

**IMPERIALISM AND THE EMERGING WHITE STATE IN THE EARLY
COLONY OF VIRGINIA**

A Thesis

by

STUART DAVID BECKER

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Chair of Committee,	Joe R. Feagin
Committee Members,	Joseph O. Jewell
	April Hatfield
Head of Department,	Jane Sell

May 2014

Major Subject: Sociology

Copyright 2014 Stuart David Becker

ABSTRACT

What accounts for the reality of U.S. imperialism and race today? How, and to what extent, is today's system of racial domination and U.S. imperialism prefigured by the early English colonization of Virginia during the time period 1607-1669? I examine primary documents such as narratives and laws from the colony Virginia. Through this case study of the colony of Virginia, I utilize anti-colonial, internal colonialism theory, and a Black Marxist approach to show its effectiveness explaining that capitalism and systemic racism are two sides of the same coin. Through the dialectical method, I show the elite colonists' efforts at uniting all colonists as "white" against the indigenous people and the African servants and slaves in an early emergence of a "white state." The white people's state is a unification of the white ruling class and white laborers against colonized people.

Through this case study of the colony of Virginia, I show some key characteristics of Euro-American imperialism such as the white elite imperialists' attempt to attain wealth through stealing land and natural resources of peoples throughout the world. These white imperialists use violence and terrorism in order to steal the land and extract natural resources from peoples around the world. I also utilize the Marxist-Leninist theory of the imperialist state and apply it to my analysis of the Virginia General Assembly. The function of the state is to protect private property and to protect the interests of the elite exploiting class. For instance, this alien state power legalizes the usurpation of land of the indigenous people. It also legalizes the enslavement of Africans and indigenous people and the exploitation of European

indentured servants. The largest planters sat on the Virginia General Assembly and wrote laws in their own selfish interests of profitmaking. Through primary sources, I show the early emergence of the white racial frame in the narratives of the elite colonists of Virginia and how it rationalizes stealing the land, natural resources, and labor of colonized people of color.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
How to Deal with the Question of Race and Class.....	9
The Case for an Anti-Colonial Approach: Parasitic Capitalism, Imperialism	16
The White Racial Frame	26
A Discussion of Colonialism.....	32
White Oppressor Nation.....	34
The White Capitalist State.....	36
Methods.....	42
CHAPTER III THE VIRGINIA COMPANY OF LONDON.....	49
Conclusion.....	59
CHAPTER IV PARASITISM, STOLEN LAND AND RESOURCES.....	61
Conclusion.....	70
CHAPTER V THE WHITE RACIAL FRAME AND THE EARLY CONSTRUCTION OF “RACE” IN THE COLONY OF VIRGINIA	72
Conclusion.....	78
CHAPTER VI THE EMERGING “WHITE CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST STATE” IN THE COLONY OF VIRGINIA.....	80
Colonial State Constructing an “Oppressor White Nation”	90
English Imperialist Wars Against the Indigenous People: The Armed Forces Serving the Interests of the Colonial-Imperialist Elite.....	96
Conclusion.....	123
CHAPTER VII CONCLUSION	126
REFERENCES	138

APPENDIX A	145
APPENDIX B	146

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Virginia was the first colony in English settler colonial North America that would eventually become the United States, the leading imperialist nation in the world today (Parenti 1995). The driving force of this study is: What accounts for the reality of U.S. imperialism and race today? How, and to what extent, is today's system of racial domination and U.S. imperialism prefigured by the early English colonization of Virginia during the time period 1607-1669? How did political and economic processes during this time period of the founding of the colony of Virginia help shape and set a foundation for the present system of racial domination and U.S. imperialism? Scholars often differentiate between systemic or structural racism and the capitalist system, not emphasizing enough how the two systems are interlocking. Orthodox Marxism argues that race and racism is merely a tool to divide an ambiguous working class. Race theorists often do not point to the global capitalist and imperialist system as the root cause of racial oppression or do not emphasize it enough. However, the social, economic, and political oppression of people of color and the ideology of white supremacy is fundamental to the European capitalist/imperialist system. Anti-colonial theory can rescue these two approaches as it informs us that the capitalist system and systemic racism are in fact one in the same. Anti-colonial theory tells us that the European dominated capitalist system is a parasite living off of the stolen land, labor, and resources of people of color all over the world (DuBois 1965; Yeshitela 2012). Also,

anti-colonial theory tells us that the exploitation of the white working class happens on a pedestal of the oppression of colonized people of color. The white ruling class shares the stolen colonial loot with the oppressor white population (DuBois 1965; Yeshitela 2012). Due to efforts by the white bourgeois ruling class to create the category of whiteness and bestow upon the European working class the “wages of whiteness,” the European or white working class has largely opportunistically abandoned the struggles of colonized people of color (DuBois 1935). Through the creation of “whiteness,” the European working class has largely sacrificed their long term class interests and have often been on the front lines of the white ruling class’s wars against colonized people for their stolen land, labor, and resources which are necessary for the enrichment of the white ruling class and white world (Hess 2000). Orthodox Marxist approaches do not acknowledge that white working class struggles are often struggles for “white rights” occurring on a pedestal of colonial oppression. Through this case study of the colony of Virginia, I attempt to utilize anti-colonial, internal colonialism theory, and a Black Marxist approach to show its effectiveness explaining that capitalism and systemic racism are two sides of the same coin (Allen 1970; Robinson 1983).

The colony of Virginia, which was colonized by the Virginia Company in 1607, is relevant to the system of U.S. imperialism and capitalism today because it is the first colony of English settler colonial America (Morgan 1975; Taylor 2001). Imperialism can be defined as transnational investment and capital accumulation by the western white bourgeoisie such as the ruling circle in United States and traditionally oppressive European states (Parenti 2011: 6). This results in the theft and exploitation of the land,

resources, labor, and markets of the masses of people on earth largely, people of Africa, Latin America, and Asia (Parenti 2011). Capitalism is a system based on private profitmaking by the bourgeoisie or owners of the means of production as a result of the exploitation of the proletariat or working class, who sell their labor to the bourgeoisie for a wage (Marx, Engels, Gasper 2005). The Virginia Company of London was an early capitalist corporation or colonial enterprise (Morgan 1975). Many of the same features of this colonial enterprise and colonial system are present in today's system of U.S. imperialism and colonial domination (systemic racism) (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006; Yeshitela 2010). In the 1600s, similar to today's capitalist system, this early capitalist corporation, was controlled completely by European or white elites. These elites were the rulers of society and their interests shaped the legal and political superstructure of society (Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005; Domhoff 2006; Parenti 2011). The economic reality was the basic foundation of this society and all other societal activity happened on top of this economic reality-the political system, the court system, cultural and religious institutions (Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005). Racial oppression was fundamental to this economic reality. The whole social system was controlled by the interests of the English economic elites. In the colony of Virginia, the English colonial elites were essentially the rulers of the society. They were eventually able to subjugate the indigenous people of the surrounding area and influence their lives in a negative way (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000; Taylor 2001). Later on, African laborers were brought in as internal colonial subject people to labor on the plantations, enriching the English empire (Williams 1944; Blackburn 2010).

Fighting for the interests of this corporation and the English investors and planters (colonial elites) were armed forces which included the group of laborers, the English indentured servants, or in other words poor and working English colonists (what would later be designated as white people) (Morgan 1975). These elite, working, and poor English people came to “North America” largely united in their mission to colonize Virginia. The indigenous people were the victims of this conquest and English imperialism in the interests of its elite investors and elite planter class. The indigenous people were brutalized and wiped out as a result of the profitmaking interests of the English/European imperialists. The English colonists’ racist warped view of the indigenous people of the America’s (they are viewed as savages, uncivilized, infidels (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Smith 1612; Waterhouse 1622; Morgan 1975) justified their brutal treatment, colonization, stealing their land, and wiping them out (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000). This racist framing is the ideological underpinning of the system of European and American imperialism and the system of global capitalism which was thrust into motion as a result of European colonization of the rest of the world beginning with the enslavement of Africans and genocide of indigenous people of the Americas (Dubois 1965). England’s Virginia Company and the English colonists wiped out the indigenous population because they sought control over the land for their plantation cash crop: tobacco (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000). These crops were sent back to England, giving England elites a commodity that expanded their economy (Morgan 1975; Taylor 2001; Hornsby 2005; Blackburn 2010). The English economic elites pursued colonization for the potential of the colony to provide potential commodities to sell for

their unjust enrichment (Hariot 1588; Haklyut 1609; Smith 1612; Morgan 1975). Foundational to the enrichment of these European powers is racial oppression, exploitation, genocide, and racial slavery.

I selected this time period because I wanted to examine the process of the colony reducing the Algonquian population from 24,000 in 1607 to 2,000 in 1669 (Taylor 2001). This time period was an important period for the unity of English economic elites and poor and working English colonists into one “oppressor nation” (Bonacich 1980, Yeshitela 2005). They would later become known as “white,” contrasting themselves against the colonized indigenous people of North America (Allen 1997).

Studying the beginning of English America can help us understand and explain the reality of U.S. imperialism today. It can help us explain how corporations and the wealthy elite classes interact with governments. Today’s corporate controlled United States government (Parenti 1995; Domhoff 2006) is built on a foundation of private corporations (such as the Virginia Company of London, the Plymouth Company of London, and the Massachusetts Bay Company) and elite Europeans and rank and file Europeans colonizing North America in the interests of taking advantage of the land and the rich resources that they planned to sell as commodities for private profitmaking (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Smith 1612; Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975; Cushing 1978). For example, in the case of colonial Virginia, the interests of the corporation, elite investors or the interests of the economic elites of England were the driving force in settling the colony (Morgan 1975). The English economic elites of the colony and the corporation set up the Virginia General Assembly (Morgan 1975). The largest planters and masters

of the colony sat on the assembly and they wrote the laws in their interests of private profitmaking (Morgan 1975). These interests conflicted directly with the interests of the English indentured servants and later African servants and slaves who later entered into an already exploitative system (Williams 1944). The interests of the laborers and the exploiting class conflict directly because the exploiting class became wealthy on the backs of the laboring indentured servants and eventually the super-exploited African slaves, and the indigenous people who were victims of genocide and enslavement (Morgan 1975). African slaves experienced worse treatment than English indentured servants due to racist justifications (Morgan 1975; Blackburn 2011). The English envisioned that the indigenous people would be enslaved to labor for the corporation. This proved too difficult, so instead the English worked vigorously to wipe them out (Morgan 1975; Feagin 2006). It goes without saying that the laws written by the Virginia General Assembly conflicted with the interests, the sovereignty, the self determination of the indigenous people (Morgan 1975; Cushing 1978).

This study can help us understand how the present reality of U.S. imperialism is based on a past political-economic foundation. It can help us see how imperialism deals with other colonized subject people when they want control over their land and resources. This study can also help us understand how certain racial groups are framed and treated when the European (white) empires encounter them. For instance, any people inhabiting lands rich with natural resources are either terrorized into submission or wiped out by U.S. and European imperialism such as English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Belgian, German, and Italian imperialism. This was the case with the

indigenous people who inhabited the territory that the English sought to conquer (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000; Taylor 2005). The United States and European imperialist system is a system based on constant war and aggression. The white empires must wage constant war against people and hold colonies and neocolonies all over the world for control over their land, natural resources, labor, and markets of the colonized countries because their enrichment is based on this theft and exploitation (Parenti 1995; Feagin 2006; Yeshitela 2010). This began with European aggression and assault on Africa and the America's including the enslavement of Africans. Also, the domination, exploitation, and genocide against colonized people is justified through white supremacy. The colonization of the America's was so important because it was required for Europe's global domination and for the rise of the European dominated system of global parasitic capitalism (Williams 1944; Feagin 2006; Yeshitela 2010; Blackburn 2011). This project can also us understand "whiteness" and how white people identify with European and U.S. imperialism. Hosea Jaffe argued that the idea of race and whiteness was born through the process of European imperialism (Jaffe 1988). During this time period, the early to mid-1600's, the English did not identify themselves as "white." However, whiteness was being constructed through their framing of the indigenous people as "savages and infidels." Religion was one of the first markers of whiteness and non-whiteness (Higginbotham 1998; Feagin 2010; Goetz 2012). For instance, Europeans and the English framed the indigenous people as not Christian and therefore "infidels" that needed to be civilized (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Smith 1612; Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975; Cushing 1978). This justified at first trying to enslave

them and then committing genocide against them (Morgan 1975; Higginbotham 1998; Goetz 2012). Virginia was the first colony in English America and is considered the founding of the United States. Virginia is important because it represents the birthplace of the United States which would later become the leading imperialist power in the world (Parenti 1995; Parenti 2011).

These characteristics seen in the early colony of Virginia are seen today in the case of ongoing European imperialism and now United States imperialism, the world's leading imperialist power. For example, today the United States engages in ongoing war in the Middle East with the goal of maintaining a stronghold over the region's rich oil supply (Chomsky 2010; Parenti 2011). Also it supports and arms brutal regimes all over the world that allow the U.S. corporations to plunder the resources of the given country or area and exploit the masses of the people in these countries in cheap labor positions, keeping the world safe for western investors and western transnational corporations (Parenti 1995; Parenti 2011). Not only that, but the United States government, its repressive state apparatus continues to treat African descendant people, indigenous people, Mexican-indigenous people, darker Latino's, and indigenous people within the United States as internally colonized subjects as these groups are disproportionately represented in poverty, cheap labor positions, and in the prison system (Allen 1970; Mills 1997; Yeshitela 2005; Feagin 2010, Alexander 2012).

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

How to Deal with the Question of Race and Class

John Solomos argued that there is no problem of racism that can be thought of as separate from the structural features of capitalist society (Solomos 1986: 107). Stuart Hall said, "Race is the modality in which class is lived. It is also the medium in which class relations are experienced" (Hall et al. 1978: 394). Edna Bonacich said that race and ethnicity represent a deeper reality of class relations and dynamics. Understanding race as a reflection of a deeper reality of class relations provides us with tools for changing that reality (Bonacich 1980).

According to Robert Miles, race and class are intertwined. In the capitalist system, the colonized people (people's whose land, labor, and resources are stolen) are racialized and experience worse treatment than the white working class. The racialized groups are often blocked from upward mobility. Miles said:

The race/class dichotomy is a false construction...One of the central political and ideological processes in modern capitalist societies is the process of racialization...but this cannot in itself over-ride the effects of the relations of production. Hence, the totality of 'black people in Britain cannot be adequately analysed as a 'race' outside or in opposition to class relations. Rather, the process by which they are racialised, and react to that racialization (both of which are political and ideological processes), always occurs in a particular historical and

structural context, one in which the social relations of production provide the necessary and initial framework within which racism has its effects. The outcome may be the formation of racialised class fractions (Solomos 1986: 100).

“People of color” are racialized inside the broader economic system of global European, North American transnational capital accumulation. Since “people of color” come from lands rich in natural resources, they are racialized as “inferior” groups to be enslaved. The slavery or near slavery of “people of color” or colonized people is foundational to the system of global capitalism. Without this stolen land, labor, and resources, modern capitalist industry would not exist (Dubois 1935; Robinson 1983).

Annie Phizlackea also argued that racism developed as an ideology with specific historical and material contexts. Phizlackea and Miles say that “race” should not be the object of analysis itself but rather the object of analysis should be the process of racialization or racial categorization which takes place within the context with specific economic, political and ideological relations (Solomos 1986: 99). Solomos asks the question, what is the role of racism in capitalist societies and what is the role of the state in reproducing racism? (Solomos 1986: 107). Solomos suggests that racism is an ideological construction that has a material basis. How do we understand the intertwining of race and class? How do we understand the intertwining of the capitalist system and systemic racism?

According to Stephen Steinberg, Marxists generally have the tendency to subsume race to class. Orthodox Marxists believe in the unity of labor, lumping together disparaged and exploited groups who are cast in a mutual struggle against capital.

According to Steinberg, many Marxists do not deny that blacks are more severely exploited and oppressed than other workers. However, they believe that whatever differences exist in the situation of black and white workers are secondary to their mutual interest in class struggle. In other words, orthodox Marxists seem to believe that there is one ambiguous working class and that racism is merely a tool to divide the single working class. Cedric Robinson argued that the (white) labor movement was most often at best ambivalent toward black liberation and progress. The ideology of racism in combination with self-interest pitted immigrant and poor white workers against the black worker and slave. After the Civil War, the same social consciousness divided the immigrant and white working classes from black ex-slaves. W.E.B. Dubois recognized this as a contradiction in the labor movement (Robinson 1983: 203). Also, the Communist Party-USA never gained much traction in the black community in the U.S. In the 1920's, many black people in America were instead attracted to the Garvey Movement which argued that black people internationally were Africans, and that all Africans were struggling against the same problem, global white domination and imperialism. The Communist Party competed with the Garvey Movement in attracting black members (Hess 2000: 190). Even today, white leftists often ignore issues and oppression specific to black, Latino, and indigenous communities. For instance, the Occupy Movement today often ignores issues of police violence in the black and Latino communities, the conditions of abject poverty in Indian reservations, poor black, and Latino communities, mass incarceration of black and Latino people or they use these issues as an auxiliary for the selfish advancement of the white working class. The

Garvey Movement sought liberation for black people everywhere through independence from European and Euro-American colonialism and imperialism. Marcus Garvey argued:

Communism is a white man's creation, to solve his own [p]olitical and economic problems.

It suggests the enthronement of the white working class over the capitalistic class of the race...

It was never conceived and originally intended for the economic or political emancipation of the blacks, but rather to raise the earning capacity of the lowest class of white workers...

All wars in Africa, the colonies where the natives have been shot down and punished, were carried out by the common white man in the ranks. In the lynchings that have occurred in the Southern section of the United States of America, the mob has always been made up of the lowest class of the white race...the mob has always been made up of the common, ignorant people from whom Communists are made up and whom the party is intended to give political power or economic advantages (Vincent 1988: 41).

As Garvey pointed out, the white working class throughout history has often been on the frontlines attacking African people in the colonies of the European imperial powers and African descendant people inside the United States. The mobs that lynched black people in the United States consisted of poor and working class whites (Dubois 1935; Robinson

1983). The white working class throughout history has often refused to unite with people of color in struggles for social advancement and equality defined by colonized people's own terms against the white ruling class (white worker's and white left movements often try to organize colonized people under its own leadership for its own selfish advancements). Repeatedly throughout American history, the white ruling class has bestowed on the general white population privileged statuses as "white people" and privileged positions on the backs of people of color in an effort to keep European descendant laborers from uniting with black and other laborers of color (Robinson 1983; Alexander 2012). In response to the white ruling class giving poor whites privileged position as "white" people, working class and poor whites have opportunistically attacked people of color for their own personal advancement. Also, the general white population has been complicit in the oppression of the masses of people around the world due to their largely privileged status on the pedestal of imperialist oppression and exploitation. W.E.B. Dubois noticed that this is why the white working class would not unite with black workers against the white ruling class in the United States (Robinson 1983). DuBois said:

Indeed, the plight of the white working class throughout the world today is directly traceable to Negro slavery in America, on which modern commerce and industry was founded, and which persisted to threaten free labor until it was partially overthrown in 1863. The resulting color caste founded and retained by capitalism was adopted, forwarded and approved by white labor, and resulted in subordination of colored labor to white profits the world over. Thus the majority

of the world's laborers, by the insistence of white labor, became the basis of a system of industry which ruined democracy and showed its perfect fruit in World War and Depression (DuBois 1935: 30).

Penny Hess argues that orthodox Marxism is centered around gaining “white rights” on a pedestal resting on colonial oppression. She shows that *The Communist Manifesto* (2005) never mentions that the (white) proletariat should stand in solidarity with enslaved Africans who built the capitalist economy. At this time the chattel slavery of Africans was at its height and was being widely debated at the time of its publication (Hess 2000: 94). The manifesto said that the proletariat should become the ruling class and that the proletariat should wrest the capital from the bourgeoisie. However, the bourgeoisie’s capital is a result of stolen loot as a result of the slavery of Africans and the genocide of the Indians, which Marx himself admits (Hess 2000: 95). If the white workers took over the capital from the hands of the bourgeoisie, then they would oversee the genocide and control the slave trade in the colonies, they would oversee the exploitation of gold and other resources from Africa and the Americas (Hess 2000: 95). The real revolutionary struggle to overturn the capitalist system cannot come from white workers. The fundamental contradiction in the global capitalist system is between the “white” oppressor nation resting on a pedestal of oppression and exploitation of indigenous people, African people and other colonized workers. All of the intricacies of the capitalist system rest on this pedestal of colonial racist oppression (Robinson 1983; Yeshitela 2010). As DuBois said, “The emancipation of man is the emancipation of

labor and the emancipation of labor is freeing of that basic majority of workers who are yellow, brown and black” (DuBois 1935: 16).

