of Liberty, the Democratic-Republican societies were composed chiefly of artisans and craftsmen of various kinds, although professionals, farmers, and farmers also joined. (130)

It is thanks to these Democratic-Republican societies that Jefferson was elected to the presidency in 1799 and 1804. Among his first political decisions figure the repeal of the liberty-curtailling laws (e.g., Alien and Sedition Acts and the Judiciary Act) and the reduction of the size and cost of central government. Most importantly, the elections of 1799 and 1804 revealed a striking difference in the way the Federalists and Anti-Federalists conceived of political power and its exercise. In these two elections, the Democratic-Republic societies resorted to popular campaigns to have Jefferson elected to the Presidency. Holding up to a classical elite theory or model of power, the Federalists dismissed popular participation in the political activity as unnatural. For them states are necessarily governed by an elite or conflicting elites, that is to say those people whose education, wealth or experience have marked them off as natural leaders. Consequently, to campaign for the vote of their social inferiors – judged as essentially uninterested in politics – in the manner that the Republicans or Anti-Federalists had proceeded would be undignified and contrary to the natural order of things.

Subsequently, younger Federalists tried to imitate the Anti-Federalists in campaigning for the popular vote, but the persistent opposition of the old guard to blatant campaigning caused their defeat in several presidential elections in a row. The ascendancy of the Republicans in the first decades of the nineteenth-century established what historians such as Mary Beth Norton *et al.* would call the “Empire of Liberty”. It is

to this Republican or Anti- Federalist Empire of Liberty that Ray subscribes in his unmasking of the many faces of arbitrary power. One ought to note here that before the denunciation of the tyrannical power of the Bashaw in the seventh chapter of his captivity, Ray targets turn by turn black slavery, imprisonment for debts, slavery to fashion and passion, impressment of ordinary seamen, parental oppression, and the tyrannical rule exercised over the “tars” by naval officers. Hence, Ray does not hesitate to interpellate the Southern Republicans or Anti-Federalists for their disavowal of the ideals of freedom by denying them the claim of being Republicans: “Are you republicans? – Away!/ ’Tis blasphemy the word to say- / You talk of freedom? Out, for shame! Your lips contaminate the name. (Ray, Exordium)”

Abiding by the Jeffersonian or Republican ideal of frugality, Ray denounced the policy of encouraging and promoting uncontrolled consumerism which put people of modest means like him under the “tyranny of passion and versatility of fashions”. Debt-ridden, Ray also decried unjust laws leaving unfortunate people unprotected from their “creditors’ voracious jaws”. For him, it was a scandal that a change of fortune made him enlist in the marines to escape imprisonment in a country that proclaimed itself as an Empire of Liberty; and that at the moment that he stepped into the *Philadelphia* on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July “the glorious anniversary of American independence” in 1803 en route to the Barbary shores to defend American freedom, he ironically realized that the ship that carried the name of the capital of the nation was just another place of confinement ruled by officers as well as tyrannical midshipmen that he dismisses as “puny brats of despotism” (Ibid). Ray put on the same footing the tyranny exercised over the “patriotic tars” by the officers in American naval vessels and the tyranny of the bashow. After recounting how one of these “tars” was soundly whipped by a deck officer shortly after



his release from captivity in Tripoli for having besmirched the deck with his dirty feet, he expressed his outrage at such a gratuitous and blatant abuse of power:

That a man, but just escaped from the sanguinary clutches of Tripolitan barbarians, weak, pallid, and broken with toil, chains, and hunger, should soon be treated worse than by those savages [...] was enough to awaken the spirit of indignation in the bosom of a sainted anchorite.

Ray's outrage in the above quote is followed up by a rhetorical question, implicitly putting side by side the abusive distortion of rational-legal authority by the deck officer who had allegedly enlisted in the American navy just in order to escape justice for a murder he had committed in the US and the traditional authority of the bashaw: "Are the officers of our navy legally invested with such absolute power? – or is such power as unlawfully assumed just as it is arbitrarily exercised." The implication is that unless the exercise of power in the American navy was hedged by law, it would defeat the very ideals of liberty and civilization in the name of which it had waged the war against Tripoli. In the final analysis, one would argue that Ray's obsessive concern with the issue of liberty at home and abroad on Barbary shores makes him look like a "liberty's captive" (the words are Daniel E. Williams (2006) than anything else. His captivity participates in the democratization of the political processes launched by the Republicans or Anti-Federalists. As a working class republican, Ray took too much to heart the principle that liberty was under siege by potential tyrants everywhere in the world and that unless the constant threat of arbitrary power was checked the Empire of freedom that American Republicans wished to build would remain a pious wish.

It follows that the differences in the rendering of the Tripoli American captivity by Ray and Dr. Cowdery are closely linked to issues of class or status and the ideologies to which they subscribe. A self-professed Republican or Anti-Federalist, Ray seems to have used the Tripoli captivity as a pretext to enter the public sphere with the purpose of divulging the dangers threatening freedom from a plebeian point of view. The

distinctive features of his captivity can be illustrated by comparison with Foss's captivity, which was written from a similar working class perspective. In both narratives, the focus is on liberty vs. arbitrary power. However, whilst Foss remains very respectful towards American authorities whose representatives he adulated and served even during his captivity, Ray was very suspicious of all differentials in power in all social and political relations because of the perversions to which they are liable. Foss's adherence to traditional authority and charismatic authority as embodied by David Humphreys and Joel Barlow can be accounted for by the fact that he wrote his captivity at the time of the predominance of the Federalists. One would argue that if Foss had written his captivity in the same manner and with the same commitment to liberty as Ray did later, it would have not received the claim it had received, and would certainly have made him as suspicious and subversive as any other member of the Democratic-Republican Societies of the time. One has to observe again that the Federalists, including President Washington and Adams, looked at the political dissent embodied by the Democratic-Republic Societies as subversion fomented by foreign agents, and so clamped down on them by the promulgation of the Alien and Sedition Acts.

One would also contend that political partisanship holds the key to the differences between Ray's and Cowdery's representations of the Tripoli captivity. One can note, for example, that Dr. Cowdery is as adulating towards the Federalist officers of the *Philadelphia*, Captain Bainbridge, Captain Rodgers, and Commodore Preble as Ray is critical of them for having allegedly mismanaged the Tripolitan crisis. As the quote below shows, Ray goes as far as to imply that Captain Bainbridge was both a coward and a traitor to the nation:

[The Tripolitan]Commodore began to interrogate us respecting our Captain, &c. He asked us whether we thought our captain a coward, or a traitor? We answered, neither. He

replied, “who with a frigate of forty-four guns, and three hundred men, would strike his colours to one solitary gun-boat, must surely be one or the other.” ... He said there was no necessity for throwing our guns overboard; that we might have known she would be got off, as soon as the wind shifted, and assured us she was already afloat- that if we had not struck our flag, they would not have ventured to board us, and highly ridiculed our captain’s cowardice. (Ray, 191)

For Ray, the real patriots of the nation are the “Jack Tars” whom Dr. Cowdery ignores in his quest for the company of the Bashaw and officers across the racial board. To put things in a nutshell, the ideological leanings of the two captive authors come out clearly in the cross-cultural representation of power holders. The difference between them is marked by the same distrust between the Federalists and Republicans. Like all republicans, Ray considers the Federalists including Dr. Cowdery antidemocratic and anti-republican at heart. Dr. Cowdery, on his part, holds up to the old guard Federalist view of republicanism, wherein political power whether at national or international levels was concentrated in the hands of an elite or a natural aristocracy.

However, in spite of these ideological differences, Dr. Cowdery and Ray did share one key common characteristic: both advertize a pre-imperial orientalism, one of them being plebian in expression and the other genteel. As noted previously, Dr. Cowdery puts himself in the shoes of an anti-conquest hero, and surveys the botanical republic of Tripoli with commercial prospects in mind. As a doctor captive, Dr. Cowdery dramatizes his genteel orientalism by enacting that notorious orientalist statement made by a fellow orientalist, Edgar Quinet, to the effect that “L’Asie a les prophètes [and] Europe a les doctors. (Quoted in Said Edward, 1991: 79) ” To this inaugurating genteel orientalism, Ray adds, as the quote below demonstrates, a plebian or popular orientalism inspired partly by the heroic march of Eaton in the Tripolitan desert, and partly by the contemporary scientific exploration and settlement of the Western territories as part and parcel of Jefferson’s policy of “encouragement of agriculture and commerce as its handmaid (Quoted in Norton Mary Beth, et al., 1991: 141”:

Where late yell'd the savage, and wolves howl'd for prey,  
Gay Villages rise and the arts flourish round us;  
And science forth beams like the dawning of day,  
Nor earth holds our commerce, nor oceans can bound us;  
Lo! India's vast shore!  
Our seamen explore!  
See Lybia's wild deserts an Eaton march o'er!  
To prove Nature's equal eternal degree –  
Heav'n ne'er formed us slaves – man was born to live free.

In such passages, Ray prefigures the poetry of Walt Whitman in its affirmation of the natural rights and liberties of man and the confirmation of his belief in the Jeffersonian vision of an Empire of Liberty, the three mainstays of which are listed according to the importance of their republican virtues: the yeomen, i.e., the cultivators of the earth, the scientists, and the seamen as proponents of commerce.

## **Conclusion**

It follows from the above analysis of the five “factual” captivity narratives anthologized by Baepler, that the representation of American Barbary captivity was closely linked with the ideologies of their authors and the major concerns or issues of their times. Writing in the colonial period and at a moment of crisis in the Puritan way of life, Cotton Mather conceived captivity narratives as a devotional literature, the major goal of which is to meditate on the intervention of God among the elect nation. The captivity of Americans in Fes is looked at as an illustrative case of captivity in sins. God inflicts suffering on captive believers in order to make them realize their straying from God's ways. Their redemption is equally brought out by a propitiated divine agency to which the captive returnees were supposed to turn in Thanksgiving prayer. This universal dimension of captivity in sin is sustained by the Protestant ethic of work that sets apart the American captives from their Western counterparts. This ethic of work had not only developed in them an exceptionally strong character in the face of apostasy, but bode well for that their future commercial prosperity as seamen.

Writing in the early period of independence, in what American historians call the Critical Period, Foss and Cathcart produced captivities meant to function essentially as foils and mirror images of the early American republic. As foils, their captivities indulge in a strongly contrastive discourse, the purpose of which is to define the American identity by setting it in diametrical opposition to Barbary in terms of manners, customs, tradition of government, and so on. In the role of citizens of a still infant postcolonial nation, their captivity stands for a symbol of captivity of the nation in its entirety. It is important to note that both author captives consider themselves as victims of independence because their nation was not yet recognized in the concert of nations and was not yet militarily and diplomatically strong enough to protect them. The culture shock that the two author captives register shows to what extent their national identity was still shaky, and to what extent it hurts to be brought back to bondage with the alleged complicity of the former colonizing power, Britain. Their denunciation of this complicity makes the captivities fall in the category of postcolonial literature with an emphasis on the “writing back to empire.” In addition to the function of foil, Foss’s and Cathcart’s captivities also function as mirror images of the nation and the major political and cultural issues that confronted it. The cosmopolitan character of Algiers, the New Englandization of American identity, the power relations between the states and the national government, the issue of collecting tax revenues, the issue of black slavery, individual rights and liberties and so on were among the major debatable issues of the time in which the two author captives participated by setting implicit and explicit parallels between the republic of Algiers and the United States.

Dr. Cowdery and Ray published their captivities in a context marked by the accession of the Anti-Federalists to power, and the military coming to age of the nation. The research shows that the captivities are sites of ideological confrontation between Dr. Cowdery

the Federalist and the die-hard Anti-Federalist Ray. Unlike the early independence captivities, these captivities do not transform Barbary in this case Tripoli into a foil for a contrastive self-definition. In Dr. Cowdery's account, Tripoli is not just a place of confinement but a space to explore for commercial interests. Playing the role of the anti-conquest hero, he imagines Tripoli as a botanical garden and a potential market. Similarly, Ray's captivity cuts no unbridgeable geographical divide between Tripoli and the United States as far as the constant threat to liberty is concerned. He uses his captivity in Tripoli as a pretext for entering the public sphere for giving his point of view about the issue of freedom from the working class perspective, with hope of enhancing further the process of democratization. However, notwithstanding the ideological differences between the two authors, they both inaugurate a pre-imperial American discourse through two distinctive types of orientalism called respectively plebian orientalism and genteel orientalism in this research. These two types of orientalism are different in terms of function from the postcolonial orientalism of Foss and Cathcart on the one hand, and the colonial religious orientalism marked by Islamic polemics of a Cotton Mather on the other hand. As the next chapter will attempt to show with respect to William Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers*, captivity in Barbary continues to be deployed as a template for the development of American orientalism and imperialism in the form of ideological rather than physical captivity.

## References

- Adler Peter, "Culture Shock and the Cross-Cultural Learning Experience," in *Readings in Intercultural Education, Vol.2*, Pittsburgh: Intercultural Communication Network, 1972.
- Ahlstrom Sydney E., *A Religious History of the American People*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Albert Ellery Bergh, ed. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Vol.5, The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904.
- Baepler Paul, *White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Barbary Captivity Narratives*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999.
- Bercovitch Sacvan, *The American Jeremiad*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.
- Berman Jacob Rama, "The Barbarous Voice of Democracy: American Captivity in Barbary and the Multicultural Specter," in *American Literature*, (79:1), March, 2007, pp.1-27.
- Counihan Carole and Van Esterik, eds., *Food and Culture: A Reader*, Third Edition, New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Bourdieu Pierre, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Rice, London: Polity Press, 2010.
- Ebersole Gary L, *Captured by Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity*, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.
- Mather Cotton, *Letter to the English Captives in Africa*, Boston, Printed by B. Green and J. Allen in the Year 1698, in <http://name.umd.umich.edu/N00685.001.001>, accessed on July 13, 2016.
- Matar Nabil, *Islam in Britain 1558-1685*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Norton Beth Mary *et al*, *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*, Dallas: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991.
- Norton Beth Norton, *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States* (Brief Seventh edition), Dallas: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007.
- Parker Richard B., *Uncle Sam in Barbary: A Diplomatic History*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.
- Peskin Lawrence A., *Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public, 1785-1816*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Said Edward W., *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin, 1991.
- Slotkin Richard, *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1660-1860*, Middletown, Connecticut, 1973.
- Smith Gaddis, "The U.S. vs. International Terrorists: A Chapter From Our Past," in *The American Heritage*, August, 1977, pp. 37-43.
- Turner Victor, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Vaughan Alden T. Vaughan and Clark Edward W., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981.

VanDerBeets, "The Indian Captivity Narrative as Ritual," in *American Literature*, 43 (1971-1972), p.562.

Williams Daniel E., ed., *Liberty's Captives: Narratives of Confinement in the Print Culture of the Early Culture*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2006.

Zakai Avihu, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.



## CHAPTER THREE

# WILLIAM SHALER'S CAPTIVITY IN IMPERIAL AND ORIENTALIST IDEOLOGIES

The United States whilst they wish for war with no nation, will buy peace of none. It is a principle incorporated into the settled policy of America, that a peace is better than war, war is better than **(James Madison)**

### Introduction

The above quote comes in President's declaration of war against Algiers in 1815, just a few months after the end of the 1812-war against Britain in 1814. Algiers for three years from 1812 to 1815 had considered itself at war with the United States principally for the delay in payment of tribute. It was only after the end of the conflict with Britain had ended that the United States could turn to the war front in the Mediterranean by sending a fleet under Commodor Preble. Aboard on one of the ships came William Shaler, commissioned together with Preble and William Bainbridge to come to terms with Algiers by renegotiating the peace treaty of 1796 making the United States a tributary nation. Surprised at a moment when the Algerian fleet was out corsairing, the American commissioners forced the day to sign a more honorable treaty to the United States by annulling the obligation of payment of tribute that had hurt the national pride for nearly two decades. After the signature of the peace treaty, William Shaler remained in Algiers as Consul General. His long stay in Algiers from 1815 to 1827 in such position made him turn into scholarly activity, the main production of which is the *Sketches of Algiers* (1826).

In the previous chapter, it is argued that Dr.Cowdery and William Ray had inaugurated the first phase of American orientalism, the former from the genteel point of view and the latter from a plebeian or working class perspective. Following with the evolution in American orientalism, this chapter contends that William Shaler solidly established the American orientalist tradition. His *Sketches of Algiers* is not properly speaking a

captivity narrative though the author himself complains several times in his correspondence about feeling confined in his function as Counsel General in Algiers. If things had depended totally on his will, he would not have stayed for such a long period in Algiers because of his interest of being affected on a mission in the American continent. There is another much more important reason than the fact that Shaler was uncomfortable in Algiers which allows for the placement of his *Sketches of Algiers* among captivity narratives. It is his capture by the orientalist tradition, most notably by the British one as represented by Thomas Shaw's *Travels or Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant* (1738).

In the preface to his *Sketches of Algiers*, Shaler shows to what extent his book as a text is principally an oriental intertext. This chapter will demonstrate why Shaler places his sketches in the British orientalist tradition by citing Shaw as one of the authorities about Algiers right from the start in the preface where he says the following:

In composing these Sketches, the author has been principally indebted to the valuable work of Dr Shaw on Barbary; he has also consulted Chenier's Recherches sur les Maures, and the travels of Ali Bey in Africa and Asia with advantage. He regrets that Bruce's Travels were not within his reach, though he thinks from recollection that they add little to the information given by the first. Doctor Shaw's Travels in Barbary and the Levant furnish, in the author's opinion, the only safe guide to the investigation of the geography, natural history, and antiquities of the Kingdom of Algiers.

Edward Said writes that orientalism is principally a question of authority with regard the Orient as a textual construct. Obviously, as the above quote indicates the Orient as text is already so thick a description that Shaw could resort to oriental intertexts to produce his own representation of the orient. If he is captivated by Dr. Shaw as he obligingly calls him, it is because Shaw was a member of the Royal Society, and as such could right be considered as an authority in the field of oriental biblical studies. As Shaw implies it in his dedication, the material of his book was collected during his stay as Chaplain in Agiers, and as he puts it "whilst I was engaged in this undertaking, it was a pleasing encouragement to consider, that my well-intended labours were approved by

HER LATE Majesty; and it did not a little enflame my endeavours, when She was pleased to promise me the Honour of Her Royal Patronage. (Shaw Thomas, 1738, dedication section)” Shaw’s dedication was addressed to George I, with the reminder that his work was first commissioned by the late Queen Anne. This makes of Shaw an imperial agent of sorts at the time Britain was affirming her imperial might against imperial France, thinking all the while about the penetration into the interior of North Africa. Shaw, to use Mary Louis Pratt, observed Algiers with “imperial eyes”. His production of knowledge about Algiers, though seemingly innocent, is meant to be used for imperial expansion.