Orthodox Marxism can be rescued through the internal colonialism and anti-colonial approach and Black Marxist approach. According to these approaches, colonialism is the condition that black people in America and all over the world struggle against (Allen 1970; Yeshitela 2010) Colonialism is defined by Omali Yeshitela as foreign domination by an alien state power for exploitative economic purposes and for political advantage (Yeshitela 2010). This means the responsibility for the oppression of African descendant people, indigenous people, and other people of color can be put squarely on the white capitalist ruling class, while the white working class and middle class often unite with their white capitalist class oppressors and the colonial State. Due to white supremacy, the white working class often collaborates with their capitalist oppressors in maintaining the colonial relationship between Africans, indigenous people, and other people of color (Robinson 1983; Yeshitela 2010). The white capitalist ruling class uses the entire white population as a base of support for their colonial domination of people of color. This makes up a white oppressor nation. Edna Bonacich (1980) discusses the concept of “super exploitation.” When dealing with the issue of race and class, this mode of thought distinguishes between the white working classes and the working classes of the colonized people of color. The system of imperialism has created this distinction. The white working classes in the system of imperialism are part of an entire oppressor nation that has a dialectical relationship with the oppressed or colonized nations. The white working class often acts as policemen of the oppressor nation,

keeping the colonized workers in subjugated positions to be super exploited (Robinson 1983).

The fundamental contradiction in the system of global capitalism and imperialism is not capitalist versus worker, but oppressor nation vs. oppressed nation. The ideology of white racism grew as a justification for the exploitation of colonized peoples: they were “naturally inferior” and needed Europeans to “help” them move into the modern world. Racist ideology developed not only in relation to people living in the distant colonies, but also toward people living in “internal colonies,” (Allen 1970) where either white settlers had become established or colonized workers had been brought under some degree of coercion. African descendant people and Indians in the America’s are oppressed nations by the white oppressor nation (Bonacich 1980). European imperialism also created a bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie among the oppressed nations that facilitate the exploitation of land, labor, and resources of the oppressed nations. The petty bourgeoisie of colonized people are middlemen, perpetuating the system of oppression and exploitation against the masses of black people, Latinos, indigenous people, and other people of color. This is known as neo-colonialism which means white power in a black, brown, or yellow face (Nkrumah 1965, Yeshitela 2012).

The Case for an Anti-Colonial Approach: Parasitic Capitalism, Imperialism

My analytical concept of “parasitic capitalism” is taken from the analysis of Omali Yeshitela. This is close to Robinson’s concept of Black Marxism. Capitalism was born as a global economic, political, and social system that often survives off of colonizing, enslaving, and exploiting African descendant people, Native Americans,

Latinos, and generally people of color all over the world for the benefit of the Western white power structure. The white western power structure is a parasite living off of stolen land, labor, and resources of the colonized masses of the earth (Williams 1944; DuBois 1965; Parenti 1995; Yeshitela 2010; Blackburn 2011). A parasite requires a host for survival. Without a host, the parasite will die (DuBois 1945; Jaffe 1988; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). This parasitic system was born as a result of a deadly European assault on the rest of the earth including the genocide of the Indians, the slavery of Africans, and the British Opium War against the Chinese (Marx 1867; Hess 2000). This is what is known as the “primitive” or primary accumulation of capital (Marx 1867). This is imperialism (Lenin 1923; Parenti 1995; Yeshitela 2010). The rise of the global Western dominated capitalist system required European imperialism first. Without this stolen, land, labor and resources, the white western power structure will die like a parasite without a host (Yeshitela 2005). Capitalism is an economic system based on exploitation of stolen land, labor, and resources by the looters of the Western white power structure who loot and exploit Africa, Asia, and Latin America (DuBois 1965; Parenti 1995; Parenti 2011). There is a unity of opposites in this system. There is not an American capitalist system that is isolated from the world. It is a global capitalist system based on imperialism, white domination over the rest of the earth (Lenin 1923; DuBois 1965; Robinson 1983; Castro 2000; Yeshitela 2005; Feagin 2010; Parenti 2011).

The system of capitalism is based on the foundation of “primitive accumulation” (Marx 1867; Robinson 1983). This is the previously mentioned theft of the lands, labor, and resources of colonized “people of color” all over the world beginning with the

genocide of the Indians and the enslavement of Africans. The slavery of Africans stimulated the industrial revolution, gave rise to the global capitalist system, uplifted and enriched Europe, North America, and the white world (Williams 1944; Robinson 1983; Blackburn 2013). The resources are stolen from the colonies and brought into the capitalist mode of production in the “mother countries” or the white dominated imperialist centers. Finished products are made and sold back to the colonies (Ture and Hamilton 1992). The white working class sits on the pedestal of stolen land, labor, and resources of people of color (Hess 2000).

Imperialism is the “primitive accumulation.” Imperialism means transnational investment and capital accumulation by the western white bourgeoisie such as the ruling circle in United States and Europe (Parenti 2011: 6). Imperialism and colonialism are offshoots of capitalism as the global system of capitalism requires imperial and colonial domination by the white western power structure over the rest of the earth. The system is designed to terrorize, dominate, and oppress (Parenti 2011). Michael Parenti defines imperialism as “the process whereby the dominant investor interests in one country bring to bear military and financial power upon another country in order to expropriate the land, labor, capital, natural resources, commerce, and markets of that other country” (Parenti 2011: 7). Imperialism and intervention around the world is designed to keep the world safe for investors or Western capitalist looters (Parenti 1995). Africa, Asia, and Latin America are rich in natural resources, minerals, and foods but the people are poor because they are victims of imperialism which steals their resources and exploits them in cheap labor positions (Yeshitela 2010; Parenti 2011). The European colonizers extracted

gold, silver, furs, silks, spices, flax, hemp, timber, molasses, sugar, rum, rubber, tobacco, calico, cocoa, coffee, cotton, coal, palm oil, tin, iron, ivory, ebony, and later on oil, zinc, manganese, mercury, platinum, cobalt, bauxite, aluminum, and uranium from Africa, the Americas, and Asia. Imperialist powers such as the United States, England, Portugal, the Netherlands, France, and Spain grew especially rich as a result of the worst of all extractions, the abduction of millions of Africans into slave labor (Robinson 1983; Parenti 1995: 7). Not only are the lands pillaged, but the people of these targeted lands are often killed. The western white empires impoverish and slaughter people all over the world (Parenti 2011: 8).

The goal in capitalism is constantly obtaining profits for the bourgeoisie or the exploiting class, the private owners of the means of production (Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005; Robbins 2008). This means constant growth or constant profit making is required for the capitalist system or the system will fall into crisis. In capitalism, the laborers have lost control over the land. In the system of capitalism, the means of production (land, resources, factories.) are owned privately by few elite people called the bourgeoisie while the proletariat or the working class, sell their labor power to the bourgeoisie. It is in the capitalists' interests to keep the wages for the laborers as low as possible in an effort to make a profit (Robbins 2008). The laborers or the proletariat's interests directly conflict with the capitalists' interests of making profits without end as the laborer's interests are mere survival, earning enough resources to survive day to day (Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005). Another fundamental feature of capitalism is commodity production. In a capitalist society, everything produced is for sale on the

market (Yeshitela 2012: 34). In the system of capitalism, wealth is created socially, through collective labor, and through exploitation of land and labor while the bourgeoisie, the people who own the means of production, become wealthy as a result of the appropriation of the profits of this collective labor (Marx, Engels, Gasper 2005). Labor is a commodity to be bought by private owners of the means of production, and sold by laborers (Marx, Engels, Gasper 2005). The people who labor and create value are paid the least, while the business elites, the people who do not labor profit off of the expropriation of profits as a result of this labor. It is in the best interest of the bourgeoisie, or the people who own the means of production, and structurally essential for market growth (constant market growth is essential for the system of capitalism to function) to pay laborers the least amount of money possible in order to gain the highest profit (Robbins 2008). Of course this profit made from collective labor is not shared equally and the elites enjoy the vast majority of the profit generated from the labor (Robbins 2008). Profit from labor is enjoyed by the few (capitalists) at the expense of the many (laborers and land) and the wealthy enjoy their high form of class privilege simply as a result of unjust exploitation of laborers, land, and resources. However, the critical, primary, fundamental feature of capitalism is parasitism. Parasitism is the “primitive accumulation” (Yeshitela 2012: 35).

Marx describes that the system of capitalism required a form of start-up capital that brought the system into motion. This start-up capital was called the primitive (primary) accumulation of capital. This was the European colonization of the Americas, Africa, and Asia. This involved the Europeans committing genocide of the indigenous

people of the America's and the free labor provided by enslaved Africans. This allowed Europe to transition from the system of feudalism into capitalism, when feudal serfs were forced off of the land into the factories where they sold their labor for a wage. Marx said:

We have seen how money is changed into capital; how through capital surplus value is made, and from surplus value more capital. But the accumulation of capital presupposes surplus value; surplus value presupposes capitalistic production; capitalistic production presupposes the pre-existence of considerable masses of capital and labor power in the hands of producers of commodities. The whole movement therefore, seems to turn into a vicious circle, out of which we can only get by supposing a primitive accumulation (previous accumulation of Adam Smith) preceding capitalistic accumulation; an accumulation not the result of the capitalist mode of production but the starting point (Marx 1867: Kindle Edition Location 12837).

Karl Marx said that the startup capital required for the beginning of the system of global capitalism required an original sin that was not the result of capitalist production but the starting point. This starting point was the European assault on the rest of the world, the attack and colonization of Africa, the America's, and Asia. Marx said:

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a

warren for the commercial hunting of black skins, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These Idyllic proceeding are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation (Marx 1867: Kindle Edition Location 13554).

An anti-colonial approach and Black Marxist approach argues that the white proletariat rests on a pedestal of colonial (racial) oppression (Robinson 1983). The enslavement of Africans was not a historical aberration or a “mistake.” It was foundational to the rise and enrichment of Europe and the United States (Robinson 1983: 200). For instance, Marx describes that the wage working in Europe rested on a pedestal of slavery in the New World. The slavery of Africans gave birth to the white bourgeoisie and the white proletariat simultaneously (Yeshitela 2012). The slavery of Africans gave rise to the global capitalist system. Marx said, “Whilst the cotton industry introduced child slavery in England, it gave in the United States a stimulus to the transformation of the earlier, more or less patriarchal slavery, into a system of commercial exploitation. In fact, the veiled slavery of the wage workers in Europe needed for its pedestal, slavery pure and simple in the new world” (Marx 1867: Kindle Edition Location 13693). This wage working in Europe could not have been possible without the slavery in the New World. In *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1955), Karl Marx said that it was the European colonization of the “New World” that started the whole global European-American dominated capitalist economy that is seen today involving Europe and North America exploiting Latin America, Africa, and Asia as suppliers of cheap labor, and cheap raw materials. This European colonization established these areas of the world as

“peripheries” where wealth is stolen and transferred from the “periphery” to the European “core” (Robbins 2008). Marx describes slavery as the precondition for modern capitalist industry and the whole world (European imperialist dominated) world economy:

Direct slavery is just as much the pivot of bourgeois industry as machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery you have no cotton; without cotton, you have no modern industry. It is slavery which gave colonies their value; it is colonies which created world trade; it is world trade which is the precondition of large industry. Thus slavery is an economic category of the highest importance.

Without slavery, North America, the most progressive country, would be transformed into a patriarchal land. Efface North America from the map of the world and you will have anarchy, the complete decay of modern commerce and civilization. Cause slavery to disappear and you will have wiped America off the map of nations. (Marx 1955: 95; Robinson 1983).

The white supremacist global capitalist system began with European imperialism led by the white capitalist profitmakers, the agents of mass oppression, and their conquest of Africa and the Americas, which involved committing genocide against the indigenous people of that land and involved enslaving millions of African people. The land in the Americas had to be cleared for plantation staple crops such as sugar, tobacco, indigo, and cotton (Williams 1944). Enslaved Africans became the primary labor force working on these plantations in the “New World” colonies as the population of Europe

could not support the labor necessary for the staple crops of sugar, tobacco, and cotton (Williams 1944). These slave grown products set the stage for the industrial revolution. These products locked European wage workers into positions in the capitalist mode of production, producing products made from these raw materials (Blackburn 2011). The chattel slavery of Africans provided the sugar for the tea and the coffee cups of the Western world. The slavery of Africans also produced the cotton that served as a base for modern capitalism (Williams 1944: 5). Williams said that the limited population of Europe in the sixteenth century was not enough to cultivate the staple crops of sugar, tobacco, and cotton in the New World so relying on African slaves as the primary labor force was crucial for their economic development, the development of the “white” world at the expense of Africans and indigenous people of the Americas (Williams 1944: 5).

Adam Smith said that the discovery of America and the Cape route to India are “the two greatest and most important events recorded in the history of mankind” (Williams 1944: 51). The importance was not in the precious metals it provided, but the new inexhaustible market it gave to European commodities which came off of the backs of African slaves. Eric Williams argued that the triangular trade gave a triple stimulus to British industry. Africans were purchased with British manufactures, they were transported to the plantations where they produced sugar, cotton, indigo, molasses and other tropical products. This created new industries in England. The African slaves and their owners on the plantations provided another market for British industry from New England agriculture and the Newfoundland fisheries. Williams argued that in 1750 there was hardly a trading or manufacturing town in England which was not in some way

connected to the triangular or direct colonial trade (Williams 1944: 52). 1750 is also the same year generally given as the beginning of the English Industrial Revolution (Hess 2000: 92; Alexander 1998: 710). Randy Sparks said that the eighteenth century was Bristol's golden age. Bristol was a major Atlantic port, and its status was gained mostly through the profits of the slave trade (Sparks 2009: 92). One writer said that "there was not a brick in the city but what is cemented with the blood of a slave." In the 1740's, Liverpool became the leading slave port, the slave trade remained equally important. Many people testified to the importance of the slave trade to the British commerce and to the health of their Empire in arguments against the abolition of the slave trade (Sparks 2009: 141).

Robin Blackburn has emphasized that the slave trade stimulated the industrial revolution through commodification. The free wage labor in Europe was dependent on racial slavery in the New World. The wage laborer was tempted by commodities. They could earn cash to buy necessities and luxuries. These luxuries were tobacco, rum, sweetened tea or coffee and indigo-dyed denim cloth. This made laborers dependent and locked into wage labor (Blackburn 2013: 102). The slave produced products forced the feudal serfs and peasants off of the land forcing them into the factories to work. Workers were needed to build the slave ships, mill the fabric, distill the rum, and refine the sugar, cotton and tobacco flowing to and from England in the triangular trade (Hess 2000, 93). Marx said that the wage slavery in England could only happen as a result of "slavery pure and simple in the New World." This is an example of how in the world capitalist economy, every strata of white society including the white bourgeoisie and the white

working class exists on a pedestal of oppression of people of color, the primitive accumulation of capital (Marx 1867; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005).

At this time, white workers, often peasants forced to leave agricultural areas, were heavily exploited in the factories and mines of Europe (Hess 2000: 93). European workers realized that they played an invaluable role in the capitalist system. Without their labor, the raw materials could not be transformed into commodities that enriched the capitalist ruling class. The workers struggled for “white rights” on top of the pedestal. They wanted to prove that they were also white and deserved to reap the benefits of the stolen loot from the colonized subjects or slaves, the “wretched of the earth” (Hess 2000: 93). They bought into the white racial frame or the white racist ideology which is the ideological underpinning of the system of capitalism (Hess 2000: 93; Feagin 2010).

At the time of colonization, there was no such thing as “whiteness” although it was in the process of developing. What were the processes of the English and other European workers aligning with English imperialism and European elites against Indians and African descendant people during my selected time period?

The White Racial Frame

Throughout the paper, “white power” is used interchangeably with European or American imperialism. This is taken from the analysis of Omali Yeshitela (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010) This is because white racist or white supremacist oppression became central to this global capitalist, imperial, and colonial system while exploiting the natural riches of the America’s, Africa, and Asia, Europeans in turn subjugated, exploited, and

committed genocide against the rest of the earth, people who became known as “non-white.” The same process that enriched Europeans and brought it out of feudalism, poverty, and diseases was the same process that disrupted, underdeveloped Africa and disunited and oppressed African people everywhere (Rodney 1980; Yeshitela 2005). The concept of the “white race” or white nation was born out of the genocide of the Indians and the slavery of Africans, the beginning processes of European imperialism. Before this there was no such thing as “whiteness.” This created the biologically false concept of “race” or the concept of biologically distinct species (Jaffe 1988; Feagin 2010). This was when Europeans began defining themselves as “white” in relationship to everyone else in the world. They defined the people that they were colonizing as “non-white” and worthy of being exploited, oppressed, enslaved, dominated, conquered, or wiped out. Racism or white supremacy is the ideological underpinning of the system of Western capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism (Mills 1997; Feagin 2010; Yeshitela 2011). Charles Mills said that the “Racial Contract” is the unwritten agreement amongst Europeans that the people that they colonized or what came to be known as non-white people are inferior and Europeans or what came to be known as white people are superior and this justified exploiting them, killing them, stealing their land, plundering their resources (Mills 1997). This is the ideology that explains the world for white people (Mills 1997; Feagin 2010).

Joe Feagin’s white racial frame concept accents the worldview of white Europeans that justifies systemic racial oppression, the global capitalist system, U.S and European imperialism. The United States is built on 350 years of extreme racial

oppression (Feagin 2010: 22). Through the white racial frame, the concept of “race” was developed, which was the idea of biologically distinct species of human beings. Europeans classified themselves as the superior “white race” (Feagin 2010). Europeans believed that the lowest group on the racialized totem pole were people of African descent, and shortly up the racialized ladder were indigenous Americans and other non-whites. The white racial frame is the view of the world through white people’s eyes that all non-white people are inferior to whites, and this justifies enslaving, killing, exploiting, brutalizing, and generally oppressing non-white people for the purposes of generating white wealth. The white European dominated global capitalism requires stepping on people, and the people that have been stepped on have been and continue to be stepped on are disproportionately non-white people (Feagin 2010). The white racial frame, the idea that non-whites are inferior and whites are chosen by God as the superior race has justified the idea of “manifest destiny.” This idea of “manifest destiny” results in people of European descent going everywhere and killing anyone for the purposes of plundering and looting resources for wealth generation. The European or white “founding fathers” created mythology about “equality” and “democracy” while actually supporting anti-democratic tyranny for people of color such as the indigenous people and African people. The white racial frame justifies Joe Feagin’s theory of systemic racism which means that racial oppression is built into the system and structure of the global capitalist system exploiting people of color for the benefit of all whites (Feagin 2006).

The white racial frame rationalized oppression of indigenous people and Africans, colonized people that became a host for the bloodsucking system of parasitic capitalism (Feagin 2006; Yeshitela 2010). This was essential to the European colonizers. Feagin shows that the early colonizers described indigenous people, who they called “Indians,” as “natural slaves,” as “subhuman beasts of burden” (Feagin 2010: 42). Indigenous people were described as uncivilized “savages” “heathens,” “barbarians,” and unchristian. This rationalized the colonizers wars against the indigenous people in order to take their land and use it for plantation cash crops.

The expropriated labor off of the backs of African slaves created massive wealth for the European bourgeoisie and allowed them to challenge and replace the European feudal lords for control over the state. The ideology of white supremacy also created a “white” base of support for their capitalist/imperialist exploitation of the rest of the world (Yeshitela 2010). It unifies “white” workers with their capitalist class oppressors in maintaining the colonial relationship with Africans, indigenous people, Mexicans and other colonized people (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). Joe Feagin’s theory of the white racial frame argues that the mainstream worldview of white people is that African descendant people are lazy, less intelligent, uncivilized, inherently criminal, and generally inferior while whites are intelligent, hard-working, virtuous, and generally superior (Feagin 2010). This white racial frame is a colonial invention and bourgeois conception. It explains the current racial inequality between whites and people of color. It explains, justifies, and rationalizes the parasitic capitalist system which requires for its

existence the exploitation and oppression of the majority of the earth, generally non-white people.

Religious sentiment was central to the developing white racial frame. *The Baptism of Early Virginia* (2012) by Rebecca Goetz shows that Africans and Indians were labeled as hereditary heathens and as incapable of converting to Christianity. Many planters believed that Africans were permanently cursed because they were descendants of Ham. This justified the enslavement of Africans. Goetz says that the English hoped for partnership with the Indians in their economic endeavors while converting them to Christianity. However, most of the Powhatan people refused to convert to Christianity. There was much aggression and violence committed by the English against the Powhatan people when the English first arrived. The Powhatan people could see that the English would continue to grow and continue to expand their colony which would result in deathly consequences for their nation. In 1622, Opechancanough, the leader of the Powhatan people planned a surprise attack against the English colonizers and killed around 350 English settlers. After this, the English elites insisted that the Powhatan people were perpetual enemies who could not be converted to Christianity. This was used as an excuse for wiping out the Powhatan people. Goetz says that as the English thought of Indians and Africans as incapable of converting to the Christian religion, this helped create the idea of race and the ideology of racism (Goetz 2012).

Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia by Kathleen Brown (1996) shows the relationship between gender, race, slavery, and the English and European economic and social system. Brown shows

that English culture labeled English women who were married and employed primarily in domestic labor as “good wives” and English women who were unmarried, lacked domestic skills, and employed in field labor usually as indentured servants as “nasty wenches.” The English social structure and economic system was based on patriarchy, dominance, and subordination.

European patriarchy is rooted in the concept of private property. European men seek to own and overly extract from land for private enrichment and simultaneously own and control women. This was fundamental to the English colonial system in North America, as it was based on elite white men conquering the indigenous people in order to take private control over the land. English indentured servants were essentially commodities to be owned and African and Indians slaves entered into this already functioning system of private property, private ownership dominance, and exploitation, as they were also commodities to be bought and sold.

As Africans entered into the English colonial system, African servant women became “nasty wenches” in the eyes of the English colonial elites. Between 1643 and 1662, Virginia legislators distinguished African women from other female laborers by taxing them as they did men. African women began gradually to shoulder the economic and symbolic burden formerly carried by English servant women because they became associated with the field labor that Anglo-Virginians and Europeans believed to be unsuitable for women. This process continued into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Brown 1996: Kindle Locations 7704-7707).

A Discussion of Colonialism

I utilize Robert Allen's discussion of colonialism and internal colonialism. In *Black Awakening in Capitalist America* (1970) Robert Allen defines colonialism as the direct and over-all subordination of one people, nation, or country to another with state power in the hands of the dominating power. Europeans controlled parliaments and governments of the colonies. Political control is buttressed by a legal system designed to serve the interests of white settlers. Colonialism does not exist for its own sake. It is a system of domination and oppression. It exists and continues so the imperialist powers can rob the colonized people by taking control of their cheap land, cheap labor, and cheap resources. Economic motivation is the most important. Colonized people in the United States became a source of cheap labor for a rapidly expanding economy. The foundation of American capitalism was built on the backs of African slaves and African workers. Black America is an internal colony. It can be termed as domestic colonialism. People reject this description of the race problem in the United States as "colonialism" because they argue that the solution to the race problem is integrating black people into the American political and economic mainstreams. Integration fails because the social structure cannot accommodate the people at the bottom of the economic ladder as the system is fundamentally based on the oppression and exploitation of colonized people. Robert Allen argues that American democracy is a sham that hides the murder, brutality, exploitation and naked force upon which the socioeconomic system of American capitalism is built on (Allen 1970).

Omali Yeshitela describes white racism as the ideology that justifies imperialism. According to Yeshitela, white racism springs from the material conditions of U.S.

colonial domination of people of color. For example, the racial profiling of black men as “criminals” “dangerous” “thugs” comes from the fear that black men will steal from the oppressor white population, essentially taking back stolen loot from 400 years of slavery, segregation, racial oppression and exploitation:

All of the people who benefit from colonialism, all of the people who benefit from enslaving black people and Mexicans and Indians are naturally and normally and appropriately afraid of black people, Mexicans, and Indians because of the possibility that black people, Mexicans, and Indians who are starving, impoverished, will come back to take some of the loot that has been stolen from them or maybe angry enough to try to harm some of them....White people are afraid, they are afraid of 'what the black people are gonna do, (white people think) they are gonna do to us what we did to them,' they are afraid of Mexicans who they starved and kept out of their own land, they are afraid of the whole world, they are afraid of the 80 percent of the people on the planet earth who they forced to live off ten dollars or less a day. This is the objective reality and that is the context within which we have to understand the fearfulness or pretended fearfulness of white people of a 17 year old child with a skittles, and a bottle of drink, and a hoodie walking through the community. All of us (black people) are suspects within this country (Yeshitela 2013).

Through the framework of the internal colonial model, when a police officer shoots a person of African descent in America in the streets, this is a product of the public policy of police containment in the African community (Newton 2002; Hess 2000: 328). This is not merely an instance of individual racial biases or discrimination. This is the equivalent to when the U.S. military kills people in Iraq, Afghanistan, in the war in Vietnam, or the when governments around the world that are armed and funded by the CIA kill the resisting people to keep the world safe for transnational capital (Parenti 1995). Internal colonization is part of the same blood sucking system of U.S. imperialism. How does this internal colonial model match up with this my time period? How does this early time period of the colony of Virginia serve as a pretext for this current reality of American imperialism and internal colonialism?

White Oppressor Nation

W.E.B. DuBois' concept of the wages of whiteness argues that whites surrender class consciousness and solidarity with the colonized working class "people of color" and unite and collaborate with their capitalist class oppressors in maintaining this colonial relationship with Africans and other people of color (DuBois 1935). Working class whites buy into the wages of whiteness because of opportunism. They want to obtain resources and wealth at the expense of the masses of the people on earth. In other words, they want a share of the stolen colonial loot from the white bourgeoisie. The elite whites have created the concept of "whiteness" and working and poor Europeans want to prove that they are also "white" and also worthy of property and resources which come from violent colonial oppression (Harris 1993; Hess 2000). Instead of receiving higher

wages that they could earn in uniting with blacks, they instead receive the wages of whiteness (DuBois 1935). The United States colonial system provides all whites across class lines a public and psychological wage (DuBois 1935; Roediger 1991; Harris 1993; Lipsitz 1998). This wage reminds working class and poor whites that “even though I face economic hardships and I may have a horrible life, at least I’m better than somebody” (Harris 1993; Mills 1997; Lipsitz 1998).

Omali Yeshitela argues that the bourgeoisie uses the general white population as a base of support for their colonial terror and exploitation of Africans, indigenous people, Mexicans, and generally the rest of the world by sharing a significant amount of the colonial loot with the general white population (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). For instance, by 2009, the median net worth of white families was \$265,000, while the median net worth for black families was only \$28,500. This racial wealth gap has nearly tripled in the last 25 years (Luhby 2013). This unification of the white bourgeoisie and white working class forms the white capitalist state or white people’s state, or oppressor white nation. Historically, the poor and working class whites have been on the front lines in oppressing and terrorizing colonized people (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006). This is why white racial framing is the most rampant in the working class white communities. This is because poor whites want to prove that they are also white and deserve an elevated status on the pedestal of colonial oppression and a piece of the stolen loot taken from colonized people around the world (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). The Ku Klux Klan (KKK) consisted of working class and poor whites. The KKK began to emerge during the reconstruction era after the era of chattel slavery officially ended. The white working

class wanted to repress colonized people to maintain their privilege status as “whites.” The KKK served as an extension of the white state, by lynching black or African people in the United States, they terrorized internally colonized Africans to prevent them from rising up and taking back what is theirs, expropriated labor value (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006).

The fundamental contradiction in the world is between oppressor and oppressed nations. All whites consist of an oppressor nation. There is not one ambiguous universal working class. There is the working class of the oppressor white nation and the working class of the oppressed nations or colonized people (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005; Yeshitela 2010). How does this concept emerge in the early period of the colony of Virginia? How does the colonization of Virginia serve as a foundation for these dynamics?

The White Capitalist State

According to Marxist theory, the state is used as a repressive apparatus, an instrument in the hands of the ruling class that legalizes the oppression of one class by another (Lenin 1923). The capitalist state is set up to protect the wealth of the elite exploiting class such as business elites and property owners (Jackson 1971). The state is manifested in the police, the prisons, the courts, the legal system, the army, the navy, the marines. These are institutions of repression and social control. This apparatus of repression called the state emerges in human society when there is a split between an exploiting class of people and an exploited class of people (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005; Parenti 2011). When applying an anti-colonial framework, the capitalist state has a different relationship with colonized populations compared to the oppressor white

population. The white capitalist state is a violent force that commits genocide on, violently oppresses, and intimidates colonized oppressed nations such as Africans or African descendant people, Mexican-indigenous people, indigenous people, Arab people, other Latinos, and other oppressed nations in order to steal their land, resources, and exploit their labor and also to maintain this exploitative relationship between U.S. imperialism united with the oppressor white population and colonized people. This is why colonized people of color such as blacks, Latinos, and indigenous people experience brutal repression unseen by the white population (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005).

In *Racial Formation in the United States*, Omi and Winant argue that for most of U.S. history, the state's main objective in its racial policy was repression and exclusion (Omi and Winant 1986: 81). Omi and Winant argue that for much of U.S. history, the racial state has been despotic towards people of color (Omi and Winant 1986: 81). From the earliest days of colonialism in North America, an identifiable racial order has linked the system of political rule to the racial classification of individuals and groups. The major institutions and social relationships of U.S. society such as law, political organization, economic relationships, religion, cultural life, residential patterns, have been structured by the racial order from the beginning (Omi and Winant 1986: 79).

The state monopolizes legitimate violence (Lenin 1923; Parenti 1995; Yeshitela 2010). It is used to keep capital all flowing in the same direction. It maintains control over economic life. Violence and terror is a main tool of nation building. This violence and terror united the white working class population with their white capitalist

oppressors as a “white state” or a white nationalist state (Marx 1998). Groups who refuse to assimilate and submit to the hegemony of the capitalist nation state are either killed off or terrorized into submission (Robbins 2008: 106). State killing is not a misuse of authority but rather it is a function of the state itself (Robbins 2008: 107). Pierre van den Berghe said “modern nationalism is a blue print for ethnocide at best and genocide at worst” (Robbins 2008: 107). For instance in United States ethnocide was a case of depriving Africans of their history as a people, their language, and their name. This is also evidenced by the genocide of the indigenous people of North America by the settling of the colony of Virginia. This was a function of the state because the purpose of settling this colony was for exportation of natural resources or cash crops. Land had to be seized from the indigenous people in order to grow plantation cash crops and export them to England in order to make a profit for the economic elites, expand the English economy, and enrich the elite planter class, colonial elites, and the English bourgeoisie.

Terrorism can be defined as political intimidation by violence or threat. Given this, we see that terrorism is a main function the capitalist nation state and that anti-state terror pales in comparison to state terror (Robbins 2008: 108). Terror is a tactic of the English colonizers (elite and working class) in their attacks on colonized people of color and maintaining their subjugation under the hegemony of European Western imperialism. The state is an instrument for repressive white power capitalism. From the very beginning the white nationalist capitalist state has been set up to repress terrorize and maintain the colonial exploitative relationship with colonized people in such as Native Americans, black people, and Latinos (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010).

The United States military is an arm of the capitalist state of the United States. The U.S. military represses insurrections all over the world against U.S. and European imperialist hegemony such as in Afghanistan, Iraq, Vietnam, and many others (Parenti 1995). The CIA and the FBI are also arms of the state (Parenti 1995). The CIA has backed countless efforts all over the world to overthrow leaders that do not bow down to the interests of U.S. and European imperialism (Parenti 1995). The drone strikes that shoot down resisting people in Pakistan, Somalia, Libya, Afghanistan, and Yemen are tools for the U.S. capitalist state. The U.S. government shoots down people to terrorize the masses of people. This makes the oppressed people in these countries afraid to organize and struggle for independence from the U.S. imperialist orbit resulting in self-determination, mass advancement, and a higher standard of living. The common explanation in the United States by the bourgeoisie for the U.S. military intervention all over the world is to “protect the U.S. way of life.” Most white North Americans unite with this imperialist terror all over the world because the bourgeoisie shares the stolen loot with the general white population. The democracy and comfort of the white world exists on a pedestal of colonial oppression of the majority of humanity. So they are attempting to “preserve the way of life” of the white world because the comfort of the white world rests upon a foundation of slavery, genocide, raping, pillaging, looting, and stealing from the rest of the world.

The imperialist state also manifests itself inside the “belly of the beast” against internally colonized people in the form of the police, with police containment in the African descendant communities, the Mexican indigenous communities, and the Indian

reservations (Alexander 2012). According to the internal colonial framework, the police represent the frontlines of the U.S. imperialist system in the internal colonies within the United States. According to this theory, the police work to contain and control internally colonized people keeping them oppressed, exploited, and separated from their stolen land, labor, and resources (Allen 1970; Jackson 1971; Hess 2000; Newton 2002; Yeshitela 2010). This is why, according to a study done by the Malcolm X Grassroots Movement, In 2012, an African descendant person in the United States was shot and killed by the police, a security guard, or a vigilante every 28 hours (Malcolm X Grassroots Movement 2013). Also, blacks constitute 1 million of the 2.3 million people incarcerated in the United States. Blacks are incarcerated at a rate nearly six times of whites (naacp.org). Whites have united with the capitalist state to terrorize colonized people (Hess 2000). This is why the vast majority of the long history lynchings of blacks, Mexicans, and indigenous people were never prosecuted by the U.S. government. The genocide of the Indians was a public policy by the U.S. government under the phrase of “manifest destiny.” Working class and poor whites were willing participants in this policy by the United States government against the genocide of the Indians (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006). The United States could not even exist or become a world imperialist power without the genocide of the Indians and slavery of Africans.

The present reality of U.S. imperialist global domination, the global European dominated capitalist system, systemic racial oppression, and internal colonialism within the United States is built on a past foundation of European colonialism in the Americas. The colony of Virginia and the Virginia Company is one example of this. This early

capitalist corporation had many key characteristics similar to present day transnational capitalist corporations. For instance, it sought to conquer and dominate lands to take control over the natural resources for their conversion into commodities that could be sold for profitmaking. While conquering the lands, genocidal warfare was unjustly inflicted on the people in these rich lands and survivors were enslaved and economically exploited. Similar to today, although they were less complex, the group of elite English (white) men had an army of people fighting for their interests that included the rest of the colonists, such as indentured servants and a few wage workers, who sought a better life in the “New World.” This was an early form of the capitalist state, the group of arms or violent forces served the interests of private capital by repressing, brutalizing, and committing genocide on already self-determining indigenous people (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000; Taylor 2001). This early white capitalist state had the same role as it does today, to terrorize and keep colonized people separated from their stolen land, stolen resources, and stolen labor. Also, the bourgeois legal system within the colony legalized oppression of the working class by the exploiting class. These bourgeois laws also divided African servants and slaves from European servants, attempting to create a “white base of support.” As the English colonizers united against people who they racialized as “savages”, “infidels, and “uncivilized” people, all English people from rich down to poor united as “white” (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Smith 1612; Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975; Cushing 1978). This divided “whites” from the rest of the world. Poor Englishman immigrated to the “New World” and fought for their rights on the pedestal of colonial domination. In other words, they fought for economic empowerment at the

expense of the indigenous people of the territory of “Virginia” and later on against African servants and slaves. The English shifted their current economic burden onto the colonized Indians by killing them and stealing their lands. Later, they would force this economic burden further onto the backs of African slaves who became the primary workforce on the Virginia plantations in the 1700s (Morgan 1975). These white colonists were the pioneers that enriched all of Europe and white society (Fanon 1961).

Methods

I attempt to employ the dialectical method to analyze the colony of Virginia (Ollman 2003). The dialectical method shows that everything in existence has fundamental internal contradictions (Newton 2002: 182). Society is in a constant state of transformation. Society never remains static. This is the result of the collision of contradicting forces in society. When the two contradicting forces collide, the organism transforms. The dialectical method examines society as a whole while examining the internal contradictions of that society and how these contradictions collide and transform society into something new. Dialectics acknowledge that there are positive and negative qualities to everything. Sometimes an organism can be dominantly positive or dominantly negative. When the contradicting forces collide, the stronger of the forces shapes the organism more in its favor. However, at some point the balance will alter and there will be new qualitative development (Newton 2002: 182). Wherever there is action there is always a reaction.

This is applied to class struggle. In contemporary society, a class that owns property dominates a class that does not own property. These are contradicting forces as

the propertied class's interest is to constantly make profits at the expense of the laboring class while the laboring class's interest is for mere survival as they are forced to work for the exploiting propertied class. In this society, the propertied class dominates and oppresses the laboring non-propertied class. However, wherever there is oppression, there is always resistance. Resistance can take many forms and sometimes it cannot be seen with a naked eye, but resistance is constant. The contradicting classes are in a constant state of struggle and for that reason, society constantly changes and transforms (Ollman 2003). Ollman said:

The dialectic is critical because it helps us to become critical of what our role has been up to now. In Marxist terms, one doesn't advocate class struggle or choose to participate in it (common bourgeois misconceptions). The class struggle, representing the sum of the contradictions between workers, broadly defined, and capitalists, simply is, and in one way or another we are already involved, often—as we come to discover—on the wrong side. On learning about it and where we fit into it, we can now decide to stop acting as we have been (the first decision to make) and what more or else we can do to better serve our own interests. What can be chosen is what side to take in this struggle and how to conduct it. A dialectical grasp of our socially conditioned roles and the equally necessary limits and possibilities that constitute our present provides us with the opportunity for making a conscious and intelligent choice (Ollman 2003: 20).

Understanding anything requires that we know something about how it arose and developed and how it fits into the larger context or system of which it is a part (Ollman 2003: 13). Utilizing the dialectical method means viewing the entire world as a whole and seeing how different parts fit into the whole and what role they play in society. For instance, the capitalist system was born as a global system that required imperialism and must be examined as a global system. In order to develop an accurate understanding, the United States enrichment cannot be viewed in isolation, but must be examined along with its imperialist satellites, internal colonies, colonies, and neo-colonies. Also, analyzing Africans or African descendants cannot be viewed as in a vacuum, rather, an accurate analysis of an oppressed people must also take into account their historical oppressors: European and Euro-American imperialism. Modern commerce and capitalist industry and the resulting European enrichment would not have happened without the slavery and dispersal of Africans, colonialism and neocolonialism in Africa, and the resulting impoverishment of African people (Yeshitela 2012). Where ever there is an “up” there is also a “down.”

In the early colony of Virginia there were contradictions within the group of English and European colonists. Some were elite non-laboring “gentlemen” or investors of the Virginia Company, or non-laboring planters, who profited off of the labor of the various European workers or indentured servants. The laboring colonists were usually forced to travel and work in the colony because they had no economic opportunity in England. The colonial planners, investors in the colony, and the wealthy planters who traveled to the colony went to the colony for different reasons: to make profits.

I show through the events in the colony that the elite English colonists dominated the laboring colonists through force or the threat of force in an effort to create their “white base of support” or “white oppressor nation.” For instance, when laboring colonists ran away to live with the Indians they were punished and threatened with death. Some who ran away attempting to assimilate into Indian society were killed as an example to frighten others and prevent them from doing the same. When a laboring European colonist had sex with a laboring African in the colony, the two were punished separately to show that “interracial sex” was unacceptable and labeled “illegal” in the colony. These two examples show how the colonial elites’ created a “white base of support” for their colonial oppression of Indians and Africans. Of course many of the English and European colonists had different motives. The elite colonists traveled to the colony to make profits while the laboring European colonists traveled to the colony to labor often because they had no other options and they thought they it was their only chance at having a decent life. However, the elite English colonists’ interests in gaining land and making profits often trumped the interests of the laboring Europeans and Africans as the elites often had the superior means of force on their side.

Also, the elite colonists wanted to acquire land for the extraction of resources and this conflicted the sovereignty of the indigenous people already in the colony. The English colonists with their guns were able to often defeat the contradicting force of the Powhatans who were generally had only bows and arrows to fight the English.

I will use Michael Burawoy’s extended case method. The extended case method is necessary for answering this research question as opposed to grounded theory because

this study is not merely a historical piece, but rather a historical-sociological piece that links this focused time period around the beginning of the colonization of Virginia to the broader system of United States imperialism and racial oppression. I am attempting to answer how the present situation is based on a past foundation. Burawoy says that reflexive science uses theory to link micro to macro. He argues that reflexive science connects the present to the past. He argues that with help of theory, ethnography can be global (Burawoy 1998: 5). Although I am not doing ethnography, I can apply this to my analysis of primary source data that were written largely by these colonial elites. By using theory to guide me, I can extend observations over space in time, locating the discourse of the elites of the colony of Virginia with the general history of western imperialism using my previously stated frameworks (Burawoy 1998). I want to use this method to test and extend my previously stated theories. With the guidance of these theories, I can show how the past set the foundation for the present. For instance, I can show an early consolidation of a “white oppressor nation” during this time period in the colony of Virginia (Bonacich 1980; Yeshitela 2010). I can also show the process of the development of the capitalist state, a repressive apparatus in the hands of the exploiting class that legalizes oppression and exploitation. With this background theory on the development of capitalism and the primitive accumulation, I am showing that this history of the colony is not isolated and unconnected from the system of capitalism replacing the system of feudalism in Europe, but rather it is directly tied to it (Marx 1867; Williams 1944; Blackburn 2011). Also, the present reality of racial oppression and the capitalist and imperialist system of the United States is directly tied to the time

period that I examine. For instance, some may argue that the colony of Virginia is not an example of capitalism as the system of capitalism did not emerge until the industrial revolution later on in Europe. However, as Marx pointed out, the industrial revolution in Europe required colonialism and slavery in the America's. Colonialism and imperialism are offshoots of capitalism (Marx 1867; Williams 1944; Blackburn 2011).

I am also locating the language and the discourse of these colonial elites within the context of these theories about the connection between white supremacy and capitalism. I also will use critical discourse analysis. Blommaert and Culcaen (2000) argue that critical discourse analysis is often used to examine political discourse and ideology. It examines how ideology is being reproduced. It can be used to examine race, and racism in language. It is also used to examine economic discourse. In Fairclough and Mauranen, they study how Margaret Thatcher's political discourse has "colonized" society in order to achieve hegemony and to make authority legitimate (Blommaert and Culcaen 2000: 453). Since I am examining documents largely written by the colonial elites, these have to be examined critically with the knowledge of their class position and class interests. The language of these elites can show how they view the world and the indigenous people and how this correlates to the economic and governing system that they set up. This language can also show us the colonial elites true motives for colonization. This can be compared to the true motives of U.S. government today for their foreign policy and intervention around the world. It can also be used to compare how the victims of this instance of colonial domination are treated to the treatment of "people of color" today.