It will be argued in this research that if Shaler had used Shaw’s imperial observations of Algiers as an intertext, he was motivated in this principally by similar imperial motives. However, one would contend that Shaler’s confirmation of Shaw’s orientalist observations in his sketches develops into what one can call a swapping orientalism. By looking out at the United States from a “decadent” Turkish Frontier, Shaler sometimes implicitly and sometimes explicitly suggest the displacement of the British imperial presence from the American Continent in Canada to Algiers. Such a swapping of imperial territories is ideologically informed partly by the Monroe doctrine, and partly by the Manifest Destiny. The case will be made that in writing his *Sketches of Algiers* Shaler is a captive of the “imperial nationalist” ideology brought out to the fore as a result of the victory of the Americans over the British forces in the 1812 war. Edward Said says that orientalism as imperial ideology cannot be understood without looking at the historical and social circumstances (Said Edward, 1991: 21) that gave it birth. Accordingly, just as in the other chapters of this research, Shaler’s captivity in the oriental and imperial ideologies will be set in their enabling historical conditions.

## **Historical Background of the Rise of American Imperial Nationalism**

The enabling historical conditions for the rise of the American imperial nationalism will be detailed with reference to Mary Beth Norton et al's book *A People and a Nation* (1991). The authors of this book retraced the Anglo-American war in 1812 the violation of American neutrality during the Napoleonic Wars that resumed in 1803. For nearly three years, the belligerents in this war, Britain and France, more or less respected this American neutral policy, making of America the "largest neutral carrier [... and] the chief supplier of food to Europe. (Ibid., 147)" In the meantime, America resolved to her advantage the Tripolitan crisis by negotiating a favourable treaty with Tripoli in 1805 releasing the United States from the obligation of payment of tribute. However, as soon as the Napoleonic wars came to a standstill with the victory of the British at the battle of Trafalgar and the defeat of the Russian and the Austrian forces at Austerlitz by Napoleon, the United States could no longer maintain her neutral position, for the French and the British resorted to the blockading of each other's trade. As Norton et al, put it, "as a trading partner of both countries, the United States paid a high price" (Ibid., 147) as a result this other way of making war.

Apart from commercial loss due to the blockading of trade by the British and the French, Britain resorted to the indiscriminate impressment of American sailors to man its navy. According to Norton et al, in spite of the denunciation of the violation of neutrality rights, "it is estimated that six to eight thousand Americans were drafted in this manner between 1803 and 1812. (Ibid., 148)" The crisis over violation of neutrality rights came to a head in June 1807 with what would come to be known as the Chesapeake affair. The *Chesapeake* is the name of a forty-gun frigate that refused to be searched by another British frigate the *Leopard* for suspected British deserters. It was finally forced to submit to this humiliation in the very American territorial wars with

heavy casualties among the crew and the impressments of many American sailors. Still unprepared to wage war against Britain, the United States resorted to economic sanctions against British and later against France by passing by the Embargo Act (1807) the Non-Intercourse Act (1809), and the Macon's Bill Number 2 (1810).

Norton et al go on to explain the origin of the Anglo-American with reference to the complexities of the Macon's bill:

The Bill reopened trade with both Britain and France, but it provided that if either nation ceased to violate American rights, the president could shut down American commerce with the other. Madison, eager to use the bill than go to war, was tricked at his own game. When Napoleon declared that French edicts against United States shipping would be lifeted, Madison declared nonintercourse against Great Britain in March 1811. But Napoleon did not keep word. ... (Norton et al, 1991: 148-49)

One understands that in the context of the military strategy of blockading each other's trade, Madison's nonintercourse with the belligerent which violated its neutrality rights amounted to a declaration of war against Britain. Accordingly, Britain tightened further the control of the Atlantic and blockaded the major American ports with the result that the British threat to American sovereignty in the seas and in the Western territories through its Indian allies became a reality to a huge number of Americans. It is in this context of hysteria over the British threat that Madison declared war against Britain on June 1, 1812. According to Norton et al, the grievances enumerated in Madison's declaration of war were old ones: "impressments, interference with neutral commerce, and British alliances with Western Indians. Unmentioned was the resolve to defend American independence and honor – and the thirst of expansionists for British Canada. (Ibid.)"

There is no need to go over the details concerning the vicissitudes of the Anglo-American war of 1812, but it is important to note that the two belligerents did not it fight out to the end. There were military victories on both sides, but the hostilities ceased the moment the Napoleonic wars in the European continent ceased with the

defeat of Napoleon in Waterloo. Since the major issues that led to the Anglo-American war were partly offshoots of the blockading of trade, there was no reason to go on with the hostilities once the situation returned to normality in Europe. So when the Americans and the British finally signed the Treaty of Ghent on December 24, 1814, issues such as impressments, maritime rights and so on were pushed aside as no longer valid while the issues of exchange of prisoners, the restoration of conquered territories, and arbitration of boundary disputes were provided for.

However, the results of the 1812 war were not altogether on the debit side. For one thing, the war reaffirmed the independence of the infant nation. It is considered by many historians as a second war of independence establishing once for all her international status among the concert of nations. In addition to the reaffirmation of the right of neutrality, the war removed the last psychological obstacle for the maintenance of a substantial standing army. Economically, the war stimulated economic change. Indirectly, the Non-Importation and Non-Intercourse Acts had spurred the production of manufactured goods in replacement of the British and French goods put under embargo. Territorially speaking, the war removed the Indian threat as the Indians found themselves without allies and without leaders, the majority of whom were killed during the hostilities. At the political level, the national euphoria following the unexpected end of the war put under the carpet the Northern radical federalists' revived talk about secession. But the most important of all gains is the new sense of American nationalism and the adoption by the Republicans of the major Federalist ideas into their programmes. As Norton et al write it so well,

Self-confidently, the nation asserted itself at home and abroad as Republicans aped Federalists in encouraging economic development and commerce. In his message to Congress, President Madison embraced Federalist doctrine by recommending military expansion and a program to stimulate economic growth. (Norton, et al, 1991: 154)

It is with this imperial nationalism in mind and heart that Shaler in 1815 embarked in the fleet sent by Madison to right the humiliation that the Dey had inflicted them in 1812 by declaring war for the delay in payment of tribute. The Dey expelled Tobias Lear then Consul General after payment of more than \$ 30000, and launched the Algerian corsairs against American vessels in the Mediterranean. The result was the capture of a merchant vessel the *Edwin*, whose captain had not warned the warning circulated by Thomas Lear in residence in Gibraltar. Thus another American captivity crisis started in 1812 with the Dey's declaration of war against the United States, but by that time the United States had already declared war against Britain and had therefore to suspend official treatment of the crisis until the war against Britain was over. The Algerian crisis was not considered a priority though it was a disturbing issue. Unofficially, However, Madison charged Mordecai M. Noah, American Consul in Tunis with the duty of redeeming the American captives in quiet way, just as Jefferson had tried to do in the first Algerian-American crisis, but like him he did not fully succeed in his endeavour. The failure to solve the crisis led to his dismissal by the Madison administration.

By 1815, with the war of Britain over, the failure of Noah's mission turned out into a huge embarrassment for an administration which prided itself for having challenged valiantly such a huge imperial power as Britain while seeking to pay ransom for the captives of the *Edwin* in Algiers. As Lawrence Peskin goes on to relate this episode of American history pertaining to Barbary, "as the administration began to prepare for war in Algiers, they selectively released some details to Congress and the public. (Peskin Lawrence, 2009: 199)" Public anger was thus displaced from a faulty administration to the Dey. It was further whipped up by the press and the correspondence of the captives' reports to relatives at home. Capitalizing on this opportunity to bring a glorious touch to

the preceding war with Britain, which in the eyes of many Republicans, was complicit with Algiers in the capture of the *Edwin*, Madison declared war against Algiers a few months after a Treaty of Ghent to free militarily the American captives. Under Stephen Decatur and William Bainbridge, it quickly captured two Algerian war ships, one of them commanded by the famous corsair Reis Hamidou. After blockading the port of Algiers, it forced the Dey to agree to a treaty suspending the payment of tribute and the enslavement of captives, henceforward considered as prisoners of war. A captive of a nationalist imperialism just like all his contemporaries, Shaler took official duty as the Consul General of the United States in Algiers under the force of arms.

During his stay in official duty as Consul General in Algiers, the postwar nationalism strengthened further in the direction of imperialism with the election of James Monroe into the presidency. According to Norton et al, if Chief Justice John Marshall had established federal supremacy and federalist nationalism, John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State during the two terms of James Monroe's presidency from 1817 to 1825, "managed brilliantly the nation's foreign policy. Adams stubbornly pushed for expansion, fishing rights for Americans in Atlantic waters, political distance from the old world and peace. (Norton et al., 1991: 156" Among his achievements is the Rush-Bagot treaty of 1817, the result of which was the demilitarization of the United States and Canadian border. There was also the 1818 Adams-Onís Treaty through which the Spanish minister Don Luis Onís agreed on behalf of Spain to cede Florida to the United States and to define the Southwestern boundary of the Louisiana in exchange of the payment of \$ 5 million dollars and the abandonment, at least temporarily, of the United States claims on Texas. Hence, the United States expanded further its territory through diplomacy without firing a single shot.



However, there was a caveat to this expansionist policy through diplomacy. It is the independence wars that broke out to the South of its borders in Latin America. From 1808 to 1822, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Mexico, and the United Provinces of Rio de la Plata, including present-day Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay broke free from imperial Spain. In 1822, once it had guaranteed the territorial security of the country through treaties, the United States government officially recognized all these Latin American independent countries. As Norton et al. tells us “Great Britain proposed a joint United States-British declaration against European intervention in the hemisphere, Adams rejected the British overture; he insisted that the United States act independently in accordance with the principle of avoiding foreign entanglements. (ibid., 156)” It is in the context of worsening political situations in Europe as a result of the civil war in Spain, and the threat of the intervention of European countries in the Latin independent countries to the detriment of the economic and political interests of the United States that the Monroe doctrine was born to protect those interests.

In a nutshell, the famous Monroe doctrine spelled out in an American unilateral declaration made by Monroe in his last message to Congress on December 2, 1823, consisted of three major principles: the noncolonization of the Western hemisphere as well as the West Coast (then under the threat of Russian expansion) by European nations; the non-intervention by Europe in the internal affairs of independent Latin American nations; and the non-interference by the United States in the domestic affairs of the European countries, as well as in the colonies in the American continent. Of course, all this meant keeping the European countries out of the American continent and putting it under the influence of the United States to serve its own economic and political interests. Reading Shaler’s *Sketches of Algiers* without taking the Monroe Doctrine in consideration would make its author’s militant call for Britain to conquer

Algiers and leave the far distant colonies such as British Canada sound a little strange if not confusing. Captive of the imperial ideology of the Monroe doctrine, Shaler, one would argue, consider that Algiers as already an American colony ready to be exchanged for the close-to-home colony of British Canada, thus leaving full scope for American expansion there.

By arguing for Shaler's captivity by the nationalist imperialist ideology of his time, this research disagrees with Lawrence A. Peskin's that with Ray's and Cowdery's captivities, American Barbary accounts moved "beyond captivity" narratives as a genre (Peskin Lawrence A, 2009:188-209). Baeppler near makes a similar implicit statement by including in his anthology captivities resulting from the Algerian crisis of 1785-1796 written by Foss and Cathcart, and two others resulting from the Tripolitan crisis of 1801-1805, but eludes the Americano-Algerian war of 1815 as context for the writing of further American captivities. It is true that the captives of the *Edwin* disappeared in the Atlantic after their redemption in 1815, thus forfeiting any chance of leaving accounts of their captivity in the manner that Foss, Cathcart, Ray and Cowdery did, but it is also true to say that the 1812-1815 Algerian crisis laid the ground for Shaler's account of captivity, which strikingly resembles the Puritan captivity by Cotton Mather in the place it allows to the imperial, orientalist ideology of his time.

### **Exceptional Republicanism and the Captivity of European Nations**

In his *Orientalism*, Said writes that "The Orient was viewed as if framed by the classroom, the criminal court, the prison, the illustrated manual. Orientalism, then, is knowledge of the Orient that places things Oriental in class, court, prison, or manual for scrutiny, study, judgement, discipline, or governing. (Said, 1991: 41)" This applies perfectly to the description of Algiers and Algerines that Shaler gives the reader in the seven sketches of his book. In the first sketch devoted to the description of the

geographical location of the kingdom of Algiers, its topography, climate, natural and manufactured products, the major towns, the territorial divisions, and its demographics, one has the impression that Shaler is a geography teacher, involved in the teaching about Algeria with the map of Algeria as drawn and included by Thomas Shaws in his *Travels or Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant*. Indeed, Shaler appears to have made a synthesis of what Shaw says in his book for pedagogical purposes. In this sole chapter besides the recognizable paraphrases from his predecessor, Shaler makes at least 6 references to Shaw by mentioning explicitly.

On the first page after locating the “King of Algiers” on Shaw’s map, he cites a long passage from the latter’s travelogue by giving the approximate distance between the Algerian seacoast to the desert. Bowing to the authority of the British author, he starts to explain to his imaginary students that “Doctor Shaw, who appears to be better informed on this subject thinks that at Tlemcen, it does not exceed forty miles, at Algiers sixty miles, and that at a medium of sixty miles may be taken as its breadth from the Mediterranean to the Sahara.... (Shaler, 2)” Following up this classroom statement, he gives his students the Arabic name for this arable stretch of land between the Sahara and the seacoast by reminding them they call it the Tell. Shaw then stops short at the imaginary line separating the Tell from the Sahara by filling the land to the south of it with “mountains, marshes, and fertile plains, which on the maps of Africa have obtained the name of Belled el-Jerred, and until better explored, may be regarded as doubtful territory. (Shaler, 2)” In the absence of territorial exploration, Shaler appeals to inquiries of native travelers to draw the right picture of the exact topography of the country for his imaginary lecture, but he could not take it from them that the breadth of the country is much larger than announced by Shaw. “I do not regard this as sufficient authority on which to contradict those laid down by this respectable traveler,” he declares. (Shaler, 2)

It follows from the above that Shaler's geography as explained in his imaginary class is an "imaginary geography" in the sense of Edward's words. In other words, this geography is the outcome of an intertextual attitude that takes the territory of what he calls the King of Algiers for Shaw's map, and a map, as Roland Barthes affirms in one of his writings, is not a territory. The rest of the information of this geography lesson concerns the heights and lows of temperature, the levels of rainfall, the seasons, the nature of the soil and its fertility, and the crops, the production and productivity of crops. In giving information about the above, one notes that the classroom discourse often turns into comparison and evaluation with European countries and the United States as major references. Of course, one always feels that he is attending a geography classroom, but from mere description, the author always citing Shaw as a pedagogic manual resorts to the analogical pedagogic discourse. Shaw understands that one cannot grasp the unknown and appreciate the information about it at its real value if the known or familiar is not brought into comparison.

Hence, the imaginary pupil gets to know that Algiers "enjoys a healthy and agreeable temperature, which is neither oppressively hot, nor severely cold in winter. (Shaler; 3)"

As general rules have always exceptions, he adds the caveat that the temperature can rise dramatically "sometimes during four or five days" in midsummer because of the Saharan winds. He follows up by delimiting the seasons, the direction of winds, the quantity of rain, and in short what makes the Kingdom of Algiers a viable territory to conquer and live in agreeably. Harking back to the past of the regions as reported by ancient Greek and Roman authors, he cites nominally Salluste, he declares that "The Soil throughout this region has not degenerated from its ancient reputed fertility. (p.3)"

It is given to the imaginary class to understand that the land can still sustain the life of European colony. He makes it known that the staples crop grown in the region are

wheat and barley. The soil is so fertile that in spite of the “rude state of agriculture,” it gives a good yield, from eight to twelve pecks for one. The flower made out of the Algerine hard species of wheat is “difficult to knead but it makes excellent bread. (Shaler, 4)” Shaler takes time to explain that the Algerine wheat was so praised in Italy for its excellence that it was imported for the manufacture of macaroni. This is another way of saying that the contemporaneous Kingdom of Algiers that he observes, just like Roman Numidia, continues to play the role of food basket for the Roman descendants.

Though he agrees with the ancients – he cites Sallust in a footnote – that the country under scrutiny is deficient in terms of forests and that the timber produced in the rare forests that exist is of such a poor quality that it is “seldom used for naval construction”, he declares the olive tree as the king of all trees in the region. “The olive, he writes, is here in its native soil and climate, and flourishes wherever permitted. (Shaler, 4)” He passes in review the other types of trees and plants that grow in what looks like a botanical garden or orchard. Transforming himself into a naturalist of kinds, he tells his imaginary class that the walnut and the chestnut grow in all parts of the Kingdom, and “produce fruit of good quality, though inferior to that of Spain, France, and Italy. (Ibid.4)” In short all types of fruit trees peculiar to temperate climates are cultivated in the Kingdom, some of them inferior and some other superior in quality (e.g., pomagranates, grapes, figs) to those grown in Europe. The vegetable productions are no less various and excellent than the production of fruits.

Said tells us that Orientalism can be defined a “style of thought.” He mentions in this regard the systematic ontological distinctions that orientalist of all shades establishes between the West associated with civilization and the Orient which is its negative foil or the Other. One finds another style similar in its purport as the one that Said mentions in his book but expressed in an idiosyncratic way, the imaginary conditional “if” or other

similar expressions. So for example after point to the agricultural potential of the Regency of Algiers, Shaler imagines and lets the reader indulge in the same fantasy by saying the following: “Though, from the peculiar physical character of this country, which abounds in plains of various elevations, it must surpass most others in variety and excellence of its vegetable productions, if it were inhabited by a civilized and industrious people. (Shaler, 4)” As said earlier, Shaler takes himself as some sorts of naturalist detailing the flora of the country, but he does not hide the proprietary possessiveness in an innocent garb as the naturalist, or anti-conquest hero described by *Mary Louis Pratt in her Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. His personal style of describing the country with imaginary conditional “if” makes his book read as a promotional colonial literature of the kind that the early American settlers were served to incite to immigrate to the United States.