How does the language of the elites of the colony of Virginia “colonize” the rest of society and help them achieve hegemony? What were the true motives of the colonial promoters and investors for the colonization of Virginia? Or how does the language of the colonial elites reflect their elite class position? How does the language of the English justify their colonial system’s actions towards the indigenous people?

CHAPTER III

THE VIRGINIA COMPANY OF LONDON

The Virginia Company of London was an early capitalist corporation, a private tyranny created by a charter from the king to Richard Haklyut and others including one of London's leading merchants, Sir Thomas Smith, who became the treasurer of the Virginia Company. White elites are the architects of the whole system of imperialism, an economic system that requires exploitation to function. It came into existence in 1606. Smith was the Virginia Company's principal officer (Morgan 1975: 44). The Virginia Company was a joint-stock company and the company's members hoped for a profit. Shiploads of England's unemployed European laborers were shipped over to Virginia as skilled specialists (Morgan 1975: 44). The Virginia Company was responsible for colonizing the territory that became the colony of Virginia. The company's goal was to produce oils, wines, spices, sugar, countless other resources to be made into commodities, and to search for and extract gold, silver, copper and all kinds of minerals (Hariot 1588; Haklyut 1609; Cushing 1978). The colonial elites and promoters were excited about taking advantage of the rich soil and all of the possible commodities that could be made from the natural resources from the territory (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Hariot 1588; Haklyut 1609; R.I. 1609; Smith 1612). However there was no gold to be found in Virginia. The company hoped to achieve long term occupation, creating a settler colony (Kingsbury 1935; Cushing 1978; Tompsett 2000: 32). The English wanted to establish a settlement that would become a market for English goods, to advance

shipping and the shipbuilding industry (Kingsbury 1935: 14, 21). The colonizing of “North America” was done with the goal of accumulating profits for English elites (Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975). This private tyranny ruled the colony of Virginia just as the large capitalist corporations and banks rule the United States and the world today (Domhoff 2006; Parenti 2011). The profitmaking interests of the English colonial elites would directly conflict with the self-determination of indigenous people, African servants and slaves, and English and other European colonists who had no property.

The Virginia Company’s goal was accumulating profits but it also said that it hoped to “civilize” the indigenous “savages” of the America’s by bringing them Christianity (Morgan 1975: 47). For instance, in the “Ancient Charters Relating to the First Settlement of Virginia” it said that the goal of the Virginia Company was to provide the Indians who they called “savages” with Christianity and civility: it said, “provide, that the true word, and service of God and Christian faith be preached, planted, and used, not only within every of the said several colonies, and plantations, but alsoe as much as they may amongst the salvage people...” (Cushing 1978: 68)...“that every person and persons being our subjects of very the said colonies and plantations shall from time to time well entreate those salvages in those parts, and use all good meanes to draw the salvages and heathen people of the said several places, and of the territories and countries adjoining the true service and knowledge of God,...” (Cushing 1978: 74).

The Indians considered most colonists mean and stingy, enslaved by their labors and drive for the accumulation of things. The concept of private property was foreign to Indians and land was not a commodity to them. The indigenous people are animistic,

which means that they believe that spirits inhabited the land, and that they should act with much restraint in extracting and exploiting it. This culture conflicted directly with the English culture. The Algonquians possessed neither the market institutions nor the mentality of capitalism. The Indians did not hire one another to work for wages. They didn't have the concept of "capital" or a market for exchanging it. They did not own pieces of land as exclusive and private property. Sachems annually assigned garden plots and hunting territories to particular families or clans. This depended upon their numbers, needs, and abilities. The Indians owned only what they could readily carry as they shifted encampments annually. This included clothing and their wooden and stone tools. Their culture cherished leisure and generosity more than the laborious accumulation of individual property for display. Chiefs accumulated honor and influence by giving away food and deerskins rather than by hoarding all that they could acquire. Chiefs bore the burden of generously entertaining official visitors, both Indian and colonial. Hospitality and generosity were fundamental duties so any violators were shamed and ridiculed. No one went hungry in an Indian village unless all starved. Theft was virtually unknown in Indian society because there was so little to steal and there was often not a need to steal. No one locked a wigwam. This culture sharply conflicted with the English culture which glorified accumulating private property at the expense of others. As a result of the English social system, the English took elaborate precautions to protect their property and to punish thieves (Taylor 2001: 191).

The English colonizers attempted to destroy the native system and practices by assimilating the Indians into the colony as menials, absorbing them as economic

subordinates (Taylor 2001: 129). U.S. and European imperialism often seeks to travel around the world and enslave and exploit colonized people in cheap labor positions for the enrichment of the elite investor class and the general white population. Edward Waterhouse, the secretary of the Virginia Company, suggested that Indians should be enslaved as they “now most justly be compelled to servitude and drudgery, supply the roome of men that labour, whereby even the meanest of the Plantation may employ themselves more entirely in their Arts and Occupations, which are more generous whilst Savages performe their inferior works of digging mynes, and the like” (Waterhouse 1622: 25). This early white supremacy is the racially framed underpinning for the capitalist system which required imperialism and colonialism first, such as the genocide of the Indians and the slavery of Africans (Yeshitela 2010). John Smith, an elite Englishman envisioned that the Powhatan Indians would be conquered just like the Spanish did to the Aztecs and then enslaved by the English, put to work by the Virginia Company (Morgan 1975: 77). Smith said that the English should have learned the lesson from the Spanish and “forced the treacherous and rebellious infidels to doe all manner of drudgery and slavery for them, themselves living like Souldiers upon the fruits of their labours” (Morgan 1975: 77).

Capitalism is a parasitic economic system. This means that some people profit as a result of the expropriated labor of others. The elites of England, the shareholders, investors, the backers of the Virginia Company and the planters in Virginia were the parasites. The Virginia Company’s idea was that when the riches came to England from Virginia, the company would pay out dividends to all of the shareholders in proportion

to the number of shares that they owned. The elite men of England could buy shares or a man could have a share by going to Virginia. The money made from the sales of shares paid for the shiploads of England's unemployed laborers and skilled specialists to go work in the colony of Virginia (Morgan 1975: 45). These men would be the indentured servants and they would not share in the profits made from the labor in Virginia. The company promised the soon-to-be "white" servants that they would work for the company for seven years as a payment for their transportation and then would be able to take advantage of the bountiful opportunities of the "new world" (Morgan 1975: 46). This was an example of the unification of the "white" workers and "white" bourgeoisie in their colonial mission against colonized people.

"Gentlemen" of the colony often had no manual skills and were usually not expected to labor at all, but were expected to provide advice and be the intelligentsia of the Company. The shareholders of the company included members of the nobility, 32 present or future earls, 4 countesses, and 3 viscounts and hundreds of lesser gentlemen. Of the 105 settlers who started the colony, 36 could be classified as gentlemen. In the next batch of 120 English settlers, 28 were gentlemen, and in the next supply of 70 settlers, 28 were gentlemen (Morgan 1975: 83). There were a few daily wage earners in Virginia's labor force. Most of the workers in Virginia were servants or tenants. Planters made investments by paying for their servant's trip to the New World. Servants were the most valued by planters. Planters could lose their investment if their servants died, but most believed that the rewards outweighed the risks. Servants had to be fed, clothed, and housed (Morgan 1975: 83). John Pory said, "our principall wealth..consisteth in

servants” (Pory 1619: 1). The white elites envisioned that their wealth would come off of the backs of English servants and indigenous people who they hoped to assimilate as menial workers or slaves.

In order to make going to work for the company more attractive for the poor Englishmen, Edwin Sandys gave them the option of working as sharecropping tenants under the direction of a company agent. Under this, they would give half their earnings to the company for seven years and then receive fifty acres of land after their seven years was up. The investors obtained one hundred acres for every share of stock in the company and fifty acres for every tenant that was sent to occupy their lands. The governor of the colony received 3,000 acres and 100 tenants. The treasurer got 1,500 acres and 50 tenants (Morgan 1975: 97). It was believed that the land in Virginia and North America was abundant or never ending and unused. This provided the English people much more opportunity for economic prosperity than existed in England (Hornsby 2005). However, the land was inhabited by other people and was not unused.

By colonizing North America, the English could transfer their economic burden onto the Indians by violently forcing them off of their land and later Africans through enslavng them. For instance, England was in economic crisis in the period leading up to colonization as London was notorious for filth, poverty, plagues, fires, crime, and executions right up before their colonization of the “New World” (Taylor 2001: 122). During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the rural people suffered increasing forced displacement, unemployment, and homelessness when the aristocratic landlords instituted a program known as enclosure (Taylor 2001; Blomley 2007: 2;

Bradley 2012). This was designed to increase profits (Greer 2012). The landlords enclosed common lands formerly used by the peasants to pasture livestock and to gather fuel, herbs, roots, fish, and rabbits. The increased poverty, vagrancy, and crime caused the propertied to fear a collapse of society into chaos (Taylor 2001: 120; Blomley 2007). The colonial promoters planned to solve this problem in England by sending these unemployed poor people to work on colonial plantations. This would provide a new market for English manufactures and it was a chance to control the poor as well as increase wealth and power for English elites (Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975; Allen 1998; Taylor 2001: 120). By colonizing Virginia, England could rescue itself from economic crisis. Essentially, the crisis would be shifted onto the indigenous people of the territory through the wars against the Algonquian people and other surrounding indigenous nations.

England was dependent on the woolen industry and its dependence on one single export product made her vulnerable to a depression (Bradley 2012). The Virginia Company was intent on presenting a colony to England to increase its exports (Morgan 1975: 70). The goal was to produce profits and for this goal, Virginia could not be merely a trading post but it would have to be an extension of England where Englishmen would have to live and produce articles of trade that they could not produce in England (Kingsbury 1935; Morgan 1975: 70). This required the domination of the native people's already in Virginia.

The planters learned how to grow tobacco in 1616. They were led by John Rolfe. At first King James was opposed to smoking but he loved the profits that came from

tobacco imports because it was so addictive. Consumers were willing to pay high prices for tobacco to satisfy their craving (Herndon 1957; Taylor 2001). This was an early drug industry (Tompsett 2000). This shows part of the unjust and exploitative nature of the system of parasitic capitalism/imperialism: the system is based on private profitmaking for the bourgeoisie. The system does not care about the well-being of the masses of people in society. The system is designed around serving the self-interests or the profitmaking of the elite few at the expense of the masses of people (DuBois 1965; Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005; Parenti 1995; Parenti 2011).

The colonizers were shipping home commodities like glass, salt, soap, pitch, tar, potash, clapboards, sassafras, and iron (Virginia Planters 1623; Cushing 178: 116). These commodities sold for a low price in London and were not enough to cover the company's costs for shipping people, equipment, and provisions across the Atlantic (Taylor 1975: 132). The Virginia Company fell towards bankruptcy in 1624 (Morgan 1975). The company gave up trying directly to control the land and the laborers and instead allowed the colonists to own and work land as their private property (Taylor 1975: 132). The colony remained controlled by the wealthy planters, the large property owners, or the plantation bourgeoisie, who were still driven by profit profitmaking. European indentured servants, African and Indian servants and slaves still provided the forced labor that enriched these wealthy planters (Morgan 1975; Allen 1998). In other words, the colony remained a fascist, tyrannical, capitalistic, exploitative system after the Virginia Company dissolved as the elite planters still controlled the colony through

the Virginia General Assembly, the colonial bourgeois government and legal system (Morgan 1975).

The English colonial elites (early white elites) of the Virginia Company often argued that they had an abundance of civilization and religion to share with the “inferior savages” of North America (Smith 1612; Cushing 1978). A common tactic of European imperialist oppression has been to wipe out the culture of the oppressed and make them believe that they have the exact same culture as the oppressor. Fidel Castro speaks about the Western aggression against the cultures of the people of the exploited third world: “What is one’s homeland, if not one’s own culture? What is national identity if not a country’s own culture? Can there be greater spiritual wealth than one’s own culture, created during eons by humankind? Can our customs be simply swept away, ruthlessly swept away?” (Castro 2000: 53). “It is very sad to hear – and it is true—that if a survey is made among Mexican or Latin America who was Bolivar, they do not know. Yet a great majority of those children know who Mickey Mouse is. That is their cultural legacy to us; they are destroying the most cherished values of our lives, or peoples, our nations, our communities” (Castro 2000: 55). Similarly, the colonists of the Virginia Company sought to wipe out the culture of the Indians and convert them to Christianity. Governor George Yeardley, an English (white) elite wealthy plantation owner or agent of mass oppression proposed to take whole families of Indians to live in English settlements to establish a college where the English would “civilize” Indian youth and teach them Christianity.

Sir Thomas Gates was instructed to take some Powhatan children and raise them in an English manner away from their parents influence. This was part of the policy of genocide by the private tyranny of the Virginia Company. For instance, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, passed by the United Nations in 1948 lists “forcibly transferring children of the group to another group” as part of its description of genocide (United Nations 1948: 256). The white colonizers were often missionaries who wanted to bring Christianity to the Indians who they called savages and uncivilized. According to the Records of the Virginia Company, the executives wanted to convert Indian children to Christianity and give them a colonial education:

It was also by m’ Trer propounded to the Cort as a thing most worthy to be taken into consideracon both for the glory of God, and the honor of the Company, that forasmuch as the King in most gracious favor hath graunted his lres to the severall Bishops of this Kingdome for the collecting of monies to erect and build a Colledge in Virginia for the training and bringing up of Infidells children to the true knowledge of God and understanding of righteousness.” (Kingsbury 1935: 220).

The Virginia Company planned to take indigenous children at the age of seven or younger and teach them until they were 12 years old. This college would teach them English and the religion of Christianity:

The furtherance of with good worke, the Convertinge of Infidles to the faith of Christe I pmsed to my good friends 500th fro the maintenance of a

Convenient number of young Indians taken at the age of Seven years or younger and instructed in the reading and understanding the principles of Christian Religion unto the Age of 12 years and then as occasion serveth to be trained and brought up in some lawful Trade with all humanity and gentleness until the Age of one and Twenty years, and then to enjoy like liberties and privileges with our native English.... (Kingsbury 1935: 307-308)

The oppressor imperialist power often seeks to wipe out the culture of the oppressed colonized population. If they are able to do this, they can make the colonized population totally dependent colonized subject people. The goal of the oppressor is to make the colonized people identify totally with the colonial power so they will protect their oppressor's interests at the expense of their own. The Virginia Company was never successful at making a college for indigenous children to attend and be converted to Christianity although European powers used this tactic in the future against indigenous people (Hess 2000). The Powhatans were largely not attracted by their colonial settlement and way of life (Tompsett 2000).

Conclusion

The goal of the Virginia Company was to make profits for private shareholders and large planters by profiting off of the labor of English indentured servants, and Indians who they envisioned would be enslaved to work for the planters. The English never envisioned that the Indians would be treated as equals, they always envisioned that they would be treated as inferiors and enslaved. The colonial elites said that their

mission along with profitmaking was to “civilize” the Indians by teaching them true Christianity as they stole their land and enslaved them. It was too difficult to enslave these indigenous people given their knowledge of the land. Instead, English colonizers fought genocidal wars with the surrounding indigenous people in an effort to seize the land for their exploitative purposes (Morgan 1975). Many of the surviving Indians conquered by the English colonizers in wars were enslaved and often shipped to Caribbean in return for African slaves (Allen 1998).

The colonial planners envisioned that the colony would rescue England from their economic crisis by putting the poor and unemployed masses in England to work in the colony. European Imperialism often shifts its economic crisis onto colonized people (Marx 1867; Williams 1944; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). By doing this, they are able to expand economic opportunity and democracy within the European imperialist centers (Hess 2000). Indentured servitude in the colonies set the stage for African slavery (Williams 1944). African slaves entered into an already functioning economic system based on exploitation and private profitmaking (Williams 1944). The entire colony was centered on the private profitmaking of the elite exploiting planter class. Private profit making is a key characteristic of the capitalist system.

CHAPTER IV

PARASITISM, STOLEN LAND AND RESOURCES

Empires do not just pursue power for power's sake. There are real material interests at stake, and fortunes to be made many times over (Parenti 2011: 7). The intervention is intended to enrich the investors and keep the world safe for their private profitmaking. Behind Colonel Blimp there stood the East India Company and the Bank of England. Behind Teddy Roosevelt and the US Marines there stood the United Fruit Company and Wall Street. (Parenti 2011: 7). Behind the colonists, terrorizing the indigenous people of the territory of Virginia was the Virginia Company of London.

The European imperialist powers dominate, brutalize and destroy indigenous people all over the world in order to take control over their lands for extraction of natural resources. These natural resources are exported to the imperialist center to be manufactured into finished products to be sold around the world for the unjust enrichment of white power (Ture and Hamilton 1992; Feagin 2006). In many of the primary documents, the English elites such as Queen Elizabeth, Richard Haklyut, Thomas Hariot, John Smith, and others discuss the rich lands of Virginia and all of the resources that they thought could be found in the colony of Virginia. The elites planned to turn these natural resources into commodities to be sold for the enrichment of English economic elites (Queen Elizabeth 1584; Hariot 1588; Haklyut 1609; Smith 1612). They also discussed the nice climate in the territory of Virginia and its potential to be made into a settler colony (Smith 1612). These documents suggest that the primary reason for

colonization of Virginia was to take over the land for control over its rich resources, rich climate, and to make the resources of the territory into commodities. This would make profits for the elite English investors and planters of the Virginia Company. It would also expand and enrich the English empire.

Tobacco became the staple crop of the colony of Virginia and the Chesapeake region, Virginia and Maryland. It was the second most important staple crop in North America after cod fishery (Hornsby 2005: 88). Tobacco remained the most important agricultural staple on the mainland through the “colonial period” (up until the American Revolution) (Hornsby 2005: 88). The development of the tobacco trade was second only to sugar in importance (Hornsby 2005: 88). The first tobacco was imported into England from the Spanish empire in the 1590. After this, smoking became very popular. The English empire was able to compete with the Spanish empire’s tobacco and had its own source of supply with its successful cultivation of tobacco in the Chesapeake. Its domestic market boomed. Between the early 1620s and the late 1670s, rose from some 65,000 pounds to 20 million pounds (Hornsby 2005: 91).

Tobacco plants could not be grown in England and thrived in Virginia because they prefer a long, hot, and humid growing season (Taylor 2001: 134). During the 1620’s, tobacco sold in England for about five to ten times as much as it cost to produce in the Chesapeake. If a planter could obtain land and a few laborers and keep them alive and working, he could make more in a year than in a decade spent in England. Tobacco’s profits increased the value of indentured servants and this stimulated the flow of emigrants to Virginia (Taylor 2001: 134). On the one hand of enrichment of the

English empire required the other hand of racist colonial oppression, exploitation, and genocide.

Even though the early settlement schemes funded by the London Virginia Company and English aristocrat Lord Baltimore failed, the Chesapeake region became the principal farming frontier on the eastern sea board. The Chesapeake became the wealthiest agricultural region in the thirteen colonies, known for their wealthy planters that owned large plantations and many slaves (Hornsby 2005: 88).

England colonized North America because it was rich and England was poor. In “A Map of Virginia” John Smith, an elite English colonizer describes the land of Virginia, the indigenous people, the animals, the fruit, the potential commodities. In this document, Smith describes the potential of the land to be exploited. Smith said,

Within is a country that may have the prerogative over the most pleasant places of *Europe, Asia, Africa, or America.* for large and pleasant navigable rivers: heaven and earth never agreed better to frame a place for means of habitation being of our constitutions, were it fully manured and inhabited by industrious people. Here are mountaines, hills, plaine, valleyes, rivers, and brookes all running most pleasantly into a faire Bay compassed but for the mouth with fruitfull and delightsome land (Smith 1612: 1).

The white racial frame is evident in this quote as Smith implies the indigenous people are not industrious and that the English elites are industrious (The English elites did not believe that the English poor and laborers were industrious). This racism is endemic to

the system of European imperialism. It rationalizes colonial domination by describing English elites as industrious as they would develop the land in their own way of producing cash crops to sell for private profits enriching the elite English (white) class. Indigenous people are viewed as inferiors to be pushed out of the way so the English could pick the riches that they hoped would be in the territory.

The English essentially set up a settler colony in Virginia. Smith said, “The mildnesse of the aire, the fertilitie of the soile, and the situation of the rivers are so propitious to the nature and use of man as no place is more convenient for pleasure, profit, and mans sustenance” (Smith 1612: 1). In this quote, perhaps Smith expresses satisfaction about the rich land and temperate climate of Virginia. The English wanted to establish a settler colony for long term occupation and establish political, economic, and social systems and institutions similar to the mother imperialist country. Early examples of this were religious institutions such as Christian churches and the Virginia General Assembly. As the indigenous population dwindled throughout the seventeenth century as a result of English violence/wars and diseases, the English colonial population continued growing as a result of their continued influx (Taylor 2001). In the future as the Anglo (white) system grew more powerful, these areas became prosperous as the system is designed to economically develop the white areas while simultaneously “underdevelop” and exploit colonized people and the areas that they inhabit (Allen 1970).

The Ancient Charter of the Virginia Company said that its mission was to search for gold, silver, copper, and all kinds of minerals:

And we do also grant and confirm, for us, our heirs and successors, that it shall be lawful for the said treasurer and company, and their successors, by direction of the governors there, to dig and to search for all manner of mines of gold, silver, copper, iron, lead, tin, and all sorts of minerals, as well within the precinct aforesaid, as within any part of the main land, not formerly granted to any other; and to have and enjoy the gold, silver, copper, iron, lead, tin, and all sorts of minerals, to be gotten thereby, to the use and behoof of the said company of planters and adventurers; yielding thereof, and paying yearly, unto us, our heirs and successors, as aforesaid (Cushing 1978: 92-93).

The Virginia Company was like an early transnational corporation with the goal of taking over the land of the earth and subjugate, enslave, or wipe out the people of the land to obtain the resources for the Anglo or white dominated exploiting class.

Smith thought that the Virginia Company could obtain copper and other minerals from the new colony and enslave the indigenous people while simultaneously converting them to Christianity:

Then how much hath *Virginia* the perogative of all those flourishing kingdomes for the benefit of our land, when as within one hundred miles all those are to bee had, either ready provided by nature, or else to bee prepared, where there but industrious men to labour. Only of Copper wee may doubt is wanting, but there is good probabilitie that both copper and

better minerals are there to be had for their labor. Other Countries have it. So then here is a place a nurse for souldiers, a practise for marriners, a trade for marchants, a reward for the good, and that whish is most of all, a businesse (most acceptable to God) to bring such poore infidels to the true knowledge of God and his holy Gospell (Smith 1612: 1).

Generally attached to the search for minerals and commodities to enrich Europe or in this case the English is the act of racializing the colonized people. The English imperialists want to remake the colonized people of the world in their image. Thorstein Veblen argues that barbarian imperialists attach God to justify their brutal, exploitative, and unjust practices (Veblen 1899). Smith also discusses establishing a white settler colony with “industrious” white workers. If they establish this, there will be “reward for the good.” This is bourgeois ideology describing that the English colonizers and imperialists are “good,” justifying their stolen wealth and resources from colonized people.

In letter written in 1584 from the Queen Elizabeth of England to Walter Raleigh, she grants Raleigh settlement rights in Virginia. In this document, Queen Elizabeth expresses her desire to search the land for gold and silver and steal these for the enrichment of the English Empire: “our heires and successors, for all services, dueties, and demaunds, the fift part of all the oare of golde and silver, that from time to time, and at all times after such discoverie, subduing and possessing, shall be there gotten and obtained” (Queen Elizabeth 1584: 291). It is a characteristic of European thought and culture to want private control over land for exploitation of its resources for individual

gain (Ani 1994). This way of thinking directly conflicts with traditional American Indian animistic cultures that view the land as sacred which can be owned by no individual (Taylor 2001). Europeans believed that humanity had a divine duty to dominate nature with unchecked power while North American indigenous people believed that they had to show restraint in regards to using and exploiting nature. They believe that humans are one with nature and believe that the fundamental principle in harvesting nature is the pursuit of reciprocity (Taylor 2001: 19).

In “Virginia, Richly valued...” Richard Haklyut, a prominent advocate of colonization in the “New World,” describes Virginia as a probable site for gold and copper:

We likewise reade not long after, that the Governour set forward to seeke a province called Pacaha, which hee was informed to be neere unto Chisca, where the Indians told him, that there was gold..

But what neede I to stand upon forren testimonies, since Master Thomas Heriot, a man of much judgement in these causes, signified unto you all, at your late solemne meeting at the house of the right honourable the Earle of Exeter, how to the Southwest of our old fort in Virginia, the Indians often informed him, that there was a great melting of red mettall, reporting the manner in working of the same. Besides, our owne Indians have lately revealed either this or another rich mine of copper or gold in a towne called Ritanoë, neere certaine mountains lying West of Roanoac (Haklyut 1609: 4).

English colonizers came to Virginia looking to exploit the land, and loot the resources.

The colonial planners also thought that they could make commodities of countless other resources that they expected to find in the colony of Virginia. Haklyut discussed finding silkworms to make silk in the mulberry trees.

A fourth chiefe commoditie wee may account to be the great number of Mulberrie trees, apt to feede Silke- wormes to make silke: whereof there was such plenty in many places, that, though they found some hempe in the countrie, the Spaniards made ropes of the barks of them for their brigandines, when they were to put to sea for Nova Hispania. (Haklyut 1609: 5)

Haklyut thought that different colors of dye could be found (Haklyut 1609: 5). He also said that pearls could be found in Virginia. Haklyut said that he passed over cotton wool and that should not be forgotten (cotton would later serve as a base for the development of the modern capitalist system (Williams 1944)):

Another very gainfull comoditie is, the huge quantitie of excellent perles, and little babies and birds made of them, that were found in Cutifachiqui. The abundance whereof is reported to be such, that if they would have searched divers graves in townes thereabout, they might have laded many of their horses. Neither are the Turkie stones and cotton wooll found at Guasco to be forgotten, nor passed over in silence (Haklyut 1609: 4).

Thomas Harriot discusses several potential commodities in Virginia that would attract investors including silkworm, pitch, tar, rosen, and turpentine, sassafras, wine, cedar, iron, pearl, sweet gums (Harriot 1588: 14-18). He even thought that the colony could grow sugar cane (Harriot 1588: 19).

In “A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia...” countless commodities are reported to be found in the colony of Virginia for the control of the English empire. This passage shows that the English sought to compete with other European empires:

The rich Furrer, Caviary, and Cordage which we draw from *Russia* with so great difficulty, are to be had in *Virginia*, and the parts adjoining, with ease and plenty. The Masts, Planckes, and Boords, the Pitch and Tarre, the Pot-ashes and Sope-ashes, the Hempe and Flax, (being the materials of Linnen,) which now we fetch from *Norway, Denmarke, Poland,* and *Germany*, are there to be had in abundance and great perfection. The *Iron*, which hath so wasted our *English* Woods, that it selfe in short time must decay together with them, is to be had in *Virginia* (where wasting of Woods is a benefit) for all good conditions answerable to the best in the world. The Wines, Fruite, and Salt of *France* and *Spaine*; The Silkes of *Persia* and *Italie*, will be found also in *Virginia*, and in no kinde of worth inferior. Wee omit here a multitude of other naturall Commodities, dispersed up and downe the divers parts of the world: of

Woods, Rootes, and Berries, for excellent Dyes: of Plants and other Drugges, for Physicall service: Of sweet Woods, Oyles, and Gummes, for pleasure and other use: Of Cotten- wooll, and Sugar-Canes: all which may there also be had in abundance, with an infinity of other more (His Majesties Counseil for Virginia 1620: 4).

European empires seek to compete with each other for control over territories, colonies, and commodities to be sold for the profitmaking of European (white) elites (DuBois 1920). In the process, people around the world, colonized people, largely people of color are brutalized, terrorized, enslaved, or wiped out by these European (white) powers.

There was no gold or other precious metals to be found in Virginia. The main staple crop became tobacco. In the 1620's, there was a tobacco boom. Virginia just began shipping tobacco to the English market. The prices were lower than Spanish tobacco, but it was high enough to inspire the planters to start growing as much tobacco as they could (Morgan 1975: 112).

Conclusion

The English empire came to North America in search for riches and commodities to sell. They had many ideas for potential commodities that they could make out of the plundered resources. The plan was to enrich the investors of the Virginia Company. The lands were considered vacant and the people who inhabited the land were considered inferior who should be exploited, enslaved, pushed aside, or completely wiped out. The goal of the English was to separate the indigenous people from their land and resources. As I show later in Chapter 5, the rich land that these indigenous people inhabited made

them criminals on their own land. This resembles today's global capitalist system where U.S. transnational corporations seek to control the land, labor, and resources of countries all around the world, largely places abundant in resources such as Africa, Latin America, and Asia, while subjugating and exploiting the people of these lands in the process through means of force or the threat of force (Parenti 1995). Today, African descendant people are stereotyped by the white capitalist system as "criminals" because the wealth of the white world was accumulated on their backs through slavery and colonialism in Africa and through an ongoing system of exploitation (Feagin 2006). Also, Arabs are stereotyped as "terrorists" because they come from a land of rich oil reserves that the exploitative U.S. and European empires want to control and need to control for their unjust enrichment. Colonized people of color are labeled as inferior because the U.S. Empire and traditionally oppressive European empires require exploitation of the masses of the world's people, stolen land, and resources in order to enrich themselves.

CHAPTER V

**THE WHITE RACIAL FRAME AND THE EARLY CONSTRUCTION OF
“RACE” IN THE COLONY OF VIRGINIA**

“It is the colonist who fabricated and continues to fabricate the colonized subject. The colonist derives his validity, i.e., his wealth from the colonial system.”

Frantz Fanon (Fanon 1963: 2)

White supremacy is a bourgeois colonial invention and is the ideological underpinning of imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism (Mills 1997; Ladner 1998; Feagin 2010; Yeshitela 2010). From the beginning, the white colonial elites of the Virginia Company framed themselves as white and superior and the indigenous people as savage, uncivilized, unchristian, idle, and inferior. The white racial frame has two key parts, the arrogant pro-white sub frame that defines whites as hard working, industrious, more intelligent, and generally superior and the numerous anti-others sub frames that define people of color as savages, uncivilized, lazy, criminal, less intelligent, and generally inferior (Feagin 2010). Capitalism is system that enriches the general white population. Its goal is to produce profits for its white elites while violently colonizing people of color all over the world. Eventually, these elites would be forced by also exploited European workers to share some of this loot with them. This created an oppressor white population as European workers largely united with European elites in their colonial mission (Bonacich 1980; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). The system of

capitalism treats all whites as superior although the white bourgeoisie exploits the white working class and poor. It defines colonized people of color as inferior and therefore worthy of slavery, exploitation, or genocide. This is the white racial frame, the worldview that the white oppressor population uses to justify the racist, capitalist, colonial oppression against people of color for the purposes of enriching white or European elites and the European white population (Feagin 2010). This is because the capitalist system is parasitic and the unjust enrichment of the white world requires their stolen land, labor, and resources.

A common theme throughout all of the documents written by English elites is the framing of the indigenous people as savages and infidels who need civilization and to be taught true religion such as Christianity. This justifies brutal treatment, killings, and genocide of the indigenous population. The indigenous people and Africans are othered as they are defined as “heathens” and unchristian. Defining Indians and Africans as unchristian, “heathens”, uncivilized rationalized their enslavement. Designating Africans and Indians heathens and unchristian was a convenient justification for appropriating these people’s lands, markets, and labor (Brown 1996: Locations 2344-2350) This is the early articulation of the white racial frame in America.

Also, the colonial leaders, wanted to destroy the culture and traditional political, economic, and social systems of the indigenous people so no colonists would run away and join the indigenous people in order to live a life with much greater ease and equality (Taylor 2001: 128). This problem for the English imperialist leaders was experienced in the Irish Conquest. Sir William Herbert said:

Colonies degenerate assuredly when the colonists imitate and embrace the habits, customs, and practices of the natives. There is no better way to remedy this evil than to do away with and destroy completely the habits and practices of the natives (Taylor 2001: 128).

Herein lies the purpose of defining the Indians as heathens, savages, unchristian and attempting to bring them Christianity. The colonial elite exploiting class hoped to make their colony stronger and increase their wealth by bringing the indigenous people into the colony as menial workers (Taylor 2001). During the wars against the Algonquian people, many were captured and sold into slavery. The English also fought wars with the Dutch, but Dutch prisoners of war were never sold into slavery (Morgan 1975).

When examining documents by English elites that discuss plans for colonizing the Americas, English elites already utilize an early version of the white racial frame or white supremacy to rationalize colonial domination. John Smith said that in the process of gaining new territories for the English Empire, the indigenous people will be subjugated: “The gaining of provinces addeth to the Kings Crown: But the reducing of the Heathen people to civilitie and true religion” (Smith 1627: 7).

In the letter written in 1584 from the Queen Elizabeth of England to Walter Raleigh, Elizabeth grants Raleigh settlement rights in Virginia. In this document, Queen Elizabeth utilizes the white racial frame in its early form, defining Indians as heathens, barbarous, and unchristian and therefore worthy of being enslaved and brought to their knees by the English Empire:

Know ye that of our especial grace, certaine science, & meere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents for us, our heires and successors doe give and grant to our trusty and welbeloved servant Walter Raleigh Esquire, and to his heires and assignes forever, free liberty & licence from time to time, and at all times for ever hereafter, to discover, search, finde out, and view such remote, *heathen and barbarous lands, countreys, and territories, not actually possessed of any Christian prince, nor inhabited by Christian people...* (Emphasis added) (Queen Elizabeth 1584: 290)

People of Africa, indigenous people of the America's, people of Asia, and the natural resources of these countries have become the objects of exploitation for western imperialists. As Queen Elizabeth shows, they are viewed and dehumanized as "barbarous heathens" to be exploited and shown "true civilization" by supposedly superior Europeans. While viewing the rest of the world or "people of color" as objects to be exploited, nature is viewed the same way. Instead of living harmoniously with nature, this economic system is bent on exploiting nature as much as possible in order to make a profit (Harding 1993).

The white racial frame said that the Indians should be economically exploited similar to the way Europeans believe that nature needs to be exploited for profitmaking. After the Powhatan's surprise attack on the Jamestown settlement in 1622, The Virginia Company saw this as a positive because it gave them a justification to attempt to totally wipe out the surrounding Indians. Attached to the private tyranny of the Virginia

Company's policy of genocide was vicious white supremacy: "But that all men may feel the unpartiall ingenuity of this Discourse, we freely confesse, that the country is not so good, as the Natives are bad, whose barbarous Savagenesse needs more cultivation then the ground itself, being more overspread with incivilitie and treachery, then that with Bryers" (Waterhouse 1622: 19). The system of European dominated capitalism is an exploitative system dominated by white males that treats the people of color or colonized people, the land and even European women as cogs in the system, things or objects to be exploited for their private gain.

"Note Brittania: Offering Most Excellent frutes by Planting in Virginia: Exciting all such as be well affected to further the same" (1609) is a pamphlet promoting the colony of Virginia to investors and adventurers about the richness of the land for the imperialists to exploit. While discussing the richness of the land and the hope for potential commodities, the author discusses the indigenous people using the old white racial frame, describing the indigenous people as uncivilized, beastlike, and unintelligent:

The country it selfe is large and great assuredly, though as yet, no exact discovery can bee made of all. It is also commendable and hopefull every way, the ayre and clymate most sweete and wholsome, much warmer then *England*, and very agreeable to our Natures: It is inhabited with wild and savage people, that live and lie up and downe in troupes like herds of Deare in a Forrest: they have no law but nature, their apparell skinned of beasts, but most goe naked: the better sort have houses, but poore ones,

they have no Arts nor Science, yet they live under superior command such as it is, they are generally very loving and gentle, and doe entertaine and relieve our people with great kindnesse: they are easy to be brought to good, and would fayne embrace a better condition: the land yeeldeth naturallie for the sustentation of man, abundance of fish, both scale and shell: of land and water fowles, infinite store: of Deere, Kaine and Fallow, Stages, Coneys, and Hares, with many fruits and rootes good for meate (R.I. 1609: 11)

This is the old white racial frame, describing future colonized people as savage, uncivilized as they have “no law but nature” and “no arts nor science.” They are also described as “very loving and gentle” and therefore in the eyes of the English, easy to dominate, enslave, exploit, or wipe out. The land is also described as abundant, bountiful, and perfect to sustain the English colonial settlement and establish to expand the English market and send home stolen resources.

Hosea Jaffe said that the concept of race and whiteness was born out of the European imperialism. Although there were many different indigenous nations of North and South America, the English imperialists viewed them all as one people or one “race.” Later on, the increased power of the European social, political, and economic system made this social construction a reality. For instance in John Smith’s description of all of the different indigenous groups, he said, “They are inconstant in everie thing, but what feare constraineth them to keepe. Craftie, timerous, quicke of apprehension and very ingenuous. Some are of disposition fearefull, some bold, most cautelous,

all *Savage*.” Smith describes the different indigenous groups or nations as different but “all savage.” In other words, all are viewed by the “white race” as inferior and worthy of being conquered. The Anglo-American bourgeoisie often capitalized off of inter-Indian tribal rivalries for their own selfish purposes. They often made some Indian tribes as “allies” to serve as a protective buffer or shield for the colony against the more remote and hostile tribes (Allen 1998: 42-43). The tribes that sided with the English would only be used as pawns for their goal of complete domination and conquest. This is an old tactic of divide and rule. As this quote describes, all Indians are “savage,” so whether the tributary Indian groups knew it or not, they were eventually doomed (Taylor 2001).

Conclusion

Whiteness, white racism, and white supremacy is a bourgeois colonial invention that is used to justify stolen land, labor, and resources of colonized people of color and to create a white base of support for the imperialist capitalist colonial elites (Hess 2000). The English elites framed the indigenous people as “heathen,” “barbarous,” “uncivilized,” and “savage” and therefore worthy of being enslaved. Therefore, the English suggested that they should be conquered, and exploited just like they planned to do to the land in the territory that they named “Virginia.” The Indians being defined this way was convenient because the English wanted to steal their land in order make commodities out of the resources of the land for their own enrichment. African people were also labeled as unchristian and this also made them worthy of slavery (Tompsett 2000; Goetz 2012). The colonial elites also used this as a justification for distinguishing between the laboring English colonists and the laboring Africans. Over a period of time,

the imperialist expansion unified different European ethnicities as superior white people to be the exploiters, it also unified different Native American nations as one people or oppressed nation to be exploited, and different African nations as an oppressed nation to be exploited.

The capitalist system and the wealth of white elites and the general white population rests upon the oppression and exploitation of colonized Native American people, colonized African people. The concept of race comes from the European imperial and colonial expansion and exploitation. The United States became a capitalist white nationalist state. This means that the general white population serves as an expansion of the capitalist state to terrorize and keep super-exploited colonized people in their position of subjugation and super-exploitation because the whole economy is built on their backs.

CHAPTER VI
THE EMERGING “WHITE CAPITALIST-IMPERIALIST STATE” IN THE
COLONY OF VIRGINIA

“Capitalism was born of slavery and colonialism, and the capitalist State was forged through that process. The significance of the capitalist State is that it was created and is defined by its task to maintain the relationship of white power upon the pedestal of the exploitation of African and oppressed peoples. The British Bobbies (police) which are arms of the capitalist State carried no guns at home against Europeans but were exceptionally violent in their brutality against Africans in the colonies of the British Empire.” Omali Yeshitela (Yeshitela 2012: 95).

“The State legalizes itself. It doesn’t ask permission...The State can write down that slavery is legal. If you are a slave and you try to escape slavery, you have broken the law.” Omali Yeshitela (Yeshitela 2012: 98).

The capitalist state legalizes the oppression of the working class by the capitalist (exploiting) class (Lenin 1923). The capitalist class maintains its elite status and perpetuates the exploitation of people through the threat of the violence (Parenti 2011). The capitalist class needs a protective group of armed forces to keep colonized people terrorized and in check when they struggle for self-determination. In the white capitalist state, the white oppressor population unites violently against colonized people of color to steal their land, labor, and resources (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006). Earlier, I showed the English economic elites’ interest in the land of Virginia and the potential commodities

that could be taken from the land of Virginia. In this chapter, I attempt to show an early consolidation of the “white state.” The white state is the violent force that stands in between the colonized people and their expropriated labor, stolen land, and stolen resources. The state is the armed forces, the police, the court system, and the prisons and the jails (Lenin 1923; Parenti 1995; Hess 2000). The state serves the interests of the ruling class and is in place to protect their property. In the capitalist system, the state serves the interests of the bourgeoisie and its white oppressor population in general. Colonized people experience the height of the heavy handed potential of state repression (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005). The process of uniting the laboring colonists with the profitmaking interests of the elite colonists was a dialectical process. For instance, early on in the colony, some laboring colonists ran away with the Algonquian Indians in hopes of living a more leisurely life in a much more egalitarian society (Taylor 2001: 128). These colonists were captured and often brutally killed by the elite colonists in order to discourage more runaways. The elite colonists needed laborers very early on and if these internal contradictions were not resolved, they would have no buffer zone. If the elite colonized had no working colonists to serve as a buffer and to labor in the beginning, the colony would dissolve and they would have no source of profitmaking (Allen 1998; Taylor 2001). Elite and rank and file whites labored vigorously to wipe out the indigenous people and terrorize Africans to set up this system of racial oppression, systemic racism or internal colonialism inside the “belly of the beast,” what would later become the U.S. Empire (white power) (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006; Yeshitela 2010). In the

early colony of Virginia, these characteristics of the modern capitalistic state began to emerge.