Shaler’s geography lesson continues with details about raw materials such as iron and lead, exploited by the Kabyles, he says. The manufacture of “coarse pottery” by the same people, the inexhaustible mines of the finest fossil salt, the huge number of streams and rivers come next in the list of industrial and agricultural potentials of the country. At this point, he changes the register of his discourse to that of medical doctor making statements about the healthy nature of the country. Said has already pointed that the orientalist discourse borrows its major discursive statement from affiliated disciplines such as medicine. In other words, orientalism can indulge in clinical discourse. It is what Shaler does in his *Sketches of Algiers*. But instead of focusing on illnesses that could be induced by the state of the Algerian weather as is generally the case in orientalist literature, he emphasis the existence of a “great number of salt and mineral springs. (Shaler, 5)” The implication is that colonial residence in Algiers holds out curative prospects. Again, he resorts to the one authority to whom he refers

reverentially as Dr Shaw to remind the modern Europeans that these mineral springs had been used to cure illnesses. These “Hammam, or baths, of Meregga, the Aquae Calidae Colonia of the ancients,” Shaler quotes Dr Shaw, “are supposed to cure jaundice, and to alleviate most other inveterate ill habits and distempers. (Shaler, 6)”

At least two remarks can be made about Shaler’s reference to the Roman establishment of thermal stations for curing distempers and other diseases. The first is that modern Europeans, and most notably the British, could do the same as the Romans. Building these clinic statements on the authority of Dr Shaw will certainly not pass unnoticed by the British reader, already quite familiar with such Roman thermal stations in Bath, Britain. Algiers will be for them a second home, and an asset as far as their health is concerned. The second remark is the fact the thermal stations as described by Shaw quoted by Shaler have fallen into decay. The reference to decay of the infrastructure in Algiers is consistently repeated by Shaller all through his sketches. As a stylistic characteristic, it points to the tendency of the orientalists to look at their work in the orient, as Said has pointed out in his *Orientalism*, as primarily a work “restoration.” In Shaler’s sketches it is the thermal springs and the Roman presence that are restored to the Algerian map, and of course he expects the modern European to restore those indicated thermal stations by territorial occupation.

The imperializing impulse of Shaler’s first sketch is reinforced by pointing to the navigability of the Algerian seacoast. To propose a European imperial occupation of Algeria without referring to the sea as an asset will certain defeat the imperial project that Shaler outlines right in the first sketch. The modern empires are principally sea empires, especially the one the British Empire that he has in mind in his description of the maritime situation of Algiers. Accordingly, he points to the safety of the Algerian seacoast by saying that “The seacoast is everywhere bold, and free from hidden dangers,

at any considerable from the shore. (Shaler, 6)” He concedes that presently there are not many good harbours. Among these he mentions “Boujaiah and the gulf of Stora, which are very spacious and afford perfect shelter at all times. (Ibid.)” However, he adds that “by perfect survey of this coast, which is as yet hardly known, other ports might be discovered. (Ibid.)” Until then, the ports of Bona, Algiers, and Oran could continue to be used because of the safe anchorage that they offer at certain periods of the year. In not praising the latter harbours, Shaler considers that the reader has still in memory that several European expeditions against Algiers had foundered in these ports by strong northerly gales. Of course, the historical fear of the Algerian seacoast that could dissuade colonial settlement in Algeria is alleviated by pointing to the harbours of “Boujaiah and the gulph of Stora” whose navigability is reported to him by a “very intelligent English captain, who had occasion to seek refuge in these two places during a voyage, in the winter season.” Who cannot believe in the feasibility of the imperial project mounted for the British when the testimony of the safety of Algerian seacoast comes from one of His Majesty’s officers.

Obviously, the British were already interested in conquering Algeria, and Shaler is only encouraging them to implement their imperial design by reminding them of other Algerian maritime assets in the following quote: “The sea of Algiers abounds in the fish common to the Mediterranean, and on the eastern coast the first coral, which might be made a source of national industry and wealth, (Shaler, 7)” The modality here is as important as the imaginary conditional that Shaler obsessively in pointing to the economic potentialities of Algiers that are overlooked by the British who painfully seek wealth in distant territories in the New World and the Far East while huge stocks of fish and coral lay dormant close at their doors in the Mediterranean. As if to raise imperial jealousies, he reminds the British reader that “at present the exclusive privilege of



taking this valuable article of trade [coral] is farmed to France, and is an inconsiderable source of revenue to the Algerine government. (Shaler, 7)”

Apart from fisheries, Shaler points to the abundance of big and small game, and domestic animals in the interior country inhabited by a “pastoral people, whose principal weath consists in their flocks. (Shaler 7)” As he delivers the information in his animal fact file, he refers to the fact that the interior country favours the breeding of cattle, asses, horses, sheep, dromadaries, camels, and the abundance of small and big game such as “wild hogs, hares, partridges, and in their season, quails, woodcocks, snipes, teal, and wild ducks, and in the interior, and borders of the desert, deer, antelopes, and wild goats.” At the top of the ferocious animals in the Algiers kingdom of animal comprising “the panther, the leopard, the wild cat, the mischievous jackal,” Shaler places the legendary “Numidian lion”. He grows exhilarated when he describes it because in his orientalist, imperialist eyes it is the one thing in Algiers that had not degenerated. “The Numidian lion,” he says, “has not degenerated from his ancient character [that is as it was described by ancient Roman and Greek authors]; he is still the most formidable, and according to the reports of the natives, the most magnanimous of his species. (Shaler, 8)” Clearly, in describing the fact file that he has drawn about the kingdom of animals in Algiers, Shaler suggests that Algiers is a territory that offers opportunities for husbandry, and hunting for game and for sport. As such, it is a welcome imperial destination that can accommodate farmers, aristocrats looking for hunting exotic animals, as well as frontiersmen bored with civilization.

However the civilization that is in question here is the one to come after the imperial restoration of the major cities or towns in Algiers. In making the inventory of these towns made on the basis of Shaw’s map, Shaler takes what Shaw said about these urban centres in 1738 and the dismal state to which they were reduced. The least that can be

said is that urbanization, and of course the little civilization often adduced to the previous European presence, had regressed since the Ottoman occupation of the country. Starting from the general to the specific, he tells us that the “territory of Algiers is politically divided into three provinces. (Shaler, 8)” These territorial divisions are Oran, or the Western province, Constantine, or the Eastern province, and the province of Territory in the centre, and in which Algiers as capital of the Regency is situated. He adds the reminder that Algiers is the seat of central government that “exercises an indefinite jurisdiction over the three provinces,” and can be considered as really constituting a fourth province.

The territorial organization being defined, Shaw goes on to the description of the major towns in each of the provinces. He gives the tone of his description by starting with the city of Tlemcen in the Western province. “Shaw,” he writes, “describes its ancient extent as of four miles. Since the establishment of the Turkish domination in this country, Tlemcen, notwithstanding the advantages of its position, has fallen into entire decay. (Shaler, 9)” Resorting to suppositions, Shaler adds that “it is now supposed to contain a population of about two thousand souls. (Ibid)” As noted earlier, Said singles out the judicial discourse the court as one of the distinctive characteristics of orientalism. Shaler’s statement about Tlemcen in the Ottoman period is a judgemental statement condemning the impact of the Ottoman colonial presence for the rapid urban regression and depopulation of Tlemcen taking Shaw’s intertext as the standard of urbanization measurement. Oran escapes similar judgement. After having given its exact geographical location, he praises the fertility of the region, the navigability of its commodious bays, Oran and Arzew, and most importantly its proximity to Gibraltar and Spain. Seemingly, if civilization and urbanization in Oran had not known the same regression, it was due to this geographical proximity. And after all the picture of

urbanization in Algiers cannot be all in black since there should be some place for the potential European conquerors from where to start the restoration of the country back to Western civilization.

As he further reads the map from the west to east, the master's stick falls on the star legend of the town of Mustiganim. The delivered verdict about Turkish presence in this town is the same as the one returned about their presence in Tlemcen. The judgemental attitude of the author comes across clearly in the following extensive citation:

A few miles east of Oran is situated Mustiganim, which, during the possession of the former by the Spaniards, was a Moorish city of much importance; but since its restoration to the Regency it has fallen into entire decay. Oran was regularly fortified by the Spaniards, who, after a possession of about a century, gave up this important placz, at their last peace with Algiers, in the expectation of advantages which were never realized. (Shaler, 10)

All the other Algerian cities in the imperial eyes of Shaler experienced similar decadence under the rule of the Turks. For example, he mentions the “ancient Cirta”, locating it on the longitudinal and latitudinal lines, and reporting the number of its inhabitants according to hearsay. The author's judgement then falls on those who caused its fall from its former prosperity in ancient times when when it was under Roman influence: “The position of the city is certainly one of the most happy that can be imagined, and under a reasonable government, would entitle it to every sort of prosperity. (Shaler, 11)” Shaler does the same with Bona, present-day Annaba. He refers to it as “the ancient Hippo Regius” to suggest its former popularity in antiquity when it was a great commercial centre. He then locates it always by referring to lines of longitude and altitude, delivering information about its population before he comes back to its commercial prosperity when it was French control. The next discursive move of the description follows the same stylistic pattern: “From the superior advantages of its position, [Bona] is susceptible of much improvement, if the least encouragement were given to agriculture and trade in this country. (Shaler, 11)”

Boujaiah as he spelt Bejaia is another town or city that Shaler describes before he draws the larger picture of the state of the Regency of Algiers. The profile of the town is drawn with the same regular strokes of the brush as the other profiles already reviewed: location, population, former prosperity, decadence, and of course the same imaginary projection into the future under a Western colonial power. In this respect, he uses the same idiosyncratic style: “With due encouragement, Boujaiah might become a place of much commercial importance; at present it is in a state of total decay, and contains about two thousand inhabitants. (Shaler, 11)” This language of the court, as Said would call it, continues with the description of the last town, Sherchell. “Doctor Shaw,” Shaler writes, “has described many other towns, both on the coast and in the interior of the kingdom, which have probably sunk to entire insignificance since his time. (Shaler, 12)” Here is the general verdict turned on the Turks as the enemy of civilization, who brought out the decay of whole towns whose traces could only been seen in the map and read about in the cartographic discourse of Doctor Shaw whom Shaler holds as the authority in Algerian studies. As if to close his denunciation of the Turks of destroyers of the foundations of the civilization laid down in Algiers under the influence of the Romans, he makes a case against them by mentioning the instance of Cherchell. The following quote rounds off his argument about the rapid disappearance of civilization in Algiers under the rule of the Turks:

Mention however ought to be made of Shershell, the ancient Iol Caesarea, and the most important maritime city of ancient Mauritania, situated west of Algiers, in 2° 39' east longitude. In Doctor Shaw's time, Shershell was a place of some consequence, but has since dwindled into total insignificance; it being now known only as a place where coarse pottery is manufactured, and brought by sandals for sale to Algiers. (Shaler, 12)

As noted above the orientalism of Shaler can be seen in the textual and reverential attitude that he shows to Thomas Shaw's book. One has the impression that the first sketch of Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers* is a pedagogic transposition or digest of Shaw's voluminous accounts of his travel in Barbary and the Levant. Three dominant discursive

strains of orientalism can be noted, the language of the classroom, the language of the court, and the language of the clinic. Shaler like a schoolmaster maps the territory and indicates its economic potential. The territory is described as a fertile, healthy territory left to waste by the oriental despotic regime of the Turks condemned for civilization regression. Shaler's orientalism, it is also argued, promotes a British imperial project in the Regency of Algiers. In this sense, the intertextuality that Shaler's *Sketch of Algiers* holds with Shaw's book is not at all disinterested, since it seeks to revive British imperial interests in the region by defending the viability of this imperial project through Doctor Shaw, a fellow of the Royal Society. The underlying design of such an imperial project is to displace the British Empire from Canada to Algiers in compliance with the Monroe Doctrine.

One final remark needs to be made at this stage. America is mentioned explicitly just once in Shaler's first sketch. It is in the rubric that he has devoted to animals, most notably the "Barbe horses." In this respect, he writes "the Barbe horses have had much reputation, but I do not recollect having seen a fine horse in Algiers. (Shaler, 7)" One would argue that such a remark falls within the general discourse about the generation. Pedegree "Barbe horses" under the rule of Turks had given place to ordinary animals such asses and mules. This falls also in line with the diminution of the military capacity of Turks that Shaler would argue in the next sketches. However, if, as noted above, there is no explicit reference to the United States in the first sketch one feels that America also stands as a foil. An American reader of the time cannot fail to make comparison between the described decadence in Turkish Algiers with the agricultural, commercial, and industrial progress that the United States witnessed in Shaler's time under the program known as the "American System". As portrayed by Shaler, the Regency of Algiers has more or less similar economic potentials as the United States.

However, unlike the latter it was ruled by a despotic regime more interested in their personal prosperity than that of the country. Shaler's compiles the details about this Turkish government in the second sketch of his book, always with the intent of discrediting Turkish imperialism in Algiers in barely hidden comparison with British imperialism. In doing this, he remains a captive of the nationalist and imperialist ideologies sustaining the famous Monroe Doctrine.

### **Desmystifying the Barbary Legend for Imperialist Purposes**

Said makes three statements orientalism very pertinent to the analysis of the Shaler's second sketch. One of these statements is that orientalism is "absolutely anatomical and enumerative; to use its vocabulary is to engage in the particularizing and dividing of things Oriental into manageable parts. (Said, 1991: 72)" The second relates to the textual and schematic attitude in the description of the Orient. And the third relates to the Orientalist comparative method consisting of underline the unequal partnership between the Orient and the West, and stripping the former of residual powers that might frighten the latter. One would argue that overall Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers* expresses in its very title the orientalist attitude of schematizing and dividing that region or country into manageable study parts which in the words of Said can be called tableaux vivants. Each of these sketches or tableaux stages an oriental aspect of life in the Regency of Algiers into order to make less fearful and therefore more available for Western imperialism ventures. In the second tableau or sketch it is the "Barbary legend" that for a long time was considered as the scourge of Christendom that is demystified by enumerating the faulty political organization of the Turks and the illegitimacy of their imperial presence in Algiers.

Shaler starts his second orientableau or sketch by reminding the reader that "Islamism is the only religion professed by the Algerines with the absolute exclusion of all others,

except the Hebrew, which is tolerated to the children of Jacob.(Shaler, 13)” This first broad stroke of the brush announces the orientalist dimension of the tableau that he draws of the political system of the Regency of Algiers. It has to be observed here that for Westerners “where Islam was concerned fear, if not always respect, was in order. (Said, 1991: 59)” However, as contended below, it is the terror that Islam as embodied by the Turks in Algiers that Shaler intends to deflate as an undue anxiety because of the weaknesses of the Turkish regime. In another stroke of the brush, he enumerates the languages employed in Algiers: Turkish as the language of the Turks, Arabic as the predominant tongue, French as language for diplomats in residence in Algiers, the Hebrew, and a lingua franca a “barbarous compound of Spanisg, French, Italian, and Arabic [...] as the ordinary medium between foreigners and natives. (Shaler, 13)” Clearly, instead of looking at such a linguistic hybridity as a sign of the cosmopolitan dimension of Algiers and a zone of cultural and linguistic contact, Shaler sees in it a sign of linguistic degeneration and lack of a proper identity. Shaler lived in Algiers and got several Kabyles as servants, yet his orientalist textual attitude to the linguistic materiality of Algiers is such that he feels constrained to refer to Shaw in his enumeration of languages used in the Kingdom of Algiers. In this respect, he writes the following: “The languages, spoken in Algiers are the Turkish, the Arabic, the Hebrew [sic] and what Doctor Shaw terms the Showiah, or that which is spoken by the independent mountaineers, which there is a strong reason for believing an ancient and original language. (Shaler, 13)” Shaler’s raised interest in the Showiah as an ancient language would transform him into an amateur philologist as the appendix of the Showiah words attached to his sketches shows.

However, Shaler’s interest in the linguistic identity of the Regency Algiers is primarily there to show how far the Turks are linguistically isolated from the native populations in

terms of daily communication. The isolation of the speech communities is a sign that the Turks had not taken roots in the country after nearly three centuries of military occupation of the country. This lack of a national community of language being established, Shaler, writing in the fragmentary style of orientalist, gives a very brief history of the Turkish conquest of Algiers. What is remarkable in this historical fragment is the repetition of the major statement of what Fisher calls the “Barbary legend.” Turkish Algiers is the artificial creation of two Turkish pirates “Horuc” and “Hayradin” solicited by the gullible petty king of Algiers in 1516 to assist him against the Spanish presence in the “little Island opposite the city of Algiers. (Shaler, 14)” Building on their notoriety as pirates, and “long desirous of obtaining a port where to establish their power on a solid basis,” Horuc accepted the offer and did not wait to long to murder his host and to put himself on the throne. Hence, Algiers became the proprietary colony of oriental pirate brothers from Mytilene, which in political history is an anomaly.

Shaler follows up on this piratical foundation of Algiers by telling the reader how after the defeat and killing of Horuc by the Spaniards on his retreat from Tlemcen in 1518, his brother Hayradin took over power in Algiers and put his “dominions under the protection of the Grand Seignior, and received from him a garrison of Turks sufficient to overaw any attempt of his Moorish subjects to regain their liberty. (Shaler, 15)” The implication is that the proprietary colony of Algiers became a frontier colony of the Ottoman Empire, but the Turkish garrison soon practically regained independence from the Porte which conceded them the right of electing their chiefs, “and reserving to the Grand Seignior that of confirming the election by sending or withholding the kaftan and sabre of office. (Shaler, 15)” Shaler describes Algiers as a “military republic”, having in



mind, arguably, the exceptional republicanism that America had succeeded to institutionalize.

In describing the origins of this “military republic” which reserves all honours to the corps of janissaries that founded and maintained, excluding all other inhabitants from offices of trust and profit, Shaler take pity on its founders. The latter are described as “simple people [who] gradually established their government as nearly as circumstances would permit, after the only model they had any knowledge of, that of the Ottoman Empire. (Shaler, 15)” Algiers as a Turkish colony was settled with an oriental model of government in mind, the reader is told, and this makes a whole difference with colonies established by the Europeans, especially the British ones in the East coast of the Atlantic. The British model of colonization brought with it the English man’s rights and liberties, and over centuries was refined by Enlightenment thinkers to give place in the process to an exceptional republicanism. Abandoning himself to the orientat prejudice stand outside of the processes of history, Shaler asserts that by contrast to the historical evolution of the British Thirteen Colonies to Independence, “the merits of this government have been proved by its continuance, with few variations, for three centuries. (Shaler, 16)” Contrary to the democratic republic of that the Founding Fathers had built in the United States, the Turks in Algiers formed “a military republic with a chief elective for life, and upon a small scale resembling that of the Roman Empire after the death of Commodus. (Shaler, 16)” The epistemological, ontological, and political distinctions between “us” and “them”, characterictic of orientalism” are summarized by Shaler in this short history of the formation of the Turkish government in Algiers.

The one important thing to keep in mind in reading Shaler’s fragmentary and schematic histoy of this government is the undermining of the Barbary Legend by showing its shaky political foundations. In his *Barbary Lengend: Trade and Piracy in North Africa*,

Sir Godfrey Fisher (1957) debunks the legend of Barbary in order to show how Britain had lost the opportunity to become an important trade partner in the region, and arguably to urge Britain not to lose that economic and commercial opportunity again once Algeria had regained its independence. The book was published in 1957 when Algeria was its liberation war against the French, the case with Shaler is different by debunking the legend by pointing its collapsing political order he was wishfully elaborating an imperial project for Britain in Algiers in order to divert its attention from colonial Canada. In so doing, he reveals himself to be a captive of an orientalist ideology demeaning the political power of the Turks in Algiers, and the nationalist imperialist ideology fleshed out in the Monroe Doctrine.