As a result of the “primitive accumulation of capital,” in the capitalist system, every strata of white society rests upon a pedestal of colonial oppression of people of color such as indigenous people and African descendant people (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). “The primitive accumulation of capital” gave rise to both the white bourgeoisie and the white proletariat in Europe (Marx 1867; Yeshitela 2010). Similarly, many displaced poor Englishman with no economic opportunity were put to work through colonization of Virginia. The growth of the tobacco economy during the seventeenth century attracted an enormous number of English immigrants to the Chesapeake, seeking to escape the poverty in England and to attain more resources than they could in England. Between 1625 and 1680, some 90,000 European migrants arrived in Virginia and Maryland (Hornsby 2005: 91). This was the largest European migration to any part of the eastern seaboard in the seventeenth century and second only to the influx into the English West Indies (Hornsby 2005: 91). Between two thirds and three quarters of the migrants were indentured servants. Their trips were paid for by merchants who were reimbursed by selling them to planters in the Chesapeake. The rest of the migrants paid their way across ocean and arrived in the Chesapeake with some capital. They were free migrants (Hornsby 2005: 91). Most were from the middle and lower ranks of English society, drawn from the ranks of farmers, laborers, artisans, and youths. They had little stake in English society because of the limited economic opportunity there so they looked for work overseas, hoping to establish themselves on the land in the colonies and

advance economically (Hornsby 2005: 91). England rescued itself from economic crisis by colonization of North America.

Conservatives today complain about the government, arguing “the less government the better.” However, the “free” market system is actually rooted in state power. The interests of the capitalist corporations are protected by the laws, the courts, and the armed forces (Parenti 1995). From the beginning in the United States, the government was set up to serve the interests of the exploiting elite class of the colonizing power. This was exemplified in the white settler colonial government of Virginia, the Virginia General Assembly. It had the power to make laws but these laws had to be approved first by the company. This was the first legislative assembly in the English colonial America (Morgan 1975: 96). The colonial elite English men who controlled the labor force sat on the assembly council of the Virginia Company. This is an example of this capitalist state that was set up to protect the interests of the elite white men in their interests of profitmaking. The council consisted almost entirely of the planters or masters who held a large number of servants. Between 1619 and 1627 Ralph Hamor, John Pott, Abraham Peirse, Edwin Sandys, William Tucker, Samuel Mathews, and George Yeardley sat on the council and Francis Wyatt and George Yeardley served as Governors (Morgan 1975: 124; Cushing 1978).

The council in Virginia supported masters who physically abused servants. They believed that they had to motivate their workers to work with pain and terror (Taylor 2001: 132). The function of the capitalist state is to protect property and property owners or the exploiting class from the resistance of labor with violent force (Jackson 1971).

This violent force is deemed legitimate because the bourgeoisie or exploiting class says so, it serves their interests. After a laborer was convicted of stealing two pints of oatmeal, the leaders had a long needle stabbed through his tongue to keep him from ever eating again. He was chained to a tree and he slowly starved to death. This was done to terrify English working colonists (Taylor 2001: 132). The English colonial elites were in control of the legitimate uses of force, the laws, and the government of the white settler colonial territory. The masters who were bent on making profits abused and exploited servants. Elizabeth Abbott and Elias Hinton died after beatings and lashings from the planters, John and Alice Proctor and by other servants who took orders from the Proctors. Witnesses testified that Proctor beat Hinton with a rake. There is no indication that the Proctors were punished (Morgan 1975: 127). It was reported in England that masters in Virginia abused their servants and that the work was much harder than the intermittent labor of an English farmer. Since the masters were driven by profit, they treated their servants as things, machines to grow tobacco (Morgan 1975: 127). The masters profited off of the labor of the servants. An English servant, like an African slave, was a commodity (Morgan 1975: 129). Masters bought and sold servants sometimes without the consent of servants (Morgan 1978: 128). The government granted servants freedom when their time was up if they lived (Morgan 1975: 128). Most servants did not live to become free property owners (Allen 1998). The boom in tobacco resulted in working the servants harder.

The Virginia Company planned that it would have full control over the colony and would rule through a governor. The governor would be advised by a council, but

their advice would not be binding (Morgan 1975). He would be as much a military commander as a governor. The colonial enterprise took on a military character. The Ancient Charter of the Virginia Company of London said that martial law should be enforced in cases of rebellion or uprising from the working classes:

And we do further...grant, declare and ordain that such principal governor, as, from time to time, shall duly and lawfully be authorized and appointed, in manner and from in these presents heretofore expressed, shall have full power and authority, to use and exercise martial law, in cases of rebellion or mutiny, in as large and ample manner, as our lieutenants to our counties, within this our realm of England, have or ought to have, by force of their commissions of Lieutenancy (Cushing 1978: 96).

The capitalist state serves the interests of the exploiting class and protects their property from the resistance of the exploited or working classes. The legitimate means of force serve the interests of the ruling exploiting class. Colonial Virginia took on the character of a fascist corporate state.

The company's attitude was incorporated into the laws (Morgan 1975: 80). From the very beginning you can see the laws are the opinion of the bourgeoisie or the ruling exploiting class. Law 34 concluded by the General Assembly on March 5, 1623 also legalizes the oppression of the working class by the exploiting class. It said "That no person within this colony upon the rumor of supposed change and alteration, presume to be disobedient to the present government, nor servants to their private officers or

overseers at their uttermost perrills” (Cushing 1978: 123). This shows that the elites legalized their own unjust system through this colonial court system. This was legitimized force and violence. This was an emerging version of the white capitalist state. Disobedience to exploitation was illegal while exploitation was legal. Before the 1700’s when the workforce in Virginia became primarily African slaves, English indentured servants were brutally exploited by the English colonial elites as the laws supported masters who beat and lashed servants.

Africans were not brought to the Americas to enjoy lives as equal citizens in “American Democracy.” They were brought to the Americas as captives or colonized subject people, slaves to be exploited to build European imperialism. The colony of Virginia was constructed around the profitmaking interests of the elite English class. Africans entered into an already exploitative system (Williams 1944).

The first Africans were brought to the colony in 1619 (Morgan 1975; Higginbotham 1998). Nearly all Africans were slaves when they arrived in Virginia, and, before 1644, nearly all slaves in Virginia were Africans (Brown 1996: *Kindle Locations* 2321-2322). Before the 1660’s, although all Africans were brought to the colony as slaves, some worked as servants. Few were able to purchase freedom, where they could own land, and livestock. Masters hoped to use African labor for as long as they could, preferably for life. In Virginia, from as early as the 1630’s they were willing to pay more for African laborers. The greater investment made it much more difficult for African laborers to purchase freedom or gain freedom from individual efforts like legal petition and enforcement of indentures. For example, in 1659 a Norfolk slave with Portuguese

connections sued his master for his freedom. He argued that he had lived in England and should serve only as long as other servants coming from that country. His papers read, “fardinando a negro” and were written in a language the court did not understand. The colonial elites rejected his plea and ordered him to serve for life. Since Africans were labeled as outsiders, their appeals for freedom could be easily circumvented (Brown 1996: Kindle Locations 2350-2359).

In 1667, the colonial elites responded to the inconvenience of Africans and Indians petitioning for freedom based on their conversion to Christianity. This law stated that conversion to Christianity cannot alter the condition of permanent slavery for Africans and Indians. This protected exploitative interests of the elite planter class.

WHEREAS some doubts have risen whether children that are slaves by birth, and by the charity and piety of their owners made partakers of the blessed sacrament of baptisme, should by vertue of their baptisme be made ffree; It is enacted and declared by this grand assembly, and the authority thereof, that the conferring of baptisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage or ffredome; that diverse masters, ffreed from this doubt, may more carefully endeavour the propagation of christianity by permitting children, though slaves, or those of greater growth if capable to be admitted to that sacrament (Hening 1823: 260).

Previously the terms, “heathen,” “savage,” and “slave” were synonymous. With the passage of this law, it was possible to be a “Christian” and a “slave” simultaneously,

although African and Indigenous Christians were the only ones who fit this description (Higginbotham 1996: 47).

The courts in Virginia recognized African men, women, and their fetuses as property in the 1640s. There was no law against any planter bringing in as many slaves as they wanted. A large amount of African slaves were not brought into Virginia for the first half of the century because of the high mortality rates among immigrants to Virginia. At first, there was not an advantage in bringing slaves to Virginia because slaves cost about twice as much as a European indentured servants (Morgan 1975: 297). English servants could be made to work as hard as slaves and they were a better buy. However, by the late 1600s, the mortality rate significantly decreased, so importing African slaves became increasingly popular and a better investment. The oppressor white population would then shift their economic burden further onto colonized people. This first manifested itself in the genocidal wars against the indigenous people and then by bringing in more enslaved Africans.

Human resources in the form of slave labor were a key resource that white power or the European imperialist powers stole from Africa as the wealth of the white world was acquired and stolen on the backs of enslaved Africans (Williams 1944; Rodney 1980). Slavery made for a more productive population. This was a “free market paradise” as Michael Parenti says. Masters had no hesitation putting slave women to work in the tobacco fields. African slaves were treated worse than European servant women as they did not work in the tobacco fields (Brown 1996). Children could also become property of the master. Slaves offered the same advantages of cattle and servants

(Morgan 1975: 311). A slave has no incentive to work so some masters tried to offer slaves freedom as an incentive to work harder. However, this would offset the economic benefits of having slaves. Masters had to face the fact that they must inflict pain at a higher level than they inflicted onto servants. This is a characteristic of the capitalist state as legitimate force is in the hands of the exploiting class (Lenin 1923). It also shows that Africans are super-exploited as they were treated worse than English servants (Bonacich 1980). This force is used to keep the working class subservient and exploited. Slaves had to be made to fear for their lives in order to work. It was necessary to beat the slaves harder than servants. This increased the chance of killing the slaves. In 1669 an act was implemented in Virginia “An act about the casual killing of slaves,” which basically said that masters could kill slaves with impunity. Masters had to be prepared to beat, maim, and kill slaves if they would run away or would not work (Morgan 1975: 313). Later on, if a slave was killed while being caught after a runaway, the public would compensate the master for the price of the slaves killed (Morgan 1975: 314). The Casual killing act stated:

An act about the casual killing of slaves.

Whereas the onllawin force for the punishement of refractory servants resisting their master, mistris or overseer cannot be inflicted upon negroes [because the punishment was extension of time],not the obstinancy of many of them by other than violent meanes suppress, Be it enacted and declared by this grand assembly, if any slave resist his master (or other by his masters order correcting him) and by the extremity of the

correction should chance to die, that his death shall not be accompted Felony, but the master (or that other person appointed by the master (or that other person appointed by the master to punish him(be acquit from molestation, since it cannot be presumed that prepensed malice (which alone mkes murther Felony) should induce any man to destroy his own estate (Hening 1823: 267).

The imperialists gain and maintain their power through violence and the threat of violence. It was ruled that if the African slave died through master's whippings, the master would not be charged with a felony. In a capitalist state, the law serves the interests of the exploiting class, not the population as a whole (Lenin 1923). Where there is oppression, there is always resistance, even when you cannot see it with the naked eye (Ture and Hamilton 1992). Oppressed people have to be kept in a constant state of terror so they will fear fighting for self-determination. This is the nature of the capitalist system. Africans were super-exploited slaves in this emerging white capitalist state. This was part of the beginning processes of the masses of whites uniting against colonized, enslaved Africans, creating a white people's state.

Colonial State Constructing an “Oppressor White Nation”

The state is set up to serve the interests of capital, the capitalists, or the bourgeoisie. Very early on in the colonial court system in Virginia, the colonial elites began the process of dividing the population between European indentured servants and African and Indian servants and slaves, essentially creating a “white oppressor nation” (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). This served the elite class's interests as English workers

could be made to feel superior and convinced to feel closer to their elite English oppressors, thus creating a base of support for them. Africans and Indians were lumped into one category and seen as inferior to all Europeans or whites because they were both unchristian and “heathens” (Tompsett 2000; Goetz 2012). Africans were to be convinced that they were inferior to everyone else. If this happened they would feel hopeless in their fate as slaves (Higginbotham 1998).

Like the indigenous people, Africans were labeled as “unchristian” by the English and therefore worthy of slavery (Tompsett 2000). By 1624, Virginia, the legal process perceived and treated Africans as different from the white colonists (Higginbotham 1998: 25). In 1630, a white colonist, Hugh Davis had sex with an African and he was charged with the crime of bestiality (Higginbotham 1998). He “abused himself in to the dishonor of God and shame of Christianity by defiling his body in lying with a negro.” His punishment was being whipped in front of Africans, his legal inferiors: “September 17th, 1630. Hugh Davis to be soundly whipped, before an assembly of Negroes and others for abusing himself to the dishonor of God and shame of Christians...”(Cushing 1978: 146). This was designed for humiliation as the English colonists were to be convinced that regardless of their social or economic status, that they were superior to the Africans servants and slaves (Higginbotham 1998: 25). English colonists were made to feel that they had defiled their body if they had sex with Africans.

If there was no forming of sexual bonds between European and Africans it was less likely that they would form a social, economic, or political bonds. The inferiority of

Africans and the superiority of whites was enforced in an open and public manner. For example, In the Sweat case in 1640, a case of interracial sex between a white man and African woman, the African woman was sentenced to be whipped at the whipping post, and the European defendant was sent to do public penance in the church. This was to deter others from this behavior and show that English (soon to become “whites”) were superior and Africans were inferior (Higginbotham 1998: 26):

Whereas Robert Sweat hath begotten with child a negro woman servant belonging unto Lieutenant Sheppard, the court hath therefore ordered that the said negro woman shall be whipt at the whipping post and the said Sweat shall tomorrow in the forenoon do public penance for his offence at James city church in the time of devine service according to the laws of England in that case pvided. (McIllwaine 1924: 477)

This was part of the process in the English colonial elites attempts at uniting the English colonists as an “oppressor white nation” (Bonacich 1980; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010).

Later on, in December 1662, the law ruled the child of an African mother was a slave for life:

WHEREAS some doubts have arrisen whether children got by any Englishman upon a negro woman should be slave or ffree, Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly, that all children borne in this country shalbe held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother, And that if any christian shall committ

ffornication with a negro man or woman, hee or shee soe offending shall pay double the ffines imposed by the former act (Hening 1823: 170).

This was to protect against planters who could rape Africans and make slaves out of the children born as a result of this rape. This is another instance of the white ruling class shaping the law to their interests. It also shows their hypocrisy. Earlier they made interracial sex between the colonists illegal when it could result in a unification of African and European workers against the elite planter class, threatening their power. Now, interracial sex or rape by planters is not questioned or punished, as it could be used to “breed” slaves.

Although servants were often tortured in order to make a fortune for their masters, most did not run away to live the Indians. Edmund Morgan suggests that this was a result of xenophobia, racism, and fear among Englishmen. In the 1620’s a servant’s choice was to work as much as their masters pleased and hoe tobacco for as long as they lived, or run away to a wilderness full of “savages” (Morgan 1975). Perhaps this was an early example of Europeans siding against their class interests and uniting with their capitalist oppressors as a result of racism and a sense of belonging to a white nation. The English laborers were tortured more so early on because there was not enough of another racialized other group to exploit as Indians were difficult to enslave in this case of the colonization of Virginia and Africans did not become the primary labor force of Virginia until the 1700’s. Africans entered into an already functioning brutal system where they were treated worse than European laborers due to racist justifications (Morgan 1975; Blackburn 2012).

The state protects capital from the resistance of labor through violent force or the threat of violent force (Parenti 1995). On June 30, 1640 the colonial state organized a group of armed men to pursue runaway African servants. The runaway Africans are also defined as “runaway negroes” showing that they were distinguished from English laborers:

The court hath granted that a commission shall be drawn for *John Mattrom* and *Edward ffleet* authorizing them to levy a party of men, or more if need require, out of the trained band for Charles River [York] county with arms and ammunition to go in psuit of certain runaway negroes and to bring them to the governor. *And it is further ordered* that such men as shall be pressed for this expedition shall receive their pay and satisfaction for their pains at the public charge of the counties from whence such negroes are runaway and likewise for any boat or boats that shall be taken for the said service (McIlwaine 1924: 468).

The early state also paid the men for their efforts in pursuing runaway African slaves. These are early policemen.

On July 9, 1640 the General Court decided the punishment for three servants who ran away. It was believed that this was a case of interracial cooperation. One was a Dutchman, the other was a Scotsman, and the other was an African. They all received whippings as punishment, however the African servant received the punishment of slavery for life while the other servants only received punishments of extra years to serve out on their indenture:

Whereas Hugh Gwyn hath by order from this Board Brought back from *Maryland* three servants formerly run away from the said *Gwyn*, *the court doth therefore order* that the said three servants shall receive the punishment of whipping and to have thirty stripes apiece one called *Victor*, a *dutchman*, the other a *Scotchman* called *James Gregory*, shall first serve out their times with their master according to their Indentures, and one whole year apiece after the time of their service is Expired. By their said Indentures in recompense of his Loss sustained by their absence and after that service to their said master is Expired to serve the colony for three whole years apiece, and that the third being a negro named *John Punch* shall serve his said master or his assigns for the time of his natural Life here or elsewhere (McIlwaine 1924: 466).

Since this was a case of interracial cooperation, perhaps the colonial elites gave differential punishments in order to divide the labor force by race and to create their “white base of support” (Hess 2000).

Haney Lopez says that law constructs race (Haney Lopez 1996). Race is a construction by the white ruling class to justify exploiting what came to be known as “people of color” because the wealth of the white bourgeoisie and general white population is dependent on this internal and external colonial exploitation. These are white bourgeois laws, written with the interest of profit making. The oppressor white nation, consisting of white ruling class and white workers unite to maintain the colonial exploitative relationship with the oppressed nations such as African people and Indian

people. These laws show the English colonial elites attempts at creating a white oppressor nation or a white base of support as a protective buffer group (Allen 1998).

English Imperialist Wars Against the Indigenous People: The Armed Forces Serving the Interests of the Colonial-Imperialist Elite

Another manifestation of the state is the armed forces that make the world safe for the profitmaking of the investors or the white ruling class by terrorizing colonized people, keeping them separated from their stolen land and resources. In this system of European and U.S. imperialism, the general white population supports the colonial state government and serves as an extension of the state, carrying out the interests of the bourgeois class by terrorizing and repressing colonized people whether it is Indians or enslaved Africans. The profitmaking of the bourgeois class requires terrorizing colonized people into submission, or wiping them out to take the over the land. Laboring European settlers united with this capitalist state and its interests in terrorizing colonized people of color such as Indians and Africans in hopes of receiving their share of colonial loot (Hess 2000; Feagin 2006). This is known as the white capitalist state (Hess 2000). The colonists had the advantage of more superior and powerful weapons in their wars against the indigenous people as the colonists used firearms while the indigenous people had only bows at their disposal (Gleach 1997). There was no difference in accuracy between the two weapons, but the firearm had the advantage of inflicting much greater severity of the wound when it hit the target (Gleach 1997: 84). Also, to be a skilled archer takes years of training, while the English colonial soldiers did not require nearly as much training as a result of the superior power of a firearm (Gleach 1997:81).

Lord De la Warr was the first Governor and his deputy was Sir Thomas Gates. He was told to subjugate the neighboring tribes and make them pay tribute and to seize any chiefs that refused. Gates was instructed that the Indians closest to the colony should be made enemies and if he wanted to make friends they had to be far away (Morgan 1975).

The Algonquians learned to distrust Europeans as a result of previous European violence inflicted on them. Spanish and English sometimes kidnapped and killed natives while in Chesapeake Bay to obtain freshwater and firewood to trade for deerskin and maize. The Powhatans were interested in the technology of the colonists, the metal tools and weapons of the colonists. The Indians saw little in European culture that appealed to them aside from the metal goods and firearms. They thought these people were dangerous so instead of trying to fight them, they thought they could be turned to their used to their advantage, as subordinate allies to be used as allies against the Monacan and Manahoac (Taylor 2001: 128). The Algonquians did not know that the initial few colonists were the first of thousands to follow, bent on transforming the land for the extraction of resources and destroying the Indian world (Taylor 2001: 128).

Although frequent, Algonquian warfare killed relatively few people compared to English standards. They waged short raids with the intent of killing a few warriors, taking some captives, and humiliate a rival. As John Smith observed, they rarely made war for land and goods (Taylor 2001: 127). The Algonquians could not wage long and distant wars like the English did in Ireland. In order to conquer a land, the Europeans fought for years and decades massacring entire villages and cities as their common

method with the goal of intimidating others to surrender. The English in Virginia viewed the Indians way of war with contempt, as cowardly and ineffective. The Algonquians of Virginia also viewed the English way of total war as pointless and ineffective (Taylor 2001: 127).

The first Anglo-Powhatan war began because the English were dependent on the Powhatans to feed them. They expected the Indians to be submissive. The colonists preferred to explore for gold while expecting the Indians to feed them. The Indians did not have much surplus to share as they only raised a little more than what they needed every year (Taylor 2001: 132). The English kept pressing the Indians for food and the Indians began to lash out. Seventeen colonists imposed themselves on one village and the indigenous people killed them and stuffed their dead mouths with maize as a sign of contempt (Taylor 2001: 132). The English attacked the indigenous people in an effort to terrorize and intimidate the indigenous people into giving them corn (Taylor 2001: 132). In August 1610, Captain George Percy, appointed by Lord De La Warr as captain of the Jamestown fort and member of the Virginia General Assembly, a white imperialist agent of mass oppression, led a group of colonizers and surprised and attacked a Paspahugh village, killing at least sixty five inhabitants. They burned down their homes and their fields of corn, indiscriminately killing men, women, and children (Taylor 2001:32). Percy describes the details of an English attack against the indigenous people involving cutting out their brains and looting the Indians' temples:

Butt understood from the Indyans themselves thatt they weare sacrificysed
And thatt their Braynes weare cutt and skraped outt of their heades wth

mussell shelles beinge Landed and acquainted wth their Trechery we Beate the Salvages outt of the Island burned their howses Ransaked their Temples Tooke downe the Corpes of their deade kings from of their Toambes And caryed away their pearles Copp and braceletts, wherewth they doe decore their kings funeralles (Percy 1612: 263).

While waging war on the Indians and burning their houses down and cutting down their corn, the English colonizers took the queen of the Paspahags and her children as prisoners. Percy said that the soldiers became angry because the queen and the children were spared. On their way back to Jamestown on a boat, they decided to execute the children by throwing them overboard and shooting them in their heads as they tried to swim for shore. The governor had the woman executed by running through her with a sword (Taylor 2001: 132). The atrocities committed against the queen of the Paspahags, was due to the work and the wishes of the governing officers. (Taylor 2001: 132). Percy describes this along with descriptions of the English burning the houses and cutting down the corn of the Indians:

Upon the same I cawsed the Indians heade to be cutt of. And then disPsed my fyles Apointeinge my Sowldiers to burne their howses and to cutt downe their Corne groweing aboutt the Towne, And after we marched wth the quene And her Children to our Boates ageinge, where beinge noe soener well shipped my sowldiers did begin to murmur because the quene and her Children weare spared. So upon the same A Cowncell beinge called itt was Agreed upon to putt the Children to deathe the wch

was effected by Throweing them overboard and shoteinge owtt their Braynes in the water yett for all this Crewelty the Sowldiers weare nott well pleased And I had mutche to doe To save the quenes lyfe for thatt Tyme (Percy 1612: 272).

Even though the colonists were starving, they burned the field of growing corn because they wanted to make examples of the indigenous people who refused to obey their orders. They believed they could get more corn from other Indians by making horrifying examples of the ones who refused to obey them (Taylor 2001: 132). Percy describes the terror that the colonists inflicted onto the Indians, involving destroying their villages, and capturing some to become slaves within the colony:

In theis Conflictts many Indyans beinge also slayne and wownded...for our men Cutt downe their Come Burned their howses and besydes those wch they had slayne browghtt some of them prissoners to our foarte” (Percy 1612: 277).

Terrorism against colonized people is repeated tactic of the capitalist system and the capitalist state because in order to subjugate people and exploit them, you have to threaten them with death if they assert themselves equal human beings. English imperialism gained power through violence and maintained power through the threat of violence.

Indians who came to Jamestown were treated as spies by Gates. Gates had them seized and killed. The company forbade any inhabitant of Jamestown to speak to the

visiting Powhatans. They also threatened death to “runne away from th Colonie, to Powhathan, or any savage Werowhance else whatsoever” (Taylor 2001: 133). This was an effort by the English elites to keep the poor English settlers from uniting with the Powhatans as they needed workers. The English colonial elites needed to disrupt the Powhatans current way of life, make them dependent and subservient. They didn’t want anyone to provide the Powhatans with more strength. After being frustrated with constant hunger, hardships, and brutality of the white colonial elites, several dozen working colonists ran away to join the Indians. The Indians welcomed those with steel weapons like guns. The leaders of the colony hated the new strength that this was giving to the Algonquians. In the spring of 1612, the governor recaptured most of the fugitives. To discourage more runaways, he hung or shot some of them and others were burned at the stake or had their backs slowly broken on the wheel (Taylor 2001: 133). The atrocities committed against the Englishmen who went to live with the Indians was also due to the wishes of the governing officers (Taylor 2001: 132). Percy describes this in this passage:

r Tho DALE haveinge all moste finished the foarte and settled A plantacyon in thatt Pte dyvrs of his men being Idile and not willeinge to take paynes did Runne Away unto the Indiyans many of them beinge taken ageine Sr Thomas in A moste severe mannor cawsed to be executed. Some he apointed to be hanged Some burned Some to be broken upon wheles, others to be staked and some to be shott to deathe all theis extreme and crewell tortures he used and inflicted upon them To

terrefy the reste for Attempteing the Lyke and some wch Robbed the store he cawsed them to be bownd faste unto Trees and so sterved them to deathe. (Percy 1612: 280).

These soldiers betrayed the English military, so they had to be put to death. If a soldier betrays the side that they are fighting for, the group often kills the person. This was also part of the beginning stages of the English colonial elites, using the colonists for their base of support. They needed the Indians of the territory in a position of subjugation and they could not have them gaining strength, as they needed control over the land for plantation crops for profit making. Also at this point they needed the indentured servants as laborers. Later on, with the shifting of the economic pressure and exploitation on the super exploited Africans and Indians, what came to be known as “white people” could enjoy less oppression and more security and as a result they would see their interests more in line with the English colonial elites.

On March 22, 1622, Opechancanough, the leader of the Powhatan people orchestrated a surprise attack on the English colonizers that killed 350 out of 1,240 colonists in an act of resistance to English colonialism to protect the sovereignty of the Powhatan people. This was out of fear that the English would continue to expand and encroach on their land (Tompsett 2000). This was an attack on the capitalist system, because if the indigenous people could have wiped out the English completely and prevented them from colonizing America, there would have been no tobacco plantations and consequently no exportation of tobacco to the imperialist center in England. Similarly, if indigenous people were able to resist the Europeans and prevent them from

colonizing the Caribbean, there would have been no lucrative sugar staple product that enriched Europe on the backs of African slaves. Without any colonies, the global European dominated capitalist economy would not have come into existence and the simultaneous uplifting of the “white” world would not have occurred (Yeshitela 2012). For example, In “The Virginia Planters’ Answer to Captain Butler” (1623), the Virginia planters show how the Powhatan attack on the colony, which they referred to as the “massacre,” disrupted the Virginia Company’s iron and wine industries. This was an attack on white property:

And wee doe further answer that this Country is a moste fruitfull Country and doth certainly produce divers rich Comodities. Itt is true that the Ironworks are wasted and the med dead, but that was by the Massacre wch if itt had not happened ther had been a good prooffe of that Comodity, for the works wer in a very great forwardness. As for Vines likewise ther were divers Vine-yeards planed in sundry places, butt all of them putt back by the Massacre... (Virginia Planters 1623: 416).

Overall, the Virginia Company believed this attack was a good thing for the business and the plantation because it was an excuse for wiping out the Powhatans and seizing the land that they occupied as a result (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000). In “A Relation of the Barbarous Massacre,” by Edward Waterhouse, which was the Virginia Company’s official report on the 1622 “Indian massacre” on the Jamestown settlement, Waterhouse argues that the attack was a good thing for the colony because now the colonists could seize the rich land that the Indians inhabited after wiping them out:

Thus have you seene the particulars of this massacre, out Letters from thence written, wherein treachery and cruelty have done their worst to us, or rather to themselves; for whose understanding is so shallow, as not to perceive that this must needs bee for the good of the plantation after, and the losse of this blood to make the body more healthfull, as by these reasons maybe manifest....

May now by right of warre, and law of Nations, invade the Country, and destroy them who sought to destroy us: whereby we shall enjoy their cultivated places...Now their cleared grounds in all their villages (which are situate in the fruitfulest places of the land) shall be inhabited by us...

Thirdly, because those commodities which Indians enjoyed as much or rather more than we, shall also be entirely possessed by us...

Fourthly, because the way of conquering them is much more easie then civilizing them by faire meanes, for they are rude, barbarous, and naked people...

...To conclude then, seeing that Virginia is most abundantly fruitfull, and that this Massacre must rather be beneficiall to the Plantation then impaire it, let all men take courage, and put to their helping hands, since now the time is most seasonable and advantagious for the reaping of those benefits which the Plantation hath long promised: and for their owne good let them doe it speedily, that so by taking the prioritie of

time, they may have also the priorities of place, in choosing the best Seats of the Country, which now by vanquishing of the Indians, is like to offer a more ample and faire choice of fruitfull habitations, then hitherto our gentleness and faire comportment to the Savages could attaine unto... (Waterhouse 1622: 22-27).

Also, the Governor Sir Francis Wyatt said, “Our first worke is expulsion of the Salvages to gain the free range of the countrey for increase of Cattle, swine &c...for it is infinitely better to have no heathen among us, who at best were but thornes in our sides, than to be at peace and league with them” (Taylor 2001: 135). John Smith said that the massacre was “good for the plantation because now we have just cause to destroy them by all means possible” (Taylor 2001: 135). Similarly, the U.S. Empire planned on attacking Iraq before the World Trade Center attacks on September 11, 2001. After the 9/11 attacks, they used it as a reason to start a “war on terror” in Iraq. They made up lies about weapons of mass destruction and lies that Iraq was harboring terrorists. In reality, attacking Iraq was done with the goal of tightening its stronghold over the oil reserves of the region (Parenti 2011). European and North American (white) imperialism seeks to conquer indigenous populations, steal their resources, and exploit them in cheap labor positions.

After the Powhatan surprise attack on the English colonial settlement in self-defense, the second Anglo-Powhatan War started. This lasted from 1622 through 1633. European and North American imperialism seems to require perpetual war against indigenous peoples for control over land and resources because the system is designed

around constant growth and profitmaking. The government, controlled by the English (white) elites adopted a policy of continuous attack on the indigenous people and required men to leave their crops and carry out the war for a few days (Morgan 1975: 112).

The capitalist system treats people of color as subhuman because it requires stealing their resources and exploiting their labor to function. The white racial frame says that African people are criminals, Arabs are terrorists, Mexicans are dirty, and all are viewed as inferior to rationalize this colonial system of racial exploitation (Feagin 2010). Similarly, the English colonizers said Indians were unchristian and therefore worthy of slavery and/or being wiped out. Lord Chief Justice Coke said that “all infidels are in law perpetui inimici, perpetual enemies (for the law presumes not that they will be converted, that being *remota pontia*, a remote possibility) for between them, as with devils, whose subjects they be, and the Christian, there is perpetual hostility and can be no peace” (Tompsett 2000: 35) This was a legal basis for the London Virginia Company to protect itself against accusations of mass murder. The wars against the native populations were considered just wars. Native Americans were seen as inferior because they were not Christians, so this warranted genocide against them (Tompsett 2000). The rich land that the Indians inhabited and the resources that the English wanted control over made the Indians criminals on their own land.

The English colonizers faked being peaceful with the Indians. They let them settle and plant their corn wherever so they could surprise them and kill as many as possible while burning their corn just before harvest. The English also made fake treaties

with the indigenous people in an effort to surprise attack them. In a fake peace celebration on the Potomac, one negotiator had the indigenous people drink poisoned wine. The negotiator estimated he killed about two hundred with the poison and also his men killed 50 more with weapons after the Indians were incapacitated from the poisoned wine (Morgan 1975: 100). The London Virginia Company ordered accelerating the genocide of the Native Americans. Four expeditionary forces were sent out under Governor Yeardley (also a very wealthy plantation owner) proceeding to kill all indigenous people regardless of age or sex (Tomsett 2000: 37). Within two or three years of the Opechancanough's surprise attack, The English killed many more than were killed in the massacre. A few remained among the English as servants or slaves (Morgan 1975: 100). They instituted a genocidal war against the Native Americans, attacking a series of Powhatan, Kecoughan, Waraskoyak, Nansamund, Chickahominy, Apomatumk and Paspahugh towns (Tompsett 2000).

The working English settlers were the soldiers in these attacks against the indigenous people, taking orders from the capitalist elites in the Virginia Company (Morgan 1975: 240). This is an example of the white capitalist elites using the white oppressor population like the workers, as a base of support for their colonial exploitation and domination over people of color, in this case, indigenous people. In 1623, Richard Frethorne, an indentured servant wrote a letter to his parents describing the horrible conditions of the colony of Virginia. Frethorne talks about all of the deaths caused by hunger and disease. Indentured servants faced slave like conditions, but they were given employment by the elite English colonizers through colonization. Frethorne shows that

he still identifies with the colonizers and the Virginia Company as opposed to the indigenous people of the land, despite being in a subjugated position. Frethorne says, “For we live in fear of the enemy every hour, yet we have had a combat with them...and we took two alive and made slaves of them. But it was by policy, for we are in great danger; for our plantation is very weak by reason of the death and sickness of our company” (Frethorne 1623). Frethorne identifies the surrounding Indians as enemies. The colonizers had wars with Indians to take the land and use it for plantation crops. Most if not all European in the colony who later became “white” participated in these wars against the Indians. At least from Frethorne’s letter it shows that very early on, at least he as an indentured servant identifies with the colonizing group or nation. This is in line with the theory of oppressor and oppressed nations (Bonacich 1980). That workers in the white oppressor nation align with their own exploiting class in this system of European dominated global capitalism. This time was a difficult situation for the colony as many of the colonists were starving and dying of disease. Later on in the 1600’s, the survival rate increased and the population of colonists continued to grow. Poor and working class whites have not only been complicit in the colonial domination of “people of color,” they have been on the front lines in wars against colonized people of color since the beginning of European imperialism (Hess 2000).

In the General Assembly meeting of March 5th 1623, the General Assembly banned all trade for corn with the Indians. Law 17 said, “That all trade for corne with the salvages as well publick as private after June next shall be prohibited” (Cushing 1978; 126). In February 1631, the elite planter class penalized people for speaking with

Indians. This was directed at the free colonizers and the indentured servants as they applied different penalties for each. “It is ordered, that no person or persons shall dare to speake or parlie with any Indians either in the woods or in any plantation, yf he can possibly avoid it by any meanes, but as soone as he can, to bringe them to the commander, or give the commander notice thereof upon penalty of a mounthes service for any free man offendige and twenty stripes to any servant” (Cushing 1978: 167). Also, written in February 1631, Act XLVI “All trade with the Savages prohibited, as well publique as private.” These laws could have been more attempts by the elite planters to keep the lower class “white” indentured servants united with them in their colonial mission. The elite planters wanted to keep the indentured servants from running away with the Native Americans and providing them with strength and weapons. So by banning any talks or trade with them, this seemed like a further attempt to prevent colonists from uniting with the Indians.

The colonizers had to protect their stolen land against Indians who resisted through attacks against the colonial settlements. For instance, law 23 of the laws concluded by the General Assembly on March 5, 1623 said, “That every dwelling house shall be pallizaded for the defence against the Indians.” (Cushing 1978: 127). The role of the white capitalist state is to protect white property, the colonizers’ stolen land, resources, and expropriated labor and repress colonized people, keeping them from taking back their stolen land, labor, and resources.

Law 32 (1623) was a law about “when to fall on the savages” and said that the colonial state in Virginia would provide insurance for people injured against these

attacks against the Indians. It stated, “That at the beginning of July next the inhabitants of every corporation shall fall upon their adjoining salvages as we did last yeare, those that shal be hurte upon service to be cured at the publique charge; in case any be lamed to be maintained by the country according to his person and quality” (Cushing 1978: 128). The imperialists needed a base of support, they needed an army to make war against the Indians that occupied the land. By promising that the hurt soldiers would be treated at the charge of the public, the colonial bourgeoisie and early state gave support to the soldiers carrying out wars in the elite colonists’ interests of profitmaking.

Attached to the profitmaking interests of the imperialists are armed forces. This is the force of legitimized violence. Act II (General Assembly of October 1629) said every commander of the different plantations appointed by commission from the governor shall have power and authority to levy a force of men to fight Indians. It said should the Indians “assault the plantations,” they should be able to `make an organized army to defend their stolen land:

“It is orderd that every commander of the severall plantations appointed by commission from the governor shall have power and authoritie to levy a partie of men out of the inhabitants of that place soe many as may well be spared without too much weakening of the plantations and to imploy those men against the Indians, when they shall assault us neere unto our habitations, or when they in their discretion shall deeme it convenient to cleare the woods and the parts and the parts neere adjoining when the Indians shall bee a hunting or when they have any certaine knowledge of

the Indian's aboard in those places. And if there shall be cause that the commander in person can not attend these service, then in such cases, and in his absence hee is to appoint his deputie" (Cushing 1978: 140).

This was an organized force of violence against repressed Indians whose land was stolen. Naturally, the colonizers fear the repressed Indians fighting for their self-determination. This is white logic. They are afraid of the colonized people who they repress. The racism endemic to English and European imperialism calls them violent when the aggressiveness of English imperialism is to blame for the reaction of violence in self-defense and self-determination on the part of the colonized population.

In the General Assembly of the 16th day of October 1629, the Assembly wrote in Act III, three planned expeditions to be carried out against the Indians. The Assembly wrote:

It was the opinion of the whole bodie of the Assembly that we should go three severall marches upon the Indians, at three severall times of the yeare, viz. first in November, secondly in March, thirdly in July. To effect this the colony and inhabitants are to be divided into lower division. The plantations of the upper parts as farr downewards as Weanoacke Marsh, and fflowerdieu hundred creek on both sides the river o cleare those parts and territoryes, and to doe all manner of spoile and offence to the Indians that may possibly bee effected. The second division to extend from flowerdieu hundred creeke and Weanoacke Marsh, as farr downewards as the creeke belowe Hogg Island, and to include the whole corporation of

James Cittie and Martin's Hundred, and the plantations of Mulbury Island under the command of capt. Smith. The third division to be the plantation of Warosquoyacke, and those inhabitatns to cleare the grounds and lands betweene Hogg Island creeke and Nansamunge river.

There remeane for a fourth division Elizabeth Cittie, Warwicke River, Nuttmeg Quarter, Accawamacke, the plantation at Kiskyacke and the places adjoining; to once before the frost of Christmas, & other in June, July or August, as alsoe upon those lands, between Nansamunge river and the river of Chesepeyacke. And it is concluded that the plantations of Accawmacke shall assist them against the Pamunky Indians in the summer time with ever fift man out of the inhabitatns (Cushing 1978: 141).”

As Jean Paul Sartre said in the intro of *The Wretched of The Earth* the colonists are the pioneers for all of European or white society, their struggle in the beginning was necessary to provide a beachhead on the colonized North America that would later expand and at the expense of the indigenous people of North America and make all of white society rich (Fanon 1963; xiviii).

Act III (1629) said that a new English colonist could not march on the Indians in the first year: “It is concluded and ordered, That noe new-comer for the first yeare shall bee compelled to goe in person upon any march or service upon the enemy, but shall bee only contributory to the charge thereof according to his proportion, excepte it bee in cases of extreame necessity. And noe master of a family shall presume to send any new

man upon any march or service as aforesaid upon paine of severe censure” (Cushing 1978: 150).

On March 24, 1629, ACT VIII said that no peace should be concluded with the Indians, that they should be conquered into submission: “That the war begun upon the Indians bee effectually followed, and the noe peace bee concluded with them. And likewise that all marches which shall hereafter bee ordered and appointed against them, be prosecuted and followed with all dilligence.” (Cushing 1978: 153). This is a war in the interests of the capitalist elite class of England for resources to expand their economy just as the United States engaged in wars in Iraq to gain control over the vast oil reserves (Parenti 2011). This system’s goal is to terrorize the people of the region into submission and to conquer them in order to gain control over the materials, the resources, the land, the labor.

The English colonizers were so afraid of the indigenous people that they brought their guns everywhere, even to church. As Omali Yeshitela describes, all colonized people are suspects and rightly so because the system rests on their backs. Act XLVII said (General Assembly of February 1631), “Noe man shall goe or send abroad without a sufficient party well armed” (Cushing 1978: 176). Act XLVIII (General Assembly of 1631) said, “Noe man shall goe to worke in the ground without their arms...All men that are fitting to beare armes, shall bringe their pieces to the church upon payne of every essence, yf that mayster allow not thereof to pay 2 lb. of tobacco, to be disposed by the church-wardens , who shall levy it by distresse, and the servants to be punished” (Cushing 1978: 174).

These next acts (General Assembly of February 1631) are instances of a “neighborhood watch” in the colony. The law punishes false alarms of Indian attacks within the colony: “There shall be due watch kept by night where neede requires” (Cushing 1978: 173). “The joyninge plantations, to assist the fronteires or their neighbours, upon alarmns, the default to be severlie censured, and false alarmns punished” (Cushing 1978: 174). An Indian attack on the colony will threaten the future profitmaking of English imperialism. This is why surrounding Indians are always deemed as a threat.