To reinforce the political fragility of the Regency, Shaler describes what he ironically calls “the theory of the Algerine government. (Shaler, 16) This description is made from the comparative perspective, with the American system of government standing as a foil. The most important defect in this oriental type of the Turkish government in Algiers is the non-separation of powers. The Dey, the Divan, and the Cadis and Muftis in Algiers government, look like the three branches of democratic governments as theorized by various Enlightenment thinkers and put into practice by the Americans after independence. However, like all oriental schemes of government, the Turkish government in Algiers pales by the side of really theorized democratic governments. For instance, Shaler tells us that the Divan was “formally a real corps in the state, held regular sessions, had funds attributed to it, and claimed to determine upon all the measures of government; but it has dwindled into a mere phantom. (Shaler, 16)” The comparison with Congress under the articles of Confederation is implied in mentioning the fact that the Divan elects the Dey and makes the major measures. However, Shaler qualifies this implied comparison in referring to the Divan as being constituted of

promoted elderly janissaries and to its “dwindling into a mere phantom.” Oriental experiences with “republican” forms government in the frontier of the Ottoman Empire did not bear the expected fruit, for instead of evolving into a reinforced legislative body like Congress in the United States under the Constitution, the Divan became a “dead letter in their constitution. (Shaler, 16)” It is worth pointing to the employment of the self-reflexive possessive pronouns such as “their” throughout Shaler’s sketches. One can infer that “our” that is to say the democratic republic of the United States is strikingly different from “their” that is to say the “military republic” of Turkish Algiers in its propensity to one-man despotism.

The executive branch is constituted of the Dey who nominates the cabinet, but this cabinet is also a pale, imitation copy of the cabinet as it was then conceived in democratic government as that of the United States. As described by Shaler, it is constituted of the Hasnagee, the finance minister, the Aga commander-in-chief of the army, the Vikel Argee, minister of marine and foreign affairs, the Khodgia de Cavallas, superintendant of the national domain, and the Bet el Mel, or judges of inheritances. This cabinet, Shaler remarks, is “free of any control by the pretended Divan.” (Shaler, 17)” The Dey as the chief executive is confirmed and officially installed in his duty at the reception of the firman and the symbols of power consisting of the Kaftan and the sabre of the State from the Grand Seignior. At this stage of the description of the executive branch of the Turkish government, Shaler takes care to set the records straight concerning the humiliation that the American government had experienced at the hands of the Dey in 1802 when Captain Bainbridge’s war ship was requisitioned to carry a present to the Grand Seignior under the Algerine flag. At the time the requisition of an American vessel was considered as a nation humiliation, but in the sketches Shaler turns it into a sign of prestige that the Regency had accorded to the United States. Strangely,

the relations between the Regency and the Ottoman, as portrayed by Shaler, are relations based on gift exchange on the type that anthropologist like Mauss have described. It is in this context of gift exchange that Shaler inserts the status of the United States as preferred nation by writing the following:

In terms of prosperity Algiers sends a present to the Grand Seignior once in three years, which is usually transported there with their ambassador by a foreign ship of war; and such is still the credit of the Regency, that it is always the government most favored here, which obtains this mission as a mark of honorable preference. This present is always magnificent, often amounting in value to half a million. [...] In return for these presents the Porte usually sends a vessel of war, with military and naval forces, &c. and gives them permission to recruit in its domains. (Shaler, 18)

For Shaler the national humiliation of the requisition of Bainbridge's war vessel in 1802 is not one at all, his acquired knowledge of the political system transforms into an honour and gives him authority to discuss further how the Turkish government works.

By the time Shaler published his *Sketches of Algiers* in 1828, the change of administration through peaceful elections was consolidated in the United States. This picture of an orderly and peaceful change of government is the standard that Shaler employs to condemn as any orientalist of all shades would do the political disorder of so-called oriental despotic regimes, and the bloody intrigues that mark them. The Regency self-styles itself in the words of Shaler as a "military republic" by giving the Divan the right to elect the chief executive, the Dey, but such an election "is usually the result of the intrigues of a predominant faction amongst the Janissaries, and is generally a sanguinary tragedy. (Shaler, 18)" The factional form of the Turkish government contrasts in the American reader's mind with the peaceful government by political parties in the United States. Shaler retraces this violent change of administration to the oriental character of the Turkish rulers of Algiers, for whom politics is not an inherent feature of their constitution. In thus dismissing the Turks from the game of modern democratic politics, Shaler discredits their presence in a colony that deserves better rules.

The next-point of comparison in Shaler's second sketch is the relationship between the central government of Algiers and the provinces with reference mainly to the tax revenue. The implicit standard remains the United States which by this time had constitutionally solved the problem. In Shaler's tableau, the provinces were not as is the cases in the states governed by laws voted by their constituents, but sub-colonies of the central government for farming revenues. The Dey delegates his "despotic authority" to the "beys" or governors to farm revenues. Accountable to the central government in Algiers, these beys render a visit to the Dey every three years to render the account of their administration and curry the favour of the notables there with costly bribes without "no part of these "extraordinary contributions go[ing] into the public treasury. (Shaler, 19)" The system of justice in the Regency is no less deficient in comparison to the one prevailing in the United States. Principles such as the independence of justice, the right for defense by a lawyer, the presumption of innocence, in short the rule of law is absent especially in criminal justice. As Shaler writes it with the usual orientalist style of thought, "the maxim in Algiers, contrary to of **our** common law [note the pronoun our], is, that it is better to punish an innocent person, than a criminal should escape. (Shaler, 21)" And for Shaler to add one of the monstrosities of this political system to question the legitimacy of the whole system by writing that the "post of Tchaux, or executioner, is considered **here** an honourable employment, and each public minister has one attached to his one: these functionaries rise indifferently with the others to the highest offices in the state. (Shaler, 21)"

Shaler continues to draw his tableau of the Turkish government in the Regency by saying that it is inspired by the *Koran*. In the Western World where religion was already to a private matter of faith and belief, and where secular law had come to replace religion in the regulation of civil society, Shaler's statement speaks for the

backwardness of the Regency of Algiers in matters of justice. However, Shaler makes the Turks look even more regressive in the application of this Koran-inspired justice. The quote below shows the degradation that civil justice had experienced during the Turkish imperial presence in Algiers:

Anciently it was necessary to have been graduated in the schools of either Constantinople or Grand Cairo to qualify a man for the posts of either Cadi or Mufti; but the Turks, accustomed to discharge the highest functions of government without having ever learned to read, naturally determined that any man supposed to have common sense, and the faculty of reading the Koran, might well enough be eligible to those judicial posts. (Shaler, 23)

Writing at a time that the American system of justice, especially, the Supreme Court had affirmed its independence under Chief Justice Marshall, such a statement about the Algerine judicial system can only sound as a verdict turned on the Turkish rulers who instead of improving the system as it existed had made it worse.

One last case made against the political system of the Turks in Algiers concerns economic policy. Once again, it is important to know what the United States did in this domain in order to fully grasp what Shaler considers as the oriental non-productive economic system instituted by the Turks in Algiers. As noted in the historical background to this chapter, the United States under Madison launched a nationalistic program for the encouragement of economic development by creating the Second Bank of the United States and building roads and canals. The system came to be known as the American system. Instead of such a liberal economic system also adopted in many European countries, the Turks in Algiers in Shaler's imperial eyes based their political economy on monopolies, which "reduced the agriculture and trade of the kingdom to a most deplorable state. (Shaler, 24)" Two reasons are adduced for this retardation of the economic system. The Turks are averse to any economic power or prosperity that is not under their proper control. Liberal policies in the domain of economy might bring out a change of demographics, an increase of wealth, and hence a relative degree of civilization

on the part of the native population that might endanger the political interests of the Turkish rulers.

The findings of Shaler's scrutiny of the political system of the Regency of Algiers are summarized in one single paragraph starting with the statement that "The government of Algiers is peculiar in its fundamental character. (Shaler, 25)" In other words, it does not follow the political norms of the West. It is a political anomaly and monstrosity that has to be extirpated. Shaler compares it with another oriental political system that of the Mamelukes of Egypt. However, what is extraordinary about the Turkish is not the fact that the country was settled by "a small band of foreign adventurers," reserving for themselves all the honours and benefits, for history provides parallel examples. It is the political monstrosity of "confining them exclusively to a corps of foreigners, constantly recruited from abroad [the Levant] (Ibid.)" The recruits, as Shaler follows up, are "generally the sweepings of the prisons, and the refuse of society in those barbarous countries. (Shaler, 26)" As a political emanation of the no less extraordinary Ottoman Empire whose foundations are "conquest, national arrogance, and religious fanaticism. Shaler concludes with the following summary judgement of the Turkish colony in Algiers:

Their [The Turks'] existence where they are [that is in Algiers] resembles rather an "encampment of Barbarians," than an established government; and Algiers is certainly the most remarkable of this singular empire. (Shaler, 26)

Though it is not explicitly stated, contrary to Western Empires, and Shaler has in mind the British Empire, the Ottoman Empire is disqualified as promoter of civilization. Shaler's orientalist judgement of the Ottoman Empire through what he regards as a monstrous political breed of the Regency of Algiers has something to do with the looming war in the Greek Ottoman possessions. The French conquest of the Egypt of the Mamelukes at the turn of the nineteenth century is also in Shaler's mind. And in

many ways, the imperial project that he elaborates for the occupation of Algeria is similar to the one that the French orientalist had scaffolded for the Egyptian expedition. After having undermined the political foundations of the Barbary legend, Shaler turns to the military organization of the Regency. After having described Janissaries as the scum recruited from their Levant, Shaler, mindless of the contradiction, describes them as a “plain, prudent, sensible people, and so on,” but he disqualifies them by saying that “in their political career they discover all the ferocity of barbarians (Shaler, 28)”. They show contempt to the native population, and no private property is offlimits for them. Shaler throws in an anecdote here by reminding the reader of his heroic resistance to such trespassing and violation of private property belonging to the foreign consuls. He claims that “after the peace of 1815, I represented to the reign sovereign Omar Pacha, the enormity of this disgraceful practice, and assured him that any violations of my premises would be regarded as a national injury, and treated as such. (Shaler, 30)” He adds that since then such the janissaries had stopped their deprecations of the foreign consuls’ gardens, but they had continued to terrorize the native proprietors of gardens. Shaler enumerates the characteristics of the Turks always with the view of diffusing the fear that they had inspired in the past. They were declared as “the most insufficient body of military that was ever put under arms. (Shaler, 36)” They count 15000 soldiers at the most, and so is inconsequential. As a corporation, they have a strong solidarity amongst themselves, but that sense of solidarity is undermined by self-destructive drive, the source of which is intrigue selfish rivalry of factions. Their vessels were contemptible as ships of war, and it is only the “spirit of intrigue and the base cupidity of Europe [that] given them credit (Shaler, 37).” The Turks depopulated the country by driving the natives into the mountains and borders of the desert. The deficit of the balance of payment, following the blockading of corair activities are such that the Regency is on



the brink of collapse. In this regards, Shaler inserts the balance of payments and expenditure to make his case. Shaler shames the Western powers for having accepted to pay tribute and for continuing, at least some of them, to comply with the pretensions of the Deys to superior power over them.

Once Shaler has done with the enumeration of the political, economic, military, and cultural weaknesses of the Regency, he launches into the following lengthy rhetoric flourish, the aim of which is the destruction of the Barbary legend and the promotion of his own imperial project in Algiers on behalf of Britain:

Such is the far-famed Regency of Algiers, the theme of poets, the terror of nurseries, and the cause of so much national degradation. And it cannot fail to excite the excitement of the reader, that so insignificant and worthless a power, should have been so long permitted to vex the commercial world and extort ransom at distraction; and while the great maritime powers of Europe were establishing colonies at a vast expense of human life at the utmost extremities of the earth, a mere handful of mischievous banditti has been left in the quiet enjoyment of the fairest portion of the globe, at their very threshold, and receiving from them submission, little short of homage. (Shaler, 38)

It is the geopolitical strategy of the European maritime powers that Shaler interrogates with the Monroe Doctrine as a backdrop. For Shaler, such geopolitical strategy is wrong in economic and moral terms. Economically, it is less costly to occupy Algiers than to go to extremities of the earth such as the America to create colonies. Morally, it is unacceptable for them as civilized countries to let the Regency of Algiers described as “the fairest portion of the earth” in the first sketch in the hands of “mischievous banditti” as the Turks. These moralistic, economic, and political arguments are propped up by the major principles of the Monroe Doctrine: non-colonisation of the Western hemisphere by European nations, and the nonintervention by Europe in the affairs of independent New World Nations. Thus, this polemics in favour of the European, and principally, of the British occupation of the Regency of Algiers shows that Shaler is a captive of the ideology sustaining the Monroe Doctrine. He is also no less a captive of the orientalist system of thought manifested in the radical oppositions that he sets

between the degeneration of the Regency of Algiers as a Turkish colony and frontier of the Ottoman Empire and the development of United States as a former colony in the British Empire. In detailing these oppositions sets on stage the dwindling military and economic power of what he calls a military republic to undermine the fearful aspect of the legend of Algiers as the scourage and .

### **The Prophecy of the Occupation of Algiers by the Red Coats**

The Barbary legend as far as the Regency of Algiers is concerned has another side to it than the terror it is made to inspire in Europe. This side relates to the economic potential of the country. As already note in the analysis of Shaler's first sketch, the Regency of Algiers is portrayed as a fertile country left to waste in the hands of the Turks. This research has already shown that in this regard Shaler has followed in the footsteps of such orientalist travelers such as Shaw whom he cites on several occasions; His description of the geography of Algiers betrays what Said calls a textual attitude to the object of his study, the Regency of Algiers, as invented by previous orientalists including even classical orientalists such as Saluste. The personal touch of Shaler in this description, if it can be called so, is pointing to the decay that had befallen the country as a result of the Turkish occupation. This aspect of the Barbary legend is reinforced in the third sketch, or to use Said's term, *tableau vivant* which deals exclusively with the city of Algiers. The description of Algiers, one would argue, is to raise colonial desire. One the decrepitude of the central Turkish government is signaled, and thus the fear of the city of Algiers, called the "warlike" as Shaler reminds the reader, is assuaged, the second discursive move is to titillate the desire to invade it in order to plunder its celebrated treasure. To make this possible for reasons already developed above, Shaler puts himself in the role of secret agent.

In his work *Alger, l'Europe et la guerre secret 1518-1830*, Moulay Belhamissi documents the way Europe had from the beginning of the establishment of the Turks in Algiers led a secret war of intelligence by secret agents in various disguises. At the top of these secret agents in the European intelligence service, he places the consuls, followed up in order by redemptionist monks, the captains of vessels, members of Israelite minority, the captives, the professional spies, and collaborators from the autochthonous population. He retraces the history of the military intelligence carried out by each of these groups in separate chapters from the beginning to the fall of the Regency of Algiers in 1830. When Belhamissi comes to discuss the role of the Consuls, he contents himself to mentioning the doubtful character of the self-serving consuls in Algiers rather than their mission as covert secret agent. The only hint as to their capacity to spy on the military capabilities of the Regency is limited to a suggestion that though the majority of the foreign consuls had elected residence in la "rue de la marine" later "rue des consuls," the majority of them lived extra-muros of the city in poshy villas, and so the implication that they could do their intelligence service on behalf of their respective rather easily. Apart from this suggestion, Belhamissi restricts his observation to the fact that these consuls were busy stirring war between their own countries and Algiers to promote their own commercial interests.

For a scholar, specialized in the Turkish period of Algerian history, and who knows well Shaler for having mentioned several times in his works, it is surprising to note that Shaler is noted mentioned as the most notable secret agent in the secret intelligence war against the Regency that he has the intention to describe. Arguably, Shaler does not belong to that category of consuls who put their own interests above the good of his country to deserve any reference whatever. And yet, as argued above, it is in his capacity as a self-appointed secret agent with self-set mission to gather military

intelligence that he starts his cartographic discourse of Algiers. What is remarkable is that Shaler follows the lead of Boutin in his observations about Algiers military capacities of defense as the notorious French military engineer-cum-spy Boutin commissioned by Napoleon to study the possibility of conquering the Regency. What is even much more remarkable that this Boutin appealed to the same Shaw that Shaler often cites to give authority to his conquest discourse in writing his intelligence report to Napoleon.

Shaler, as in the first and second chapter, resorts to Shaw to give the exact location of the city of Algiers, which he quotes saying that it “stands upon the site of the ancient Icosium, in north latitude  $36^{\circ}$  and  $48'$ , and east longitude  $3^{\circ}$   $27'$  near the western extremity of a beautiful bay of about fifteen miles circuit. (Shaler, 46)” Shaler then takes care to refer to the safety of the bay, its navigability, the number of ships to which the harbour can give shelter, and the “number of naval force necessary to assail it (ibid)” calculated on the basis of the Anglo-Dutch attack under Lord Exmouth in 1816. In describing the topography of the city, Shaler makes the following statement: “Algiers stands upon rather a wide base on the seashore, rises in amphitheatre upon a very quick acclivity, is about a mile and a half in circumference, and contains from eight to ten thousand houses. It is with such statement that he sets up in the manner of orientalist a theatrical stage for the imperial project that he has in mind by transforming himself into a military strategist. On this theatrical stage is set, Shaler puts in it the figurants by estimating its population at above half the number that Shaw gave for it in the eighteenth century, which is “above one hundred thousand souls. (Shaler 47)”

Taking another perspective from the sea, he describes the city in highly eroticized terms that is in accordance to the colonial desire that he seeks to stimulate. “Algiers, as discovered from the sea,” he writes, “resembles in form and colour a ship’s topsail,

spread out upon a green field. (Shaler, 48)” In this description, Algiers is reduced to a belle waiting to be boarded and to be taken. Heightening further the aesthetic sense, he writes that “with its surrounding hilly and well cultivated territory, thickly studded with white buildings, several of which are magnificent edifices, develops, on approach one of the most agreeable views on the shores of the Mediterranean. (Ibid.)” The eroticism of the scene thus described is heightened by mentioning the fact that in spite of its sea fortification, the city, Shaler assures the reader, that “it is on the land side nearly defenceless. (Ibid)” Breaking into the well-garded harem keeping the long coveted “Algiers the White” or the “Bahia” is still a possibility, and Shaler serves the plan of access.

He explains that previous expeditions to capture Algiers failed, not because Algiers was true to its reputation as “war-like” city, but because an “unpardonable ignorance of the coast and topography of the country. (Shaler, 51)” All these expedition forces landed in the most fortified part of the bay, the eastern part of it. To surprise the city, the approach should be made from the west where there is no military concentration. Shaler has already set the anxieties at rest by have drawn the topography of this Western coast. In describing this topography, Shaler becomes the hero of his own story of conquest laid down the whole scenario of how the actors who will dramatize it. He writes for example that the road from Sidi Ferraj in the West part of the bay of Algiers could be covered on horseback in three hours’ time. This calculation of travelling time is based on his strolling experience along this coast, which he also remarks, has the convenience of affording abundant springs of war all along the way for the cavalry. No fortification whatever of note protects this coast except the “castle del Emperador” that command the city. However, the latter is, itself, commanded by several heights from which it could be safely reached and overwhelmed. In the end, Shaler recommends military

diversion, the capture of Algiers in a pincer movement by the land and naval forces. As the land forces thus penetrate the city, “the fleet which had landed the troops, would by this time appear in the bay to distract their attention, when Algiers must either surrender at discretion or be taken by storm. (Shaler, 52)”

Once the topography of the city of Algiers is described and the military strategy for taking it is elaborated, Shaler moves to explain why this city must be conquered. The legitimacy of waging war against Algiers has already been argued for in Shaler’s previous two sketches which emphasized the backward regime of the Turkish colonial presence in Algiers. As argued above, the Turks are disqualified as colonizers capable of disseminating civilization by the very nature of the oriental regime that they transplanted to Algiers. In this third sketch he provides other justifications for conquering Algiers, which strangely enough, resembles those provided for the conquest of the South American cities by conquistadors such as Cortes. Without fear of contradiction, the judgements that Shaler has passed on the state of the Regency under the Turks are greatly mitigated. In *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, Tzvetan Todorov quotes Cortes’ and Bernal Diaz’s admiring observations and enchantment by the Mexican cities before they took possessions of them on the basis that they “do not acknowledge their makers as human individualities to be set on the same [cultural or civilizational] level as himself. (Todorov Tzvetan, 1992)”

One notes the same admiring observations and the same caveats posed to them about Algiers as Cortes makes about the Mexican cities. One of the achievements in Algiers is the policing of the city. The local government of the city, he asserts, is in the hands of native functionaries. Once he has finished with the description how it functions, he makes this superlative statement that contrasts markedly with what he has said about the central Turkish government: “There is probably no city in the world, where there is

a more vigilant police, where fewer cognizable crimes are committed, or where there is better security for person and property than in Algiers. (Shaler, 52)” Following this remarkable achievement in local government, he refers to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of private families as a result of the uninterrupted prosperity of Algiers in the course of centuries. Shaler thus recognizes the rise of a monied class in Algiers, signaling a little advance in terms of material civilization. However, he relates this emergence of the “bourgeois” or native monied class not to the classical development of economic systems as theorized for example by Marx, but the oddity of the oriental system of government transplanted by the Turks in Algiers. That system as portrayed by Shaler encourages among the Turkish holders of power a kind of rivalry that is destructive of both human life and the wealth that they amass. From here follows this observed paradox:

Nothing can be more insecure than the fortune of a living Turk; but that of a native, who is ineligible to any important public employment, and consequently passive in all political revolutions, is as well protected here as in other country. (Shaler, 53)

The profile of the city is thus not altogether negative if one takes into consideration the wealth accumulated by the native population. Declared to be “one of the richest cities in metallic wealth in the world, (Ibid.)” Algiers thus deserves to be got rid of the Turks and integrated into the international commercial circuit by conquest. Shaler’s orientalist system of thought cannot, of course, admit that this country as a result of class evolution and struggle could develop in this direction without foreign intervention. It would be contrary to the oriental model of political and economic development or rather stagnation that he has used as his major assumption.

The profile of Algiers moves from the economic side to the identity and character of its people. Wealth is already an indication of the commercial potential and exchange that this city is capable of developing, but to support further the argument that Algiers has reached what he calls a “partial civilization,” he defines who the Algerines are really in

order to destroy the notoriety as ferocious depradors and scourge of Christendom that they had acquired in the Barbary legend. “What is an American?” Jean-Michel de Crécoeur queries in his attempt to define the American identity in the colonial period. Shaler seems to pose the same question about the Algerine to promote a new image about them. The answer is that the “inhabitants [the Algerines] are an amalgamation of the ancient Mauritians, the various invaders subsequent to the above periods, the emigrants from Spain, and the Turks. (Shaler, 54)” The implication is that the Algerine is a new man, melted in the crucible that is cosmopolitan Algiers. Coming from a culture celebrating the melting pot, Shaler passes a highly favourable aesthetic value judgement about the amalgamation: “This mixture appears to be a very happy one, for there are few people who surpass them in beauty of configuration; their features are remarkably expressive, and their complexions are hardly darker than those of the inhabitants of the south of Spain. (Shaler, 54)” This vision of Algerines as a new breed of men comparable to the inhabitants of the south of Spain is not prosposed without a hidden motive, however. As will be shown later in this research, amalgamation is also a tool of racial extermination and total change of racial character. What counts is the historically proved disposition of the Algerines to welcome the blood of other ethnicities into these genes, hence the possibility for the British to swamp the already diminished number of Algiers in their own blood streams if ever they decide to conquer Algiers with a greater number of blood.

Developing always the same argument with the same *arrière-pensée*, Shaler removes the last obstacle to conquest and later transformation of the Algerine demographics. That obstacle is the one posed by the seclusion of women. As all orientlists of his kind, Shaler remarks that “foreigners seldom have an opportunity of seeing the Moorish women,(Shaler, 54)”. However, relying on hearsay of foreign lady residents, he extols



their charms, and the extraordinary beauty of their children. Shaler slips in a dose of prejudice by saying that women age very quickly in Algiers for two major reasons, one of during their supposed “early maturity” and early marriage, and the other a little bit farfetched and that he relates to “the excessive use, or rather abuse of the steam bath. (p.55)” He drops the subject of women momentarily but he comes back to it shortly afterwards when he treats of the manners and customs in Algiers. It is in this section that Algerine women are not as dominated by males as is the case often made in orientalist literature. This rather lengthy excerpt below projects the vision of a harem in the process of rebellion in line with the wishful racial amalgamation noted above:

Though these secluded dames bloom as it were in the desert, from the complaints of their husbands respecting their extravagance in dress, it may be inferred that they exercise no considerable portion of influence in society, and are perhaps silently preparing the public mind for a restoration of the rights, of which barbarism and ignorance have defrauded them. (Shaler, 62)

In the above excerpt Shaler makes in his words just an inference about a possible rebellion by Algerine women, but that is enough to further his idea of amalgamation and the future of swamping of the Algerine in the Spaniards did with the Moors in Spain. The importance is that the Algerine women show on testimony of their own husbands the disposition of the female counterparts for mixing in the crucible of the future Algiers under the British occupation. It is in such instance as the celebration of amalgamation for racial extension that Shaler demonstrates the extent of his captivity in the racial theory that sustains his imperial project in Algiers. Amalgamation as he continues the development has temperate the character of the people of Algiers. Shaler makes a concession to the authority of ancient writers such as Saluste, who declared the ancient inhabitants as “treacherous” and “inconstant” character of the ancient inhabitants. However, he concedes on this only the better to affirm that the present inhabitants of Algiers “are far from the ferocious barbarians which the term Algerines seems by common consent to imply. (Shaler, 55)” Foss and Cathcart, as shown in the previous

chapters, are among the American captive authors following the lead of British orientalist, who have propounded the Barbary legend and the image of Algerines as the most ferocious barbarians of that legend. Shaler corrects this legendary notoriety by assing the following positive judgement of their character:

They [Algerines] are a people of very insinuating address, and in the common relations of life, I have found them civil, courteous, and humane. Neither have I ever remarked any thing in the character of these people that discovers extraordinary bigotry, fanaticism, opr hatred of those who profess a different religion. (Shaler, 55)

Shaler knows well that in emphasizing the civility and broadmindedness of the Algerines he goes against mainstream orientalism. But as suggested in this research, such a shift of paradigm in the description of the character of the Algerine obeys to the power relations obtaining between the West and the Orient. Orientalism, as Said argues, is just that a system of power relations, and the representation of the orient largely depends on cultural strength at specific periods of history (Said, 1991: 116). Writing at a time when the West had shown its technological superiority over the Orient, Shaler could avail himself of the revision of the representation of the Algerines. As he does so, he provides an instance where he seemingly questions the textual authority of previous orientalist who were at one time impressed by the power of the Algerines using his own personal authority as long time resident-observer in Algiers. Shaler sets his experiential authority as the man in the field against the established opinion, not in order to undermine, but in order to rewrite orientalism from a position of cultural strength signaling the will to power and conquest:

I am well aware that this character of the Algerines is contrary to what has been heretofore promulgated, and to the general belief of the world; but my impressions of them, which I have received from a long residence in Barbary, differ very much from the general opinion, particularly within the last fifty years. (Shaler, 55)

Shaler reduces contemporaneous affirmations as to the contrary to mere allegations. In this regards, he laughs at the claims made by the Lord Sheffield, who in his pamphlet *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (1783) alleged that the “Algerine

hostility [would stand] as the permanent obstacles to the maritime prosperity of the United States( Shaler, 55) because it “they pretend to no navy” (Lord Sheffield, quoted in Parker RichardB, 2004: 35). History belies such as affirmations because they were made out of a mean rivalry among the great maritime powers of the time, which exaggerated the ferocity of the Algerines and tried to influence them just in order to keep their rivals out of commercial competition. Shaler adds this favourable remark about the independence of the Algerines in matters of political decision as far as commerce with foreign powers is concerned:

To any one acquainted with Barbary, these facts excite only indignation, derision, or contempt; for it is well known that the great maritime powers of Europe have always had recourse in Algiers to the most debasing expedients to support what they term their influence here, and that their enmity in Algiers is as little to be dreaded, as their friendship is worth having for an independent people. (Shaler, 56)

Bowing once again to the authority of Saluste as regards the ferocity of the character of the Numidians, Shaler discovers virtues in the conquest of the Algerine territory by the Turks. The Turkish government, democratic in form among the restricted number of Turks, and aristocratic in its rule of the natives, in addition to their impartiality of the administration of justice, and the generally rigorous character of the administration are supposed to have had a “powerful tendency to curb the licencious propensities of the Numdian character, and reduce it within the bounds of moderation and propriety. (Shaler, 56)” Hence the presence of the Turks in Algiers, after all, is not totally negative since it is held as one of the possible factors that had shaped the Numidian character so much decried by Saluste, thus paving the way for a more advanced occidental form of civilization. The other factor that transformed the character of the Algerines, to which Shaler gives the general name of Moors to distinguish them from the Turks, is commerce. For the first cause, as noted above, Shaler appeals to the classical orientalism developed by Saluste, for this second cause he applies what is generally said about the widespread international trade connections of the Jews to the Moors. Widening a no less orientalist claim usually made about Jews to the Moors who are generally held as the vindicative originators of Mediterranean violence for well-known historical reasons poses no

problem for Shaler who seeks, by all means, to demonstrate the commercial potentialities of Algiers. The distortion of historical facts about Moors to make them cut high figures in imperial eyes is evident in the following lengthy excerpt:

The all powerful mollifier of national and religious animosities, commerce, has also had its influence on them; regular Moorish commercial houses exist here, which have an established credit abroad, and that they seek to maintain by reciprocating the kindness, hospitality, and confidence, which they find when they travel, as they frequently do, into foreign countries. (Shaler, 56-57)

Contemporary scholarship such as the one developed by Nabil Matar in *Europe Through Arab Eyes* (1578-1727) on the real extent of travel and commerce of Arabs in Europe brings a caveat to Shaler's description of the transformative effect of commerce on the Moors.

Shaler does not go forward with the description of the character of the Moors, the good Algerines, without falling back momentarily on orientalist cliché. No matter what said previously about the Algerines/Moors, they could not be put on the same footing with Europeans in matters of science. He confirms previous orientalist clichés by sciences such as medicine and astronomy are “unknown and disregarded” (Shaler, 57) in Algiers. “Charms” and “amulets” constitute the whole art of healing that Algiers could show. As for navigation, the Algerine impress Western sailors to guide them in the open seas. All they can boast about in terms of literature is the *Koran*. Mindful of not destroying the case he is making for the colonization of the Regency of Algiers by going too far in his commitment to orientalist clichés, Shaler shifts the discourse to the spread of education in Algiers. The system of education is held in admiration and is said to be the “probable of the Lancastrian system of tuition. (Shaler, 57)” The observation of the way boys and girls are instructed to read and write leads Shaler to draw the following conclusion:

I think there can be no doubt that these people stand on the very brink of civilization, and might be easily led into it through a system of government less repugnant to improvement in its principles and practice, than that under which they live. (Shaler, 58)

The disposition of the Moors to be acculturated or rather assimilate foreign cultural ways is the next point to be elaborated in the propaganda that Shaler makes for them. The foodways, the clothes, as previously argued, are indicators of identity. Fox and Cathcart saw the forceful stripping of their garments and the no less forceful wearing of Turkish clothes as a traumatic experience that changed the recognized self into the other. The two author captives speak about the same trauma as a result of forceful transformation of their foodways. Shaler has another idea of about the Algerine garments and foodways. Where Fox and Cathcart saw difference between these two aspects of identity, Shaler discovers a hidden similarity bringing to surface the diffusion of Roman ways of life among the population of Algiers. Thus, after describing the major male and female garments in terms of the material used, the way they are made, and who wears what according to rank and class, he punctuates the descriptions by retracing their origins to foreign influence. For example, he writes that the “burnousse is, according to Doctor Shaw, without the hood, the pallium of the ancient Romans, and with it, the bardocullus of the Gauls. (Shaler, 59)” Without realizing that Doctor Shaw, as he always reverently refers to him, is trying to understand the unknown with the familiar, Shaler follows his lead by declaring the “hyke [...] the national garment of Lybia from time immemorial.” In his imperial eyes, it resembles “the toga of the ancient Romans.” Shaler gives the justification for drawing the comparison between the two garments by relying on the following observations:

I have seen a statue of the emperor Augustus, as chief pontiff, either at Rome or in the royal studio at Naples, where he was enveloped in a robe that bore an exact resemblance to the hyke, as worn here by the Arabs. (Shaler, 61)

Continuing to grasp the unknown by the known he compares the hyke and the manner in which it is the “common blanket [worn] by the Indians on our frontiers. (Ibid.)” So the Algerines have submitted to the Roman influence, but they are not yet like them, as they also resemble Indian in the manner of wearing the hyke. What is important for

Shaler is to note that the area is not closed to civilization and that the Algerines accommodates themselves to foreign ways of life. The rest of the customs and manners account that Shaler delivers is also corrective in several ways. Polygamy has ceased to be a general oriental oddity. Only few Algerines avail themselves of the Islamic law to take more than one wife. This evolution in matters of marriage is accounted for in terms of the rise of a wealthy class, the consequence of which is the evolution of mentality, as well as the huge number of wealthy heiresses who imposed marriage contracts, “which place [the wealthy heiress] on a certain equality with her husband, or at least protect her from arbitrary ill treatment. (Shaler, 63)” On the whole, the condition of women in Algiers have considerably changed, and it is assumed that the ladies, that is the female elite, are likely to improve further in the future under more propitious socio-economic system. As one reads the excerpt below, Shaler strangely evokes Abigail Adams’s March 1776 letter to her husband John to “remember the ladies” in the “new Codes of Laws” that the Continental Congress were then preparing in Philadelphia for the future republic:

It would be injurious to the understandings of the ladies to suppose that they have not improved these advantages; their effects have been gradually extended, and the consequence has been that the Moorish women are less slaves to their husbands, than to custom and long received notions of decorum and propriety. (Shaler, 63)

There is a short step in the above quote to go for the Moorish ladies to fit the ideals of Republican motherhood and marriage as companionship. In short, the Moorish ladies in Shaler’s description are seen in the mirror of American ladies, and speak for the existence or emergence of a superior class of women on whom to rely for the propagation of civilization once it is put into movement by a colonizing European power.

The recreated vision of Algiers comprises the comparison of the Algerian foodways with the Italian ones. The couscous the national dish is considered as the “equivalent to the macaroni of Italy and the rice of India. (Shaler, 64)” The diet is meticulously described but at no moment does Shaler refer to misery. The availability of food is not a

problem in such a rich city as Algiers. Though the number of available amusements is limited due to the lack of arts and literature, still leisure has a place in the Algerian society for both sexes. Amongst the amusements available for males, Shaler mentions coffee-houses, barbers' shops and gardening. For females, amusements include "assemblies at the public baths, and at each other's houses on occasions of marriages, births, circumcisions, &c. (Shaler, 65)" And of course there is music for both sexes. Overall, the pleasures and social life of the Algerines are simple, but they show that Algiers is not a cultural desert, and that its inhabitants share with other human beings the human trait consisting in seeking to balance work and amusement.

Said argues that "Orientalism as a profession grew out of these opposites, of compensations and corrections based on inequality, ideas nourished by and nourishing similar ideas in the culture at large. (Said, 1991: 150)" It is this discourse built on opposites, of compensations, and corrections based on inequality that is prominent in the descriptions of the customs and manners of the city of Algiers that have already been detailed above, and the ones that he makes about the minorities, the crafts, and architecture. Each of these aspects of his manners and customs account, like the ones already dealt with above, is described in such a way as to bring a correction to the Barbary legend by showing it in positive light, but the description ultimately segues into a negative evaluation in some sort of a discursive swing of the pendulum (the words are Said's). The final idea is that Algerines are relatively civilized but not yet completely as not to necessitate the intervention of a foreign higher civilization. Hence, Shaler declares that the "mechanic arts in Algiers are organized into corporations, as in several of the old states of Europe. (Shaler, 69)" This evolutionist judgement of the development of mechanic arts is intended to demonstrate that Europe has still a

civilization mission to accomplish in Algiers by improving its economic system through capitalist industrialization.

Civilization of Algiers through a forceful diffusion of the capitalist system will not pose problems in matters concerning raw materials and labour. The resources are widely available and are waiting to be exploited. As for labour, Shaler notes that “a considerable portion of the population of the city of Algiers consists of strangers; that is, of people belonging to the different African tribes ... protected in their rights here, by stipulated or implied compacts. (Shaler, 65)” So it is easy to imagine that there is a pool of labour as well as consumers to start manufacturing and commerce in the city of Algiers on a good footing. Shaler feels sympathy for the Jews because of the bad treatment they are meted out in Algiers, but their suffering is less important in his eyes than the business skills they have transferred to the Moors, a term that Shaler uses to refer to the urbanized populations in the Regency of Algiers. What wins out in the brief history that he recounts of the rise and decline of the Jews in Algiers is the vision of a city wherein the Moors are replacing the Jews as “brokers, and dealers in money and exchanges. (Shaler, 65)” Arguably, statements like the one below chase away the human suffering of the Jewish minority to give in to a barely hidden anti-semitism:

During the times of prosperity of the Regency, several Jewish houses of trade rose here to great opulence, but of late years, through the intolerable oppression under which they live, many wealthy individuals have been ruined, others have found means to emigrate, and the Moors, who have a singular aptness for trade, are daily supplanting them in the different branches of commerce practicable in this country; so that they appear now to be on a rapid decline even as to their numbers. (Shaler, 67)

It all looks like Shaler is finding a way to save his imperial project in the eyes of those anti-semitic Europeans who might hesitate to colonize Algiers because of the exaggerated influence and numbers of Jews in Algiers. For him the figure of the Jewish population in the Regency of Algiers stands at about thirty thousand. However, he notes a high trend of immigration to the Orient, for the Jews have come to realize that their



days in the Regency are counted. The picture of the restoration of the Jews to the Orient that Shaler draws in the following quote is intended to promote the historical necessity of his imperial project even as he extends sympathy to their suffering and ultimate disappearance from the Regency:

Many aged and infirm Jews, sensible that all their temporal concerns are drawing to a close, die as it were a civil death, investing their heirs with all their worldly substance, with the reserve of only the small pittance necessary to support the lingering remnant of their days in Jerusalem, where they go to die. In the year 1816, I witnessed the embarkation of a number of ancient Hebrews, on this last earthly pilgrimage, on board of a vessel chartered expressly for the purpose of transporting them to the coast of Syria. (Shaler, 68)

As the quote reveals, Shaler is not as liberal in his consideration of the presence of the Jews in Algiers as he might sound. To complete his corrections of the Barbary, not without the necessary compensations of the Orientalist discourse noted above, Shaler that Algiers declares that the city of Algiers is quite urbanized. On the debit side, he notes that the city has a narrow and confusing system of streets, just like some older European cities that he does not mention. The houses are built in an oriental style with the inside hidden from view and the windows “both within and without guarded by strong iron grates, which give these dwellings the gloomy air of prisons (Shaler, 72)”. However, these are just impressions, for they are built with fine materials – he mentions Dutch tiles and Italian marbles, and are furnished with the conveniences to allow for a good living. In order to illustrate the value of real estate in Algiers, he estimates the house that he has rented at the modest price of two hundred and fifty dollars at “one hundred thousand dollars. (Shaler, 73)”

There is another category of audience to whose concerns Shaler tries to cater. This audience is that of the abolitionists. For readers with anti-slavery sentiments so influential in English and American politics, Shaler rewrites the history of white slavery in Algiers by mitigating the cruelty with which captive authors like Foss and Cathcart have associated it following in this the lead of British captive authors. After the

reminder that Christian slavery was abolished in 1816 following the British assault on Algiers under the command of Lord Exmouth, Shaler goes on to explicate that even before this forceful abolition, the use of the term “slave” to the Christian captives would be a misnomer. He underlines the fact that the Algerine government had suppressed private cruising nearly 50 years ago and that since then the captives had received “sufficient and prompt protection from injury or insult by the natives. (Shaler, 76)” He goes on to compare the conditions of captives in Algiers to that of prisoners in civilized, Christian countries. Shaler then returns to one strand of the Barbary legend that made of Algiers a land of opportunity even for a slave. For readers who sympathized with the English industrial reformers who constructed their campaign for the reform of the factory system by equating exploited workers with slaves, white slavery in Algiers as described by Shaler can make them think of settlement in Algiers to avoid the hard times in Britain. He summarizes the situation of white slaves in Algiers before its abolition by remarking that

generally all who were industriously disposed easily found the means of profiting by it [slavery]. In short, there were slaves who left Algiers with regret, and it is believed that in the aggregate, they carried away a vast sum of money at their embarkation. (Shaler, 77)

Hence in his description of white slavery in Algiers, Shaler seeks to satisfy both the industrial reformers and the discontents of the factory system as well as the abolitionists in order to turn them into supporters of his imperial project. As argued, through this research, Shaler wrote his sketches to defend the thesis that the British Empire had to be recentred by leaving less profitable colonies such as British Canada, which are far removed from the centre of Empire, to colonies close to home in North Africa. To substantiate his thesis motivated primarily by the Monroe Doctrine, Shaler invokes indigenous beliefs and prophecies as the excerpt below demonstrates:

The Algerines are a superstitious people, believing in sorcery, and all sorts of supernatural wonders and predictions; and they have a warning from such source, that their city is to be attacked and taken on a Friday, by **Christians, clothed in**

**scarlet uniforms**, for which cogent reason they shut the city gates on that day, from eleven in the morning till one in the afternoon. (Emphasis mine, Shaler, 75)

It is easy to guess from the quote above that the Christians clothed in scarlet uniforms in question are British soldiers. The eventual conquest of Algiers by the British forces for Shaler would be a self-fulfilling prophecy.

### **Shaler's Prescription of Destiny for Algiers**

Before developing further Shaler's captivity in the orientalist and imperial ideologies and his prescription of a destiny for the Regency, it is perhaps necessary at this stage to include how he came to write his sketches. As already pointed out above, Shaler acknowledges his indebtedness to European orientalist, especially Doctor whom he often cites approvingly in his sketches. It is important to add here that he did set out the writing of the sketches on his own will. According to R.F. Nichols, the idea was suggested to him by Peter S. Dupleau, a famous Philadelphia lawyer and scholar of the American Philosophical society at the end of his furlough in the United States in 1822. It is this Dupleau who sought him out to ask him to write an account on the native languages of Northern Africa, particularly those spoken by the various Berber tribes before the Islamic conquest. One could argue from here that Shaler suddenly found himself in the position of British philologists such as Abraham-Hyacinthe Anquetil-Duperron and a Sir William James. For Said, the latter "most famous pronouncement indicates the extent to which modern orientalism, even in its philosophical beginnings, was a comparative discipline, having for its principal goal the grounding of the European goals in a distant, and harmless, Oriental source, [the Sanscrit language] (Said, 1991: 78)" One could wonder whether Shaler did not set out to do the same with the Berber languages in North Africa to detach linguistically the region from Africa and the Orient and thus to propound easily his imperial project. Any way, Nichols tells us that Shaler went on to work on his assigned philological project by

sending several reports to Duponceau, reports that were heatedly debated among the members of the American Philosophical Society.

Always, according to Nichols, Shaler discovered an interest in the new discipline of philology and in order to accomplish the mission assigned to him by Duponceau he resumed his studies in Greek and Latin. The latter piece of information is very important, for one can infer from the assumptions from which Shaler started his Berber studies. One of them relates to the importance that Shaler accords to the Greek and Roman authors in retracing the origin of the Berber languages. As already underlined on several occasions, Shaler cites sometimes approvingly and at other times disapprovingly the Roman author Saluste as to the history of Numidia. In the fifth sketch devoted to the “different nations or tribes inhabiting the kingdom of Algiers, their probable origin; manners, customs; character, religion, and languages, (Shaler, 84)” it to Herodotus that he turns to give the origin of Kabyle to confirm his belief that its “origin must be as ancient as that of any other known tongue, and that the people who speak it, descend from a stock of the remotest antiquity. (Shaler, 98)” It is not the place here to discuss Shaler’s philological theory of Kabyle, but it is important to note that he confirms Dr Shaw in his dissociation of Kabyle from the Semitic languages. In this regards, he makes the following remark:

If this language [Kabyle] were of Punic origin, it would belong to the class denominated Shemitic, and must naturally bear some analogy to the Hebrew and to the Arabic. Of this, I cannot judge, but I have the assurance of the learned Shaw that it does not, and his opinion is corroborated by that of the Jews and Arabs of this country. (Shaler, 97)

By detaching Kabyle from the family of Shemitic languages on the assurances of Shaw and the placement of Kabyle side by side with Greek in terms of its remote antiquity and on the affirmation of Herodutus, Shaler comes very close to affirming the kinship of Kabyle with the Indo-European family. From here follows the second orientalist assumption of Shaler’s learning Latin and Greek to study Kabyle. Said has amply

demonstrated the historical link between Latin and Greek studies on the one hand, and Orientalist studies on the other hand, so it is not necessary to go further in this respect. It is enough to note that philology, according to Said, laid out the foundations of modern orientalism marked among other things by an evaluative or judgemental comparatism, and that Shaler took so seriously his philological studies that, to paraphrase Nichols, he demanded the recruitment of a competent secretary to help him in his scholarly activity. William B. Hodgson joined him in that capacity in the spring of 1826, and when Shaler left his position of Consul General in Algiers in 1828 the former remained in Algiers to continue the investigation into the Berber language on behalf of the American Philosophical Society. Shaler even suggested to Duponceau at one time of sending him over a child who would be brought up to speak the Berber languages. In his first considerations, he thought about his nephew to try it out this suggestion.

Thus one would argue that in accomplishing his newly discovered vocation as a philologist for the American Philosophical Society, Shaler overshot his goal by moving into other areas of research such as the manners and customs, religion, geography, and the political system in the Kingdom of Algiers in order to further his imperial, orientalist project. So in addition to the suggested affinity that he notes between Berber and Greek, he dwells on the resemblance of the Kabyle physical appearance to that of the Europeans, their “unaffrican moral qualities (Shaler, 92),” the “ingenious and industrious character,” their spirit of independence and their resistance to the Turks, their mastery of crafts like the extraction and smelting of the iron ore, the manufacture of gun powder, and their “indistinct” and “nominal” character of religion and so on. By a subtle analogy made through the reference to the Norman conquest of Anglo-Saxon England and the latter’s resistance to frenchification, Shaler suggests that the Kabyle managed to preserve their ethnic originality as an unsubdued people. Of course, the

ultimate suggestion is that the destiny of the Kabyle is to be assimilated to a comparable nation, which is Britain.

Shaler's description of other nations or tribes such as the Mozabis, the Biscaris, the Showiah, the Touariks are similar to the one he has made of the Kabyle. For each he discovers a huge number of promotional virtues for his imperial project. For example, the Mozabis are portrayed as a "quiet, industrious, and commercial people, noted for their probity in all their dealings. (Shaler, 88)" What is important to observe in Shaler's description of the Mozabis is the fact that they are "the principal agents in the trade of Algiers with the interior [of Africa]. (Shaler, 89)" This is one way of saying that the conquest of Algiers will pave the way for the discovery of the interior of Africa south of the Sahara, and thus open trade routes closed to European commerce by the military occupation of the Kingdom of Algiers by the Turks.

In short, in his description of the demography in the Kingdom of Algiers, Shaler emphasizes the colonizability of the country. The Turks are "mere sojourners as conquerors in Africa (Shaler, 84)" and their power is in decline. The Arabs are a pastoral people who have deserted the fertile plains of the kingdom for Tunis because of "the tyranny and oppression they could not endure. (Shaler, 86)" The Moors constitute the "great majority of the population of the cities of the kingdom (Shaler, 84)" and are the legatees of the commercial activities of the Jews. The various Berber tribes, and "from which probably derives the actual denomination Barbary (Shaler, 91)" are "semi-civilized" industrious and commercial nations that belie this mistaken appellation. In short, the Barbary legend in its negative version is mistaken, and thus needs to be updated in order to attract European settlers.

Shaler does not spare the European powers for have created this negative version of the Barbary legend. For him,

Banditti, like the Algerines, who in their pride of Barbarism and ignorance, despise the arts, the science, and the improvements of civilized society would not merit the attention of history if they had not by a strange fatality, alike dishonorable and injurious to civilization, been incorporated into the political system of Europe. (Shaler, 104)

After having documented very briefly how the great European powers have created the legend for the sole purpose of maintaining monopoly over maritime commerce through the use of the “piratical” state of Algiers as an instrument for harassing minor European maritimes, Shaler shows how the United States set the pace for deflating this legend by refusing to pay tribute and forcefully obliging Turkish Algiers in 1815 to sign a treaty providing for the treatment of captives as prisoners and not as slaves. Britain reluctantly followed suit in 1816 when Lord Exmouth forced the Turkish government of Algiers to liberate Christian slaves and to renounce its piratical activities. Hence, according to Shaler, the process of the decline of the Turkish government is accelerated with the drying up of what he considers as its main source of revenue. He bears witness to the tottering of the Turkish regime by reporting how its mainstay the Janissaries ran amok in the absence of a piratical activity that had maintained them until then. The imminent fall of this regime is dramatized in the assassination of the Dey Omar, the one exceptional political Turkish figure who understood the historical necessity of changing the piratical regime, but who got killed by backward looking Janissaries. This Dey, it has to be noted, is the one who signed the treaties of peace with the United States in 1815 and with Britain in 1816 stipulating his acceptance to put an end to Christian slavery and the cruising activity. The biographical account of this Dey has all the ingredients of a tragedy that Shaler stages for his European audience.

It is in the sixth sketches that Shaler makes the ideology that has captured him clear.

The subheading of this chapter runs as follows:

The probable destiny of this fine region; the best position in Africa, from whence to prosecute discoveries in, commerce with, the interior; influence of the establishment of a European nation in North Africa, on civilization, and the suppression of the trade in Negro slaves. (Shaler, 166)

He sets out by spelling out the reasons why he thinks that the days of the Turkish presence in Algiers are counted. With the depletion of their revenue sources because of the forceful abolition of Christian slavery, the Turks could no longer maintain their presence in Algiers. Some of the sketches present statistics showing the deficit in the balance of trade. However, Shaler relates the decline of the Turkish state in Algiers to the decline of the Ottoman Empire as a whole. “The crazy state of the Ottoman empire, which now appears to be tottering on the brink of ruin, must remove the last pretext upon which the anti-social existence of these banditti can be tolerated, (Shaler, 167)” he writes. For Shaler, the Regency of Algiers is of no particular and urgent interest for the United States now that it has reaped the advantage of building a dissuading naval power out of the past confrontation with the Turks. However, even as an American, he feels interpellated on moral grounds by the destiny of the region in the days to come due to its proximity to Europe as a centre of civilization, the availability of natural resources capable to feed a dense population, its geostrategic position, as well as its fine climate. Shaler follows up with an apologia for a European conquest of the Kingdom of Algiers. A European colonization would give country the prosperity it deserves. It would make possible the realization of the civilization mission in the interior parts of the African continent because of its geopolitical location. It would spare the country further tribal divisions and the extinction of the little sparks of civilization as a consequence of eventual tribal wars, for the decaying Turkish regime is hopelessly condemned to disappear. In other words, European colonization out of purely human reasons would provide a ruling government for the Kingdom of Algiers because the latter was incapable of self-government.

Shaler moves from the general to the specific in his apologia for a European occupation of Algiers. It is when he moves to the specifics of the proposed colonization of the



Kingdom of Algiers that he spells out explicitly the outline of the unwritten story of captivity in the Monroe Doctrine that has informed his sketches from the beginning. The colonization that he proposes would not be built on monopoly but on free trade. Jumping ahead in his discourse about place of the United States in the new world order that he suggests, he writes:

The United States have been and continue to be of more value to England as a separate empire, through the all powerful influence of community of language, manners, and laws, then they ever have been as dependent colonies. (Shaler, 169-170)

It is important to note the use of the word “empire” with reference to the United States because Shaler in the next discursive move he grows apologetic with regard to the colonization of the Kingdom of Algiers by Britain. Admittedly, he concedes, Britain could be blamed for a huge number of abuses of power, and for her self-aggrandizing imperial drive that threatened the “independence and repose of other states,” but it has extenuating considerations such as the institutional character of its government, its past experience of founding colonies upon “constitutional or chartered principles, (Shaler, 170)” and its fostering of self-government in colonies as well as its newly acquired status as an incontestable global power. He closes his apologia as follows: “In the view, therefore, which I take of this subject, it would be for the general interests of the world that Great Britain should determine to occupy and colonize this portion of Africa. (Shaler, 171)”

Shaler anticipates the objection that Britain has already a huge number of colonies and that it could not, therefore, be “encumbered” with additional colonies. In responding to this objection, Shaler discovers the real political drive behind his proposition of a British expansion to the Kingdom of Algiers as a footstep for penetration into the interior parts of Africa. Present-day British colonies, he claims, are “from distance and peculiar circumstances, incapable of ever becoming integral parts of the real strength of her empire. (Shaler, 171)” The next arguments of his imperial project show to what

extent Shaler is captured by the Monroe Doctrine. He fleshes out this Monroe Doctrine with prophetic strokes as to the historical inevitability of the collapse of the British Empire in the Americas implying the historical necessity for the British to leave the American continent in the hands of the United States:

Those [the colonies] of North America will inevitably, in the fullness of time, join the confederation of the United States; those of the American Archipelago, and on the continent adjacent, are mere plantations, whose fate appears to be already drawing to the crisis, and they will probably, at no distant period, experience the lot of St. Domingo. (Shaler, 171)

The argument of geopolitical proximity is applied even to the British presence in India. The concept of Manifest Destiny was not fully propagated in American politics of Shaler's time. However, on reading his prophetic idea that Britain was holding by a thread in India, and it is time to think about leaving it for another colonizing space, one realizes it was already deeply rooted in the American political subconscious or at least that of Shaler. As Nichols observes, Shaler promoted the celebrated Gutiérrez-Magee expedition of 1812-1813 into Spanish Texas for the Madison administration. So one could argue the germ of the idea that United States is destined to stretch from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Coast, and later to blaze an oceanic passage to India was in his mind before John O'Sullivan coined the phrase of Manifest Destiny in his 1845 article written in defence of the annexation of Texas. One can easily make connections between his political anticipation that the United States would expand westward to the Pacific Coast up to the Far East and his suggestion for the removal of the British Empire from India:

Her empire in India is held by too uncertain a tenure to justify any calculations being made upon it; it may serve for many years to come yet to furnish lucrative posts to the dependants of her government, to enrich a colossal corporation, and furnish the means of corruption. That these may be national benefits, it is not my province to affirm or to deny; but it appears obviously, that the British Empire in India can never, under any circumstances, become a portion of her national strength. (Shaler, 171)

It follow from the above that Shaler prefigures America's future as a hemispheric and a great world power. His political vision is that of a new world order based principally on an American imperial nationalism, the best expressions of which are the Monroe Doctrine and what came later to be known as the Manifest Destiny. The new world order was also based on the division of the world in two Anglo-Saxon blocs, the British and American, with clearly defined zones of influence. As he carries on his argument for the reshuffling of global politics, Shaler details the material advantages that the British would reap by bringing their empire close to home by expansion in the Kingdom of Algiers at the least expense because of the weakness of the Turkish regime and the tractability of its inhabitants. The list of these advantages won't be rehearsed here. What is important to note instead is the strategy that he proposes for the long-term integration of the Kingdom of Algiers in his newly conceived British Empire. In this regard, he comes out with the idea of amalgamation for anglicizing the Kingdom of Algiers. The Kingdom of Algiers, he claims,

also offers a very important moral advantage in such a case, in the relative smallness of its population, which would be greatly benefited by the change, and which is of such a character as to admit of amalgamation with the colonists by intermarriage without dishonor to, or deterioration of the pure blood of Europe. (Shaler, 174)

Thus, in the hands of Shaler amalgamation turns into a sexual means of racial fusion and assimilation. The question that deserves to be asked at this stage is where exact Shaler stands in relation to the racial theories of hybridity prevalent at his time. According to Robert J.C.Young, there are five major theories of racial hybridity: the "straightforward polygenist theory" based on the denial that different different can mix; the amalgamation thesis propped up by the melting pot and creolization notions; the thesis that makes racial interbreeding conditional on the proximate and distant species; and finally the "negative version of the amalgamation thesis" that argues against miscegenation on the grounds that it paves the way for racial degeneration and

inevitable mongrelization of the original races. (Young, Robert J.C., 1995: 18) Shaler's choice of amalgamation as a solution to the problem of racial integration is predicated on the "fact" that the Algerian population is very small and that the country has already been depopulated of its least desirable population, the Arabs. The rest of the population the Moors and the Berbers are already declared genetically proximate species earlier in his previous sketches, and so poses no problem for their swamping in English blood. Overall, on reading Shaler's proposition of miscegenation, one has the impression is that he envisages the extermination of the Algerine population by a forceful racial fusion of the native minority with the majority of the English settlers who would immigrate to the English colony of Algiers once it was militarily conquered.

Shaler is even unhappy that this prospect of racial fusion could not be envisaged for the United States, which in his words, is "unfortunately encumbered with a mass of black population which cannot be thus disposed of (Shaler, 174)." So, in order to appear "trivial", as he says, in the eyes of the Europeans for his proposition of the racial dilution of the Algerine population in the British melting pot, he disguises the polygenist theory and the negative version of amalgamation then prevalent more or less in both the American Abolitionist and Anti-Abolitionist movements in the specious argument of the number of the black population in the United States. It has to be noted that it was as a result of the Abolitionist movement that the American Colonization Society was formed and that Monroe founded Monrovia in 1816 for the repatriation of emancipated black slaves considered to be indissoluble in the American melting pot and a threat to the racial purity of the white population. (McCartney John T., 1992: 32-53) As a fervent disciple of Monroe and an unconditional supporter of his doctrines, Shaler could not do otherwise than champion the non-assimilation of the black population in

the United States raising the criterion of racial proportion as a pretext for the non-application of amalgamation theory that he advocates for the Algerine population.

To get another insight into the reasons why Shaler puts the destiny of the Regency of Algiers in the hands of the British, one needs to put the *Sketches of Algiers* in the context of the British economic involvement in Spanish America. As already noted above, by the time of the publication of his book in 1826, all the colonies of Spanish had already won their independence. This opened, in the words of Mary Louise Pratt, a North European “scramble for America” not unlike the scramble for Africa still to come. (Pratt, 2006: 127)” The major actors in this scramble for America were British capitalists preceded by a wave of British travelers that Pratt describes as the “capitalist vanguard”. In this regard, she writes the following:

[T]he wave of South American travelers in the 1810s and 1820s were mainly British, and mainly traveled and wrote as advance scouts for European capital. Engineers, mineralogists, breeders, agronomists, as well as military men – these early nineteenth-century travelers were often sent to the “new continent” by companies of European investors as experts in search of exploitable resources, contacts, and contracts with local elites, information on potential ventures, labour conditions, transport, market potentials, and so forth. (Pratt, 146)

## Conclusion

In the light of what has already been said above, one can conclude by saying that Shaler places himself in the shoes of the South American advance scouts and capitalist vanguard that Pratt describes above. In writing his *Sketches of Algiers*, he acts all the roles that that vanguard had assumed in its explorations of South American countries. In drawing his sketches, he wrote sometimes as an agronomist and breeder, sometimes as a zoologist and a naturalist, at other times as an architect and expert in urbanization, and above all as a military engineer and strategist. In short, he is all the persons constituting the capitalist vanguard in one. However, in foregrounding the exploitable resources, the market potentials, and so forth of the Kingdom of Algiers, Shaler intends to divert British attention from the South American countries by placing emphasis on the

geographical proximity of Algiers to the centre of the British Empire and the promotion of the ideals of civilization and progress in the African continent as a corollary of the redeployment of the British Empire in Africa. In this sense, one could say that Shaler is writing in a similar vein as Pratt's South American scouts in order to counter the attraction that their writings exerted on British imagination and to divert the British expansionist drive from South America to Algiers as a closer and therefore more profitable colony.

To paraphrase Pratt in another context, Shaler is seeking in his *Sketches of Algiers* to bring out a "scramble for North Africa" similar to counter the "scramble for America" that Pratt describes. This largely explains his emphasis on the decay of the Ottoman Empire in general, and that of the Regency of Algiers. The approaching collapse of the Ottoman Empire in his imperial eyes is similar to the fall of Spanish American Empire, and could lead to the same scramble. This political vision has led him to revise or challenge the Barbary legend that stood as a psychological obstacle for the European expansion in North Africa. To use Pratt's words again, one could say that just as the 1810s and 1820s British travelers "reinvented America" for European consumption, Shaler reinvented the Regency of Algiers for British audience. His revised version of the Barbary legend is primarily intended to raise colonial desire for North Africa rather imperial repulsion. In this respect, Shaler's version of the Barbary legend remains as orientalist as the negative version that he has repudiated.

In the final analysis, one could argue that though by the time Shaler officially took his position as Consul General in Algiers in 1815, captivity had ceased to be a physical experience for Americans, but strictly speaking he remains a captive of a compound of ideologies: one of them is the Monroe Doctrine, the other is Orientalism, and the third is American imperial nationalism with an Anglo-Saxon global slant.

## References

- Anderson Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 2006.
- Belhamissi Moulay, *Alger et la guerre secrete 1518-1830*, Alger: Editions ANEP, 2009.
- Crèvecoeur St. John, "What is an American?" in J.A. Leo Lemay, ed., *An Early American Reader*, New Delhi: Asian Books
- Fisher Sir Godfrey, *Barbary Legend: War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1974.
- MacCartney John T., *Black Ideologies: An Essay in African-American Political Thought*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Mattar Nabil, *Europe Through Arab Eyes 1578-1727*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nichols R.F., "William Shaler, New England Apostle of Rational Liberty," in *New England Quarterly*, IX (1936), 71-96.
- Norton Mary Beth et al, *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991.
- Peskin Lawrence, *Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public 1785-1816*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Pratt Mary Louise, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London: Routledge, 2006.
- Shaler William, *Sketches of Algiers, Political, Historical, and Civil*, Boston: Cummings, Hilliard, and Company, 1826.
- Shaw Thomas, *Travels, or Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant*, Oxford, 1938.
- Said W. Edward, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Todorov Tzvetan, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard, New York: HarperPerennial, 1992.
- Young Robert J.C., *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, London: Routledge, 1995.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The foreign policy problems confronting the infant republic from the turn of the century through the mid-1820s strikingly resemble those faced today by the mid-1820s strikingly resemble those faced today by the newly established nations of the Third World. Mother countries often treat their former colonies as if they had not won today, the young United States steered clear of alliances with the great powers, preferring neutrality and unilateralism.

The above quotation by Norton et al puts in a nutshell the postcolonial conditions under which the United States lived its early years of independence. This claim can be widened to describe the prevalent political conditions of Elizabethan England in at least a double sense that will be explained below. In the meantime, it is important to note that my research findings about Barbary captivities will be summarized according to three major critical categories: postcolonialism, orientalism, and the public sphere. I shall link these findings about these non-fictional captivities to the category of captive narratives considered as fiction to open up new research vistas.

As claimed above, the political conditions in Elizabethan England can be qualified as postcolonial for at least two reasons. One of these, as documented by Loades is the domination of England by Spain through the marriage of Bloody Mary to Phillip II. One of the forms that this domination took is Mary's reversion to Catholicism and the persecution and exile of Protestant clerics to foreign countries. This persecution in turn sowed the seeds of Protestant nationalism that flourished when Mary died of a stomach tumor and her Protestant half-sister Elizabeth I acceded to the English throne in 1563. Even then, the feelings of domination did not completely disappear. Shakespeare conveyed these national feelings of the captivity of the whole nation in the marital dilemma in which his major character Portia, Elizabeth I's alter ego, in *The Merchant of Venice* finds herself at the death of her father. Surrounded by a huge number of powerful suitors representing the major political forces of the time, Portia like Elizabeth I was obliged to play the marriage card to neutralize the marital and political rivals. If



one has to look for the independence day of Elizabethan England, it will be the day that the Spanish Armada was defeated in 1588. Until then, England was obliged to maintain friendly relations with Spain.

The second reason why Elizabethan England can be as a postcolonial country is more global. The world in the sixteenth century was dominated by two superpower blocs, the Spanish Empire and the Ottoman Empire, the advantage going to the latter for nearly the whole century. It is in this sense that the victory over the Ottoman fleet by the Catholic Holy Alliance in Lepanto in 1577 was rightly considered by Roger Crowley as the “Trafalgar of Europe”. As a Protestant country, England did not participate in the war, but at the popular level, as Crowley remarks, the uproar of the victory touched the English shores. The oriental domination of Europe by the Orient was stalled, and the threat to the independence to Western countries was reduced.

Two British Barbary captivities, one by Foxe and the other by Haselton, reflect the postcolonial conditions described above. Foxe’s captivity in Egypt along a huge number of nationalities, its emphasis on the crucial part he played in masterminding their escape, the distinctions that he established between English heroism and the cowardice and greediness of other captive escapees, and finally the focus on the recognition that he received from Papal authorities and the Spanish king, Phillip II, show the compensatory drive at the core of the captivity. My research shows that Fox is staging another Lepanto Battle at the individual level to compensate for the chance that England missed to participate in the defeat of the Ottoman Empire. Protestant national heroism against the Ottomans, though expressed at the individual level, is significantly affirmed and recognized by those very Catholic powers, which participated in the battle of Lepanto, and not long ago quasi colonial oppressors of the English Protestants. It is in this sense that I have qualified Foxe’s captivity as a postcolonial captivity affirming the patriotism

of the English in the face of the ex-colonial Spanish and Popish powers, and against the background of a belatedly sublimated battle of Lepanto.

Hasleston's captivity was written under similar postcolonial conditions and for nearly the same reasons as that of Fox. However, whilst Fox portrays himself as a god-favoured English Protestant hero pitting his courage and his ingenuity against his captors and natural elements like the raging sea, Hasleston comes across as an English martyr and anti-Catholic pamphleer. This difference is accounted for in terms of the gap between the dates of publication of the two captivities. Foxe's captivity covered the period between 1563 and 1577 when England was not yet in open war with Spain whereas Hasleston's was concerned with the period (1582-93) when the conflict between the two countries became overt. As my research shows the Spanish captivity in Hasleston's account overshadows the Algerine captivity and makes Algiers and the Barbary Legend appear in very favourable light. As also argued in this research, Hasleston's captivity reads a popular version of John Foxe's *The Acts and Monuments of the English Martyrs*, which in the words of Loades is second in popularity only after the Bible. Posing as a martyr pamphleteer, Hasleston seeks to respond to the prevalent anti-Catholic feeling and the exacerbated sense of Protestant nationalism arising out of the Spanish threat to the independence of the country and thwarted Catholic plots of assassination of the Queen.

John Foss and James Leander Cathcart wrote their American Barbary captivities in similar postcolonial conditions as their fellow British captive authors Fox and Hasleston. Though expressed differently, the major concern of their captivities is the affirmation of selfhood and nationhood threatened by the Barbary State of Algiers with the alleged support of the former colonial power, Britain. The fragility of the national and individual identities of the two captive American authors accounts for the initial culture

shock that one can easily observe in their captivity narratives. What is remarkable in the representation of captivity by these two captive authors is the feeling of strong resentment at having their masculinity as postcolonial American citizens denied internationally as soon as it was proclaimed. Alongside the fact that the captives were feminized by being stripped of the clothes and obliged to wear Barbary clothes resembling female garments, Foss's and Cathcart's captivities are involved in negative self-definition that makes Algiers appear as everything that postcolonial America is not and should not be. In other words, Cathcart and Foss construct Algiers as both a foil and mirror image of a postcolonial American infant nation confronted like postcolonial nations to challenging domestic and foreign issues in its quest for consolidating its identity at home and abroad.

This research also shows that the representation of American captivity shifts with the shift from postcolonial nationalism to the imperial nationalism in its emergent phase at the time of Jefferson's two-term presidency and the Tripolitan war. Two captivities, one of them by Dr Cowdery and the other by Ray are employed to illustrate this ideological shift. The imperial nationalist vision cuts across class lines since both Ray as a tar and Dr Cowdery as a bourgeois man abide by it. This nationalist imperialist vision of Tripoli of the two captives authors is accounted for by reference to American territorial expansion to the West through the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, Jefferson's promotion of the exploration of the Western territories, the creation of the US navy as a result of the crisis with Algiers, and the stability of institutional life shown by the orderly and peaceful change of government that saw the election of an anti-federalist or republican president instead of a federalist one in 1801. Notwithstanding their disagreement over conditions of imprisonment, both Ray and Cowdery celebrated the

gunboat diplomacy adopted by Jefferson and saw in Tripoli a place of subsequent trade for American goods after the war.

The British captivity by John Rawlins is similar to the captivity by Ray though the emphasis is laid on the necessity to strengthening the imperial presence in the Mediterranean. Rawlins wrote his captivity published his captivity in 1622, just a few months after the end of Mansell's expedition against Algiers to supposedly put an end to piratical activities of Algerine corsairs. That expedition, as mentioned in the discussion part, is fostered by King James I's pretention to establish a *pax Britannica* in a politically and religiously divided Europe and the Mediterranean basin infested by pirates involved in an economy of plunder. The Mansell expedition turned into a fiasco and Rawlins used this as a pretext to make a case for the tars, the common seamen, as the mainstay of the British navy. His successful escape from Algiers on board an Algerine cruising ship belonging to an English Renegade, Henry Chandler, after a fomented mutiny, is intended as a contrast to the failure of the Mansell expedition. He succeeded where Mansell failed by bringing English Renegades and Algerine Corsairs to justice in Britain. Far from contesting the emerging national imperial ideology of James I, Rawlins militates for more consideration to be given to the common seamen as the one condition for the improvement of the British navy, and hence the realization of the imperial ideals set for it.

Okley's captivity, the next captivity after that of Rawlins in terms of chronology, explicitly starts with Okley's ship sailing to the New World when it was intercepted by Algerine Corsairs in 1639. The initial goal is to found a Puritan colony or plantation in the Islands of Providence, or Henrietta accorded by royal charter to a prominent group of dissident, anti-royalist parliamentary leaders. As argued in the discussion part of this research, the captivity of Okley was published after the English Civil War, in 1675

during the restoration period when anti-royalist Protestantism was revived by Puritans as a result of the Catholic propensities of the Stuart kings Charles II and James II. This particular contextualization makes Okeley's captivity read as an allegory where captivity in Algiers turns into a Puritan captivity in a corrupt England. Anti-Islamic polemics is interwoven with a subtle anti-Catholic propaganda. As a devotional text, Okeley's captivity promotes the idea of Puritan immigration to the imperial frontiers in the New World in order to found godly kingdoms.

The British emergent imperial ideology as it was implemented by Charles II in Tangier turned into a fiasco. Initially conceived as a point of entry into the interior of Africa, the colony under the siege of the Moroccan troops of Mouley Ismail was turned into a site of captivity and a place of confinement of British soldiary before it was forcefully evacuated. It is partly against this foundering of the British imperial project in North Africa that Thomas Phelps's captivity (1685) in Meknes acquires one of its meanings. If Phelps was captured by Salee corsairs and taken to Meknes, it is because the British North African imperial drive was rolled back by the Moroccan troops. In a sense, Phelps's heroic escape from Meknes and his burning of the Moroccan fleet could be seen as a face-saving feat considering the huge national debacle. This British North African imperial project was revived in the last captivity to be covered by this research that of Joseph Pitts, which published in 1704. What is remarkable about this captivity is the self-appointment of the captive author as an apostate-secret agent prefiguring such nineteenth and twentieth century orientalist, imperial authors such as Burton and Lawrence of Arabia. His captivity account also prefigures Thomas Shaw's *Travels of Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant* (1738), which served as the intertext for William Shaler's *Sketches of Algiers*.

With Shaler's book, American Barbary captivity ceases to be a corporeal captivity to become a captivity in an orientalist-cum-imperial ideology. By the time of its publication in 1826, America had fully entered into the age of national imperialism as a result of its victory over the British during the Anglo-American war of 1812, its expansion into Western territories, its compelling of the North African States to sign treaties giving it the status of favoured nation, and of course the consolidation of its navy. The Monroe Doctrine is the best expression of this national imperialism that Shaler deploys to divide the world between Britain and the United States on the basis of geographical proximity, with the African continent reserved for the former and the American continent for the latter. As I have tried to show, the Monroe doctrine informs Shaler's book at every turn and constitutes the unwritten story of captivity behind the *Sketches of Algiers*. Written principally for a British audience, especially the British official circles, Shaler's book draws heavily on Thomas Shaw's *Travels of Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant* (1738) to revive dormant British imperial interests in North Africa instead of the newly independent Latin American countries. In so doing, he rewrites the Barbary legend in such a way as to make his proposed imperial project fit in with the British imperial rhetorics of that period of time. Shaler's orientalism is qualified as modern orientalism in the sense that it was spelled out from a dominant scholarly position in the relations of power between the Orient and the Occident. In other words, his orientalism fits Said's definition of orientalism as the Western will to power and to govern what is described as the decaying kingdom of Algiers for the benefit of commerce, civilivization and christiandom. My research has shown that this definition does not hold true for the other types of orientalism developed by the rest of British and American Barbary captivities. The dominant form of orientalism developed in the premodern British captivity is basically popular and

religious. This popular and religious orientalism finds expression basically in medieval anti-Islamic polemics which sound much more as a reaction to the alleged Islamic threat than a will to power on the part of the British. This religious orientalism is informed by a strategy of containment of Islamic power rather than of conquest of North Africa. After the debacle of Tangier, the conquest of North Africa remained just a pious wish to which Pitts's captivity bear witness. As the proverb has it, "a burnt child dreads the fire," so after the fiasco of the Mansell expedition and the debacle of Tangier, the British felt compelled to suspend their imperial and orientalist reveries about North Africa until the second decade of the nineteenth century when Shaler had tried to revive them with reference to Dr. Shaws's ethnographic travelogue.

I have observed a similar development in American orientalism. Before reaching its modern stage, American orientalism is also religious in its expression. Cotton Mather's captivity sermon is a good illustration of the religious character of American orientalism during the colonial period. This American religious orientalism, like that of the British captivity authors, borrows heavily from premodern anti-Islamic polemics. Written in the postcolonial period of American history, Foss's and Cathcart's captivities remain steeped in popular orientalism but its medium of expression was no longer predominantly religious, but rather secular in its character. However, this secularisation of American orientalism does not mean that Foss's and Cathcart's captivities have totally shed their religious function. I have observed that Foss and Cathcart indulge in a popular sentimentalism in order to whip up the emotions of the readers the better to rally them to their cause. Just as in sentimental fiction, Foss and Cathcart self-represent themselves as virtuous captive heroes resisting the oppression of oriental tyrants. The battle of American republican virtues against orientalism is steeped in sentimentalism, and sentimentalism as the affiliated literature such as Samuel Richardson's *Pamela, or*

*Virtue Rewarded* shows was elevated into a quasi religious practice during the Enlightenment period. Sentimentalism being essentially linked to writings about virtuous females under masculine siege, this research considers that the postcolonial sentimental American orientalism of Foss and Cathcart cannot be of the conquering type of orientalism as is the case with the one elaborated by Shaler in his *Sketches of Algiers*. This research does not sole put into brackets some of the claims made by Said in his *Orientalism*, it also questions the theory of the private and public spheres developed by Jurgen Habermas. Habermas makes the case that the public sphere is the creation of the bourgeois class, and as such is closed to the rank and file. The Barbary captivities published mostly by ordinary seamen demonstrate that it is far from being the case since these captive ordinary sea men have entered the public sphere by recounting their captivities from the perspective of the predominant political, economic, social, religious and cultural issues of their times. For example, Ray who is a simple tar in the *Philadelphia* used his captivity in Tripoli to denounce all at once the denial of freedom to prison debtors, badly treated children, the tars recruited by force, and the Tripoli captives. His captivity, as noted in the discussion part of this research, holds an intertextual relationship with Dr.Cowdery's captivity account. The debate about freedom assumes a political dimension opposing the Republican Anti-Federalist Ray who is in favour of the extension of freedom to the working class to the elitist, Federalist Dr. Cowdery who looked down on his fellow tar captives during the Tripoli crisis.

The use of captivity narratives as a means of entry into the public sphere is not limited to the captivities placed in the category of non-fiction accounts such as the ones treated in this research. It is also the case with fictional Barbary captivity narratives. For example, it would be interesting to examine how fictional Barbary captivity narratives



are strategically deployed to deal with nationally sensitive and taboo issues such as slavery and gender in the early years of American independence. For example, the Algerine-American crisis enabled Mrs Rowson to put on stage Pamela-like figures in captivity in Algiers. As a national allegory, her play *Slaves in Algiers, or a Struggle for Freedom* (1794) puts side by side masculine domination at home and the enslavement of white captives abroad in Algiers, and places the struggle against these forms of domination on an equal footing. Deploying the same sentimental plot of a virtuous American-British female under oriental, masculine tormentor, Maria Martin's *History of the Captivity and Sufferings of Maria Martin* (1807) also reads as an allegory intended as a denunciation of masculine oppression. In short in both these captivities, captivity in Barbary is used as a pretext to militate for the rights and liberties of women.

Another sensitive issue raised through the fictional captivity tops is that of slavery. Benjamin Franklin deploys it in the form of a hoax, an alleged letter addressed by Sidi Mehemet Ibrahim, a member of the Divan of Algiers to protest against the suppression of slavery. Like Rowson and Martin, Franklin takes the Algerine-American crisis as an opportunity to state his position with respect to the nationally dividing and sensitive issue of slavery during the debates over the Constitution. Also in the same manner as Rowson and Martin, Franklin represents the defenders of black slavery at home as strange bed fellows with the Algerine slave masters in Algiers, exposing their economically absurd argument for the maintenance of the slavery system. Franklin's fellow American author Royall Tyler in his *Algerine Captive, or the Life and Adventures of Doctor Updike Underhill* (1797) mounts a similar attack against slavery through his Candide-Yankee character the doctor Updike Underhill held captive by the Dey of Algiers. In a staged encounter with an Algerine "Mollah", our Doctor character turned slave dealer now that he is captive in Algiers has one of the sore truths of

American history thrown at his face by the Mollah who reminds him of the brutality of the “Christians of the West Indies and the Christians of your plantations.”

Of all the fictional American Barbary captivity narratives, no one best illustrates the issue raised in this research than *Slaves in Barbary: A Drama in Two Acts* (1817) included in Caleb Bingham’s *The Columbian Orator: Containing a Variety of Original and Selected Pieces Together with Rules Calculated to Improve You and Others in the Ornamental and Useful Art of Eloquence*. The drama in question is emplotted in the same manner as Tyler’s *Algerine Captive* with an American slaveholder held captive in Tunis and falling in the hands of one of his exslaves now working for one of the notables in that city. The most important thing to note in this drama is that Barbary captivity is used for the instruction of the youth in the art of eloquence, and one of these youths is no one else than Frederick Douglass the originator of the American slave narrative, which played a crucial role in the democratization of political life for nearly half a century. *With Slaves in Barbary* included in the *Columbian Orator* as an epistemological and pedagogical tool for teaching the youth the art of eloquence, this research comes full circle back to Plato’s captivity myth with which I have started my research.

## References

Bingham Caleb, *The Columbian Orator*, Boston: Caleb Bingham and Co., 1817.

Martin Maria, “History of the Captivity and Sufferings of Mrs Maria Martin...,” in Paul Baepler, *White Slaves, African Masters*, 1999.

Habermas Jurgen, *The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.

Norton Mary Beth, et all, *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1991.

Said Edward W., *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin, 1991.

Rowson Susanna, *Slaves in Algiers, or a Struggle for Freedom*, Philadelphia: Wrigley and Berriman, 1994.

Tyler Royall, *The Algerine Captive, or the Life and Adventures of Doctor Updike Underhill*, New York: The Modern Library, 2002.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I.Primary Sources:

- Baepler Paul, ed., *White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Captivity Narratives*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Shaler William, *Sketches of Algiers*, Boston: Cummings, Hilliard, and Company, 1826.
- Vitkus Daniel J., ed., *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

## I.Secondary Sources

### A. Books

- Ahlstrom Sidney, *A Religious History of the American People*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Bataille, Gretchen, Ed. *Native American Representations: First Encounters, Distorted Images, and Literary Appropriations*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Bell, Michael. *Sentimentalism, Ethics and the Culture of Feeling*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Berk, Stephen E. *Calvinism Versus Democracy: Timothy Dwight and the Origins of American Evangelical Orthodoxy*. Hamden, Conn: Archon/ Shoe String Press, 1974. .
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The American Jermiad*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978, p, 163-165.
- -----, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1975.
- Berger, John, *Ways of Seeing*, London: BBC and Penguin Books, 1973.
- Bingham Caleb, *The Columbian Orator*, Boston: Caleb Bingham and Co., 1817.
- Brian Yothers, *The Romance of the Holy land in American Travel Writing, 1790-1876*, Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1997.
- Burstein, Andrew. *Sentimental Democracy: The Evolution of America's Romantic Self-Image*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1999.
- Campbell Joseph, *Hero with a Thousand Faces*, New York, 1949.
- Coley Linda, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600-1850*, London: Pimlico, 2003.
- Crowley Roger, *Empires of the Sea: The Final Battle for the Mediterranean, 1521-1580*, London: Faber and Faber, 2008.

- Damon, Linker. "Calvin And American Exceptionalism". In Johannsen, Robert W. "The Meaning of Manifest Destiny." *Manifest Destiny and Empire*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997.
- Defoe Robinson, *Robinson Crusoe*, London: Penguin, 1994.
- Davis Rober C., *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast and Italy, 1500-1800*, London: Macmillan, 2004.
- Dippie, Brian W. *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy*. Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1982
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997
- Ebersole Gary, L. *Captured by Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity*, Charlottesville and London, University Press of Virginia, 2003.
- Edmund Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Fabian, Ann. *The Unvanished Truth, Personal Narrative in Nineteenth Century America*. Standford: Standford University Press, 2000.
- Fisher Sir Godfrey, *Barbary Legend : War, Trade and Piracy in North Africa 1415-1830*, London : Greenwood Press, 1974.
- Garcés Maria Antonia, *Cervantes in Algiers: A Captive's Tale*, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002.
- Gesa Mackenthun, « The Transoceanic Emergence of American Postcolonial Identities,» in, *A Companion to the Literatures of Colonial America*, eds. Susan Castillo and Ivy Schweitzer, Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- Giles Milton, *White Gold: The Extraordinary Story of Thomas Pellow and North Africa's One Million European Slaves*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2004.
- Habermas Jurgen, *The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.
- Hebb David Delison, *Piracy and the English Government 1616-1642*, London: Scholar Press, 1994.
- Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Samuel Butlern, Mineola: Dover Publications, 1999.
- Joe Snader, *Caught between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.
- Kammen, Michael. *Spheres of Liberty: Changing Perceptions of Freedom in American Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.
- Khalid Bekkaoui, ed., *White Women Captives in North Africa: Narratives of Enslavement, 1735-1830*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Kidd, S.Thomas. *American Christians and Islam*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- -----, *American Christians and Islam: Evangelical Culture and Muslims from the Colonial Period to the Age of Terrorism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- -----, *God of Liberty: A Religious History of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books, 2010.
- Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kritzler Edward, *Jewish Pirates of the Caribbean*, New York: Anchor Books, 2008;
- Lambert, Frank. *The Barbary Wars: American Independence in the Atlantic World*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2005.
- McCartney John T., *Ideologies: An Essay in African-American Political Thought*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Mather, Cotton. *Pastoral Letter* (1696) in Kazanjian, David. *The Colonizing Trick: National Culture and Imperial Citizenship in Early America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Mattar Nabil, *Islam and Britain 1558-1685*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- -----, *Europe Through Arab Eyes 1578-1747*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- -----, *Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*, trans. John Rutherford, London: Penguin, 2001.
- Miller, Perry. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1956.
- Morill John, *Stuart Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Nasir Sari J., *The Arabs and the English*, London: Longman, 1976.
- Nicholas Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Noll, Mark A. *America's God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Norton et all, *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1991.
- Parker Richard B., *Uncle Sam in Barbary: A Diplomatic History*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.
- Peskin Lawrence A., *Captives and Countrymen 1785-1816*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009.

- Plato, *Plato: The Collected Dialogues Including the Letters*, trans. Lane Coopers et al, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Playfair Robert Lambert, *The Scourge of Christendom: Annals of British Relations with Algiers Prior to the French Conquest*, London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1884.
- Pratt Mary Louise, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London: Routledge, 2006.
- Richard Parker, *Uncle Sam in Barbary: A Diplomatic History*.Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.
- Richardson Samuel, *Pamela*, London: Penguin, 1985.
- Robson Misklcze, *Women and Children First : Nineteenth-Century Sea Narratives and American identity*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Robert Allison, *The Crescent Obscured: The United States and the Muslim World, 1776-1815*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Ronald Susan, *The Pirate Queen: Elizabeth I, her Pirate Adventurers, and the Dawn of Empire*, New York: Harper, 2007.
- Rowson Susanna, *Slaves in Algiers, or a Struggle for Freedom*, Philadelphia: Wrigley and Berriman, 1994.
- Russell D. Buhite *Lives at Risk: Hostages and Victims in American Foreign Policy*, Wilmington: Scholarly Resources. Inc, 1995.
- Sayre, Gordon M, ed. *American Captivity Narratives: Selected Narratives with Introduction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Slotkin, R. (1885), *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialisation 1800-1890*, New York, Simon and Schuster Inc, 1998.
- , *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*, Middletown, Connecticut, 1973.
- Swift Jonathan, *Gulliver's Travels*, London: Penguin, 1994.
- Timothy Marr, *The Cultural Roots of American Islamism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Todorov Tzvetan, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans., Richard Howard, New York: Harper, 1992.
- Trees, Andrew, S., *The Founding Fathers and the Politics of Character*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Turner Victor, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Tyler Royall, *The Algerine Captive, or the Life and Adventures of Doctor Urdike Underhill*, New York: The Modern Library, 2002.

-Vaughan Alden T., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1981.

-Virgil, *The Aeneid*, trans. W.F. Jackson Knight, London: Penguin Books, 1985.

-Williams Daniel E., ed., *Liberty's Captives: Narratives in the Print Culture of the Early Republic*, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006.

-Wolf John B., *The Barbary Coast: Algeria under the Turks 1500-1830*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1979.

-Young Robert J.C., *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, London: Routledge, 2002.

-Zakai Avihu, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

## **B.Articles from the Web and Periodicals:**

-Anne Marie Plane, "Indian and English Dreams: Colonial Hierarchy and Manly Restraint in Seventeenth-Century New England," in *New Men: Manliness in Early America* ed. Thomas A.Foster. New York: New York University Press, 2011.

- Axell James, "The White Indians of Colonial America," in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 32 (1975)

-Baepler, Paul. "White Slaves, African Masters." *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*, July 2003.

- Berman, Jacob Rama. "The Barbarous Voice of Democracy: American Captivity in Barbary and The Multicultural Specter." *American Literature* 79.1 (2007): 1-28. Web. 12 October 2009.

- Boehmer, Elleke. "Imperialism and Textuality". In E. Boehmer, *Colonial & Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. New York: Oxford, 2005.

-Bouânani, Moulay Ali. "Propaganda for Empire: Barbary Captivity Literature in the US." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, December 2009.

-Brant, Irving. "Madison: On the Separation of Church and State." *William and Mary Quarterly* 8, January, 1951.

- Breen T.H., "Persistent Localism: English Social Change and the Shaping of New England Institutions," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 32 January, 1975.

-Brown, L. Carl. "The United States and the Maghrib." *Middle East Journal* 30, Summer 1976.

-Burchard, Waldo W. "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains." *American Sociological Review*



19, October 1954.

- Carson, L. Herbert. Adalou Carson. "The Jews, Royall Tyler, and America's Divided Mind". United States Authors Series of Twayne Publishers, Inc , 1976.
- Daniel Long Hoeveler, « The Female captivity Narratives: Blood, Water, and Orientalism » in *Interrogating Orientalism : Contextual Approaches and Pedagogical Practices*, eds. Daniel Long Hoeveler and jeffrey Cass, Colombus: Ohio State University Press, 2006.
- Davis, R. 2001. "Counting European Slaves on the Barbary Coast." *Past & Present*, New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Edward Larkin, Nation and Empire in Early US, [http://alh. Oxford Journals. org/content /22/3/501. full. pdf+html](http://alh.oxfordjournals.org/content/22/3/501.full.pdf+html), accessed in May 15, 2010.
- Elliott, Emory. *The Literature of Puritan New England*, in *The Cambridge History of American Literature* series, Vol. I, 1996, p, 46.
- Ewing, K.P. (1990) "The Illusion of Wholeness: Culture, Self, and the Experience of Inconsistency," *Ethos*, 1990.
- "The Legacy of Puritanism." Divining America, in National Humanities Center. <http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/tserve/eighteen/ekeyinfo/legacy.htm>access, 21/12/2014.
- Fatima Harrak, « Captivity and Slavery in the Maghrib », in *The Journal of African History*, (Vol.41, N°2, 2000.
- Germain, Dom A. H. "Catholic Military and Naval Chaplains, 1776- 1917." *The Catholic Historical Review* 15, July, 1929.
- G.S. Starr, « Escape from Barbary: A Seventeenth Century Genre », *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 29, N°.1, Nov, 1965.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Work of Representation". In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London. Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage Publication, 1997.
- Howarth, A. "Social representation is not a Quiet Thing: Exploring the Critical Potential of Social Representations Theory," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 2006.
- Johannsen, Robert W. "The Meaning of Manifest Destiny." *Manifest Destiny and Empire*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997.
- Jared Gradner, *Master Plots: Race and the founding of American Literature, 1787-1845*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity". In *American Literature*, 1998.
- Kathleen M. Brown, "Beyond the Great Debates: Gender and Race in Early America," *Reviews in American History*. March 1998
- Kidd, Thomas S. "Is It Worse to Follow Mahomet than the Devil? Early American Uses of Islam", *Church and History*. 72, no. 4, 2003.

- Kitzinger, S. & C. Wilkinson "Theorizing Representing the Other," in Wilkinson, C. & S. Kitzinger (eds.) *Representing the Other: a Feminism & Psychology Reader*, London: Sage, 1996.
- Linda Colley, "Going Natives, telling Tales: Collaborations and Empir," *Past and Present* N°, 168, Aug, 2000.
- Lotfi Ben Rejeb, "Observing the Birth of a Nation: The Oriental Spay/Observer Genre and Nation Making in Early American Literature", <http://opus.macmillan.yale.edu/workpaper/pdfs/MESV5-9.pdf>, accessed on April, 2010.
- Metzger, Charles H. "Chaplains in the American Revolution." *The Catholic Historical Review* 31, April, 1945.
- Munoz, Vincent P. "James Madison's Principle of Religious Liberty." *The American Political Science Review* 97, February, 2003.
- Nichols, R. F., "William Shaler, New England Apostle of Rational Liberty," *New England Quarterly*, IX (1936).
- Pangborn, Matthew. Royall Tyler's *The Algerine Captive*, America, and the Blind Man of Philosophy. *Arizona Quarterly* 67.3, Autumn 2011.
- Rand H. Fishbein, "Echoes from the Barbary Coast: History of U.S. Military Actions against Pirates," *The National Interest*, 65-66: 66, Winter 2001/2002.
- -----, "The United States and the Specter of Islam: Early Nineteenth Century" <http://128.36.236.77/workpaper/MESV3-1.pdf> (accessed on March 30, 2010).
- Shakman, Elizabeth Hurd. "Appropriating Islam: The Islamic Other in the Consolidation of Western Modernity" in *Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, Spring 2003.
- Stagg J.C.A. *The Political Essays of William Shaler. William and Mary Quarterly* : Volume LVIV, Number 2, 2003.
- Starr, G.A. "Escape from Barbary: A Seventeenth-Century Genre." *Huntington Library Quarterly*. Vol 29:1. (Nov 1965).
- VanDerBeets Richard, "The Indian Captivity Narrative as Ritual," in *American Literature*, 43 (1971-1972).
- Weiss, Gillian. "Imagining Europe through Barbary Captivity" *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, June, 2007.
- Woidat, Caroline. "Puritan Daughters and 'Wild' Indians: E. Oakes Smith's Narratives of Domestic Captivity." *Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers*, 2001.
- Zuckerman, Michael. "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America". *William and Mary Quarterly Journal*. Omohundro Institute. Volume 34, April, 1977.

## **C.Dissertations and Theses:**

- Fatima Maameri, *Ottoman Algeria in Western Diplomatic History with Particular Emphasis on Relations with the United States of America, 1776-1816*. PhD diss, The University of Constantine, 2008.

- Julie Pal, *In the hands of Savages: representations of female Barbary Captivity Narratives in Anglo- American Narratives, 1722-1818*, PhD diss, University of Virginia, 2000.
- Julie R.Voss, *The Eagle and the Crescent: Early U.S. Literary Encounters with Islam* , (PhD diss, University of Kentucky, 2006.
- Robin Miskolcze, *Don't Rock the Boat: Women and Shipwreck Narratives in early United States Culture* (PhD diss, University of Nebraska, 2000)
- Sears, Christine. E. *A Different Kind of Slavery: American Captives in Barbary, 1776—1830*, Ph.D., University of Delaware, 2007.
- Weiss, Gillian. *Back from Barbary: Captivity, Redemption and French Identity in the Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Mediterranean*, PhD diss, Stanford University, 2002.