Anybody who resists the hegemony of European and American imperialism and seeks self-determination and freedom is demonized and seen as an enemy. Today, the U.S. Empire creates enemies without end. These enemies are created because of their need to dominate and exploit areas around the world. Just about all of the countries deemed by the United States as “friendly to the U.S.” are regimes that maintain systems integrated into the U.S. sphere of corporate global domination. All of the countries designated as “unfriendly” to the U.S. have been resistant to being exploited and dominated in the US sphere of corporate domination or white power (Parenti 2011: 34). Similarly, the English colonizers called the Indians their “irreconcilable enemies” because they inhabited rich land that the English elite colonists wanted control over for profitmaking and because the Indians resisted entering the colony to be exploited slaves. The Powhatans attacked the Jamestown settlement for fear of further expansion of the English colonists into their lands (Tompsett 2000). Written in the General Assembly of February 1631, Act LXI said, “For the Indians we hold them our irreconcilable

enemies* thought fit, That yf any Indians doe molest offend hogs, or any thinge else, or that they be found lurking, then the commanders shall have power by virtue of this sufficient partie of men, to fall out upon them. And shall finde occasion.” (Cushing 1978: 176). To “fall” on the Indians means to attack and kill them. It was advised that they should be attacked and killed if they were found around the settlement. All Indians are viewed as “suspicious” because if they attack the colonial settlement then they will threaten the economic interests of the colonizing white population.

Act LXVII (General Assembly of February 1631) made the anniversary of the 1622 Powhatan attack on the Jamestown settlement as a holiday within the colony: “IT is ordered, That the 22d day of March be yearelie kept Holyday in commemoration of our deliverance from the Indians at the bloodie massaker which happened upon the 22d of March 1621” (Cushing 1978: 177). This holiday served to unite the group of colonists against a common “enemy,” creating loyalty to the bourgeoisie. By uniting the colonists against the common enemy during this war, they are serving the interests of the elite colonial class who want to take over the rich land for plantation crops and resource extraction.

Act X (General Assembly of August 1633) said that: “no Armes or Amunition be sould to the Indians.” In this early white state, it was in the interests of the oppressor white population to make sure that indigenous people were powerless, without weapons. This way, they could more easily conquer the indigenous population for the purpose of keeping control over the land. This law read, “It is ordered and appointed, That yf any person or persons shall sell or barter any guns, powder, shott, or any armes or

ammunition unto any Indian or Indians within this territorie, the said person or persons shall forfeite to publique uses all the goods and chattels that he or they then have to their owne use, and shall also suffer imprisonment duringe life, the one halfe of which forfeiture shall be to him or them that shall informe and the other halfe to publique uses” (Cushing 1978: 219). The English had the advantage of using guns while the Powhatan’s weapons were bows (Gleach 1997: 83). The English colonial elites said that any colonist that gave arms to the Indians was a traitor and that any colonist who did should be hanged. This was also the colonial bourgeoisie’s attempts at uniting the European working colonists with their colonial mission. They were united as an oppressor nation: “That no man do sell or give any Indians any piece shott or poulder, or any other armes, offensive or defensive upon paine of being held a Traytour to the Colony, and of being hanged as soon as the facte is proved, without all redemption” (Virginia Assembly 1619: 16).

In 1639, Africans were distinguished from Europeans in the “white state” by denying Africans arms. Africans and Indians were given outsider status, as colonized subject people they were to be kept in check and exploited in the emerging white people’s state in Virginia. For example, Act X written in 1639 denied African slaves the right to bear arms, “All persons except negroes to be provided with arms and ammunition or be fined at pleasure of the Governor and Council” (Cushing 1978: 226). Mao Tse-Tung argues that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun (Allen 1998). As African workers were denied arms, this was one of the ways that the white colonizing elites denied them political power in the early colony of Virginia. Since Africans were

denied arms, this would suggest that they were not considered equal with other English laboring colonists. This was an emerging white people's state as the white colonists of all classes were provided arms to protect against the colonial settlement from the Indian attacks on the settlement.

In 1644, some African workers were involved in "riotous and rebellious" activities according to the colonial planters and this early state apparatus. This shows the resistance of African laborers, servants, and slaves, and the elite colonists' fear that African laborers might join the indigenous people in the attacks against the colonists and the English (white) colonial system: "Sept 3. 1644: Concerning the riotous & rebellious conduct of Mrs Wormleys negroes... Sept 10. 1644: Psons apprehended for rebellion (Phaps Mrs Wormleys Servants Sept 3d)" (McIlwaine 1924: 302). Africans and Indians were being lumped into categories as colonized or oppressed nations in the emerging white people's state. Colonized people such as Africans are also typically labeled as "rebellious" and "ungrateful" by the white elites because the system of European and North American imperialism survives as a result of their exploitation and oppression (Feagin 2010; Yeshitela 2010). Resistance to this exploitation is multi-formed but remains constant according to the laws of dialectical materialism (Newton 2002).

Omali Yeshitela discusses the illegitimacy of the white capitalist state and bourgeois law as from the very beginning, "killing Indians was legal, slavery was legal, while escaping slavery was illegal" (Yeshitela 1989). The law is only legitimate because

the exploiting class says it is and because they have the military power to enforce their hegemony.

In 1632, the English stopped attacking the Indians for the time being after extorting massive land concessions spreading north up Chesapeake Bay and the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers (Taylor 2001: 135). On April 18, 1644, Opechancanough executed another surprise attack, this time killing more than 400 colonizers. However, this was much smaller in proportion to the previous attack as the colonial population was 10,000 at the time, who had grown to outnumber the local Indians decimated by English genocidal attacks and disease. The English counterattack destroyed most of the Indian towns along the rivers. The survivors dispersed farther inland (Taylor 2001: 135).

Act XIII written in the March 1645 General Assembly discussed the war and destruction of the Nansimum Indians. It was written that the invaders were granted the power to expand the colonial settlement on the stolen territories after destroying the indigenous people and their corn: “And it is further enacted that the inhabitants within the lower parish of Isle of Wight county and the Vupper and Lower Norf. Counties do undertake the war against the Nansimum Indians or any other neighbouring Indians, by cutting up their corne and doing or performing any act or acts of hostility against them, And that they have power...to erect a forte within the said countyes” (Cushing 1978: 315).

Act IX October 1644 enacted that the colonial soldiers who were hurt in the wars against the indigenous people would be taken care of by the invader colonial

government: “Whereas in the late expeditions against the Indians, diverse men were hurt and maimed and disabled from providing for their necessary maintenance and subsistence, Be it therefore enacted by the authoritie of this present Grand Assembly, that all hurt or maimed men be relieved and provided for by the severall counties, where such men reside or inhabit (Cushing 1978: 287). This is part of the process of establishing a white oppressor nation and solidarity amongst all of the European invaders.

In “A perfect description of Virginia” (1649), John Farrer describes the devastation of the Indians after Opechancanough’s surprise attack: “That since the Massacree, the *Savages* have been driven far away, many destroyed of them, their Towns and houses ruined, their cleer grounds possessed by the English to sow Wheat in.” (Farrer 1649: 7). In “Virginia Impartially examined, William Bullock described, “Next I will consider force and that hath bin fatall to the *Indians*, there having beene great numbers of them slaine.” (Bullock 1649: 55). European and American imperialism destroy people and their towns all over the world in order to take over the land for private control over the natural resources (Parenti 1995; Parenti 2011).

ACT XVIII of the March 1645 General Assembly also documents that the indigenous people have been driven away and dispersed as a result of the colonizers’ wars against them. The passage again honestly describes the indigenous people as their “enemies” because they inhabit land that the colonizers want to take control over for profitmaking: “Whereas the Governor, Council and Burgesses of this present Grand Assembly have maturely weighed and considered the great and vast expence of the

colony, in prosecuting the war against our common enemies the Indians, and the almost impossibility of a further revenge upon them, they being dispersed and driven from their townes and habitations, lurking up and downe the woods in small numbers...” (Cushing 1978: 317-8)

In 1646, the English captured a one hundred year old and crippled Opechancanough. The Governor put him on display in Jamestown as a trophy, but an angry colonial soldier shot Opechancanough dead (Taylor 2001: 135). Farrer describes that Nickotawances replaced Opechancanough and essentially submitted to the hegemony of the English colonizers as he paid tribute to the English. Nickotawances also agreed that it should be lawful that any Indians should be shot if they were caught on an English settlement:

and their great King Opechauenow (that bloody Monster upon 100 years old) was taken by Sir William Berkely the Governour. THAT Opachankenow the old Emperour being dead since he was taken prisoner by our Governour, there is chosen a new one, called Nickotawances, who acknowledge to hold his Government under King Charles, and is become tributary to him, and this *March* 1648, Nickotawance came to *James* town to our Noble Governour Sir William Barkley with five more petty Kings attending him, and brought twenty Beavers- skinnes to be sent to King Charles as he said for Tribute; and after a long Oration, he concluded with this Protestation; *That the Sunne and Moon should first lose their glorious*

lights and shining, before He, or his People should evermore hereafter wrong the English in any kind, but they would ever hold love and friendship together: And to give the English better assurance of their Faith, He had Decreed, That if any Indian be seen to come within the limits of the English Colony, (except they come with some message from him, with such and such tokens) that it shall be lawfull to kill them presently; and the English shall be free to passe at all times when and where they please throughout His Dominions.” (Farrer 1649: 13).

An act written by the Virginia General Assembly wrote in 1646 said that the land between the York and the James River belonged to the English invaders. It also said that if any indigenous person was caught on this stolen land by the settler colonial government that they would be executed. Nickotowance agreed that if any indigenous people seen by the European invaders was seen on this land made an escape, he would deliver these people to the invader government for execution:

That Necotowance and his people leave free that tract of land between Yorke river and James river, from the falls of both the rivers to Kequotan, to the English to inhabit on, and that neither he the said Necotowance nor any Indians do repaire or to make any abode upon the said tract of land, upon paine of death, and it shall be lawfull for any person to kill any Indian, And in case any such Indian or Indians being seen upon said tract of land shall make an escape, That the said Necotowance shall upon demand deliver the said Indian or Indians to the Englishmen, upon

knowledge had of him or them, unless such Indian or Indians be sent upon a message from the said Necotownace” (Cushing 1978: 324).

The growing power of English imperialism creates collaborators within the colonized communities. Later on in history, these collaborators became known as neo-colonial forces, or forces collaborating with the white imperialist power against their own people (Ladner 1998). Colonized people are always suspects in the colony and rightfully so, because the capitalist system is built on their backs as a result of their stolen land and labor.

The Virginia General Assembly ruled in 1646 that if any Englishman was caught concealing indigenous person that they would be given the death penalty (Cushing 1978: 325).

Disease and attacks by the English colonizers reduced the Virginia Algonquians from 24,000 in 1607 to only 2,000 by 1669. The survivors lost almost all of their lands and became confined on small reservations, surrounded by colonial settlements. Virginia law said that landholders should shoot any native caught trespassing on their plantations (Taylor 2001: 136). As the Indian population diminished, the colonial population expanded while seizing the fertile land inhabited by the Indians for the tobacco staple crop. The English colonial population in the Chesapeake increased about 8,000 per decade during the 1630's and 1640's to 18,000 per decade during the 1650's and 1660's. The Chesapeake colonial population grew from 13,000 in 1650 to 41,000 in 1670 (Taylor 2001: 136). The new fields expanded tobacco crops and the growth in production made tobacco cheaper while opening up a much larger market in England.

Most planters continued to profit because they substantially lowered their costs and increased the productivity of the labor (Taylor 2001: 136). After destroying the Indians, the English established lucrative base in North America. The colony also absorbed thousands of poor laborers who had no had no economic opportunity in England (Taylor 2001: 137). In seeking new economic opportunities the poor Europeans became soldiers for English imperialism and largely united with the wealthy Englishman to terrorize the colonized Indians.

Conclusion

The capitalist state legalizes the oppression of the working class by the exploiting class. This was shown through laws in the colony that made it illegal to disobey colonial authorities. The white capitalist state is the apparatus of white workers united with the white exploiting class that wages terror, violence, and genocide against colonized people. This keeps colonized people terrorized and separated from their stolen land, stolen resources, and/or expropriated labor value. An early version of this white capitalist state emerged in the process of the English colonists' terror and genocidal wars against the Powhatans and other Algonquian people of the territory. If Indians were seen surrounding the colony, the colonial elites and law said that they should be killed. All colonized people are suspects and potential "criminals" in this system of imperialism because the capitalist system requires the stolen land and resources of the colonized people to function (Yeshitela 2010). Colonial law stated that all English colonists should be armed to protect the colony against potential Indian attack. The laboring class of English colonists united with the elite planter class to wage war against the indigenous

people of Virginia, terrorizing them, burning their houses, their towns, and killing them indiscriminately. This falls in line with the theory that the white oppressor nation unites against colonized oppressor nations in order to steal their land, labor, and resources (Bonacich 1980; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010).

Throughout this time frame, there were many laws that distinguished African laborers from European laborers. These were steps in the process of creating the “white race” (Allen 1998). Even though it was required that all laborers carry a gun in the colony to protect against Indians, it was written in law that Africans should not be given guns. Africans were clearly distinguished from English laboring colonists in this war against the Indians, perhaps because they were also unchristian, and therefore considered savages and heathens like the Indians. This was a step in the direction of English uniting all not just against the Indians to take their stolen land, but also against Africans, to force them into a system of slavery, and forcing the economic burden of Europeans onto colonized nations (Bonacich 1980; Yeshitela 2010). Sex between English and African laborers was also punished early on beginning in 1630 as Africans were unchristian and therefore viewed as inferior. These were processes in uniting the English as “white” in the emerging “white people’s state” (Hess 2000).

The European imperialist system seeks out resources of a territory to steal and make as commodities in order to sell and enrich the imperialist center. In the process, the people who they colonize, or the victims of this imperialist aggression are also defined as inferior “races.” In this case, the indigenous people were defined as savages, heathens, and unchristian who needed to be civilized. Africans were also viewed as unchristian

and therefore worthy of slavery. This is not different from today's imperialist system when it is often argued by the United States that people of the world who are victims of imperialist aggression need to be shown "true democracy" (Parenti 2011). In the case of this settler colony, the indigenous people were defined as criminals on their own land. The armed forces of the English and their colonial legal system separated the indigenous people from their own land and resources. In the process, the indigenous people were almost completely wiped out. The English were able to take over the land for their tobacco plantation cash crops. The white capitalist state was forged through the process of the European imperialist powers, like England, colonizing the world, enslaving Africans and committing genocide on the Indians (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2005; Yeshitela 2010).

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

White leftists and liberals often speak nostalgically about when the United States was supposedly “democratic.” The United States was built on a foundation of anti-democratic tyranny for internally colonized people such as the indigenous people and Africans and even for European indentured servants and laborers who had no real property. Democracy and capitalism are on a collision course as Michael Parenti argues. The capitalist system and the private tyrannies that rule the system seek to profit off of the exploited labor of others and enforce this domination through violence and the threat of violence. This is the nature of this inherently undemocratic and tyrannical system. Michael Parenti argues that the Euro-American transnational corporations attempt to dominate all national boundaries and governments (Parenti 1995). Similarly, the Virginia Company of London sought to dominate the indigenous nations of the territory they were colonizing.

The goal of the capitalist system is to constantly make profits for the exploiting investor class, the imperialist elites of largely European descent (Marx, Engels, and Gasper 2005; Robbins 2008; Feagin 2010). The London Virginia Company’s colonization of Virginia was part of the beginning processes of the advent of the European dominated capitalist system. For example, the staple crops of sugar, tobacco, cotton, and indigo on the slave plantations in the “New World” colonies were required for laying the foundation for the modern global capitalist system, forcing the feudal serfs

in Europe off of the land into the factory's to mill the fabric, distill the rum, and build the ships, selling their labor for a wage (Marx 1867; Williams 1944; Hess 2000; Blackburn 2012). These new commodities also tempted new wage workers and locked them into these wage working positions (Blackburn 2012). This capitalist system has an innate need to constantly expand into new territories (Marx, Engels, Gasper 2005). Imperialist and colonial domination of people all over the world was required to bring the capitalist system into existence and enrich the white world. For example, the wage slavery in England required for its existence the genocide of indigenous people of North America and the slavery of Africans (Marx 1867; Blackburn 2012).

The Virginia Company of London was an early capitalist corporation, an early private corporate tyranny. This means that its goal was to make profits for its investors at the expense of the masses of the people. U.S. and European imperialism and its transnational corporations often travel to other people's lands to exploit the land, the resources, the labor, the markets of other peoples and countries around the world (Parenti 1995). Similarly, the Virginia Company hoped to colonize North America and establish an English (white) settler colony to find gold, silver, copper, other minerals, and countless other resources to make as commodities to be sent back to the imperialist center. It wanted to expand the economy of England because it was dependent on the woolen industry (Morgan 1975). People of the company traveled to North America including elite gentlemen and planters (non-laboring exploiting class), indentured servants, and a few wage laborers. The men of the company also were the armed forces that fought unjust wars against the indigenous people of Virginia (Morgan 1975;

Cushing 1978; Gleach 1997). The wars fought by the Virginia Company were unjust because they encroached on the land of the Indians as the colonizers needed the land for the plantation tobacco crop and, over time, other agricultural production to make profits for their own selfish interests. They were not interested in respecting the indigenous people as sovereign nations, they viewed and treated the indigenous people as inferior “savages” who “needed more cultivation than the ground itself,” (Waterhouse 1622) were worthy of slavery, and needed to be taught true religion and civility. They planned on exploiting them and profiting off of their enslaved labor and at the very least stolen land. They committed genocide against the indigenous people to profit off of this stolen land and some captured Indians were sold into slavery in Virginia and in the Caribbean. Slaughtering people all over the world in order to take control over the land and the natural resources of the territory is a common characteristic of the European dominated imperialist capitalist systems (Parenti 1995; Harding 1998; Yeshitela 2010).

The white racial frame is endemic to the imperialist system as the system requires exploitation, stolen land, stolen resources, exploited labor, and their exploited markets for its existence (Feagin 2010; Yeshitela 2010). The system is parasitic (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). Colonized people of color are described as criminals, terrorists, uncivilized, savages, and generally inferior because of the rich land that they inhabit. If colonized people become independent and self-determining from the European dominated imperialist capitalist system i.e. if they use their land, labor, and resources for their own interests, then the global capitalist system will collapse and the wealth of the

white world will be depleted. In other words, the system will decline like a parasite without a host and “whiteness” will no longer be privileged (Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010)

The militia of the English colonial system represented the repressive violent forces that are commonly associated with fighting the unjust wars on behalf of the capitalist elite exploiting investor class. The English were not known as “white” until the early 1700s (Feagin 2010). At this time, whiteness and non-whiteness was being constructed as the indigenous people were labeled by the colonial system as “savages” unchristian “infidels.” Whiteness was also being constructed through the laws, the court system, another manifestation of the emerging white capitalist state (Higginbotham 1998). At this time most Englishman were united against the indigenous people (Gleach 1997). Poor Englishman came to the “New World” searching for a better way of life as they had little or no economic opportunity in England (Taylor 2001; Hornsby 2005). Although it was difficult in early colonial times in Virginia, later on, the mortality rate significantly decreased and the “abundant lands” of the New World were attractive for the poor Englishman (Hornsby 2005). The economic opportunity for Englishman came as a result of the stolen land of the Indians. Elite and poor English people had a material stake in committing genocide against the Indians as they could benefit economically at their expense. Although this was in unity with the wishes of the elite colonists. If the laboring colonists abandoned the colony to assimilate into the indigenous people’s society, the colony would dissolve and the elite colonists would be too isolated to make profits. This is why if laboring colonists ran away to assimilate with the Indians, they were brutally punished and killed when caught (Taylor 2001). The ideology of white

supremacy was pushed forward by the elite colonists and disseminated throughout all of the colonists. The English colonists violently seized the land and defended the stolen land with arms. Their political and economic power came from terrorism with the power of the gun. In the final analysis it seems that the vast majority of “whites” united against the indigenous people. This was an emerging “white people’s state” and “white oppressor nation” (Bonacich 1980; Hess 2000; Yeshitela 2010). The white capitalist state is the violent force that separates colonized people from their land, resources, and/or expropriated labor value. This white capitalist state makes colonized people criminals on their own land.

As Marxist-Leninist theory argues, the legal system is central to the capitalist state (Lenin 1923). In the system of capitalism, the exploiting class legalizes the oppression and exploitation of the working class by the exploiting class. The legal system makes this oppression legitimate (Lenin 1923). The legal system is in place to serve the interests of the exploiting class and protect their property from the resistance of the exploited classes (Lenin 1923; Jackson 1971; Parenti 2011). Similarly, in the colony of Virginia, the planter class legalized the oppression of the indentured servants and African servants and slaves, making it illegal to disobey the will of the planter class, who were driven by private profitmaking (Cushing 1978). The Virginia General Assembly consisted of the wealthiest planters who wrote the laws in their interests of profitmaking (Morgan 1975). The Virginia General Assembly supported masters who beat their indentured servants to motivate them to work (Morgan 1975). Later on, all Africans became slaves under law and a law was enacted that said African slaves had to be

threatened with death in order to force them to work. The law stated that it would not be a crime if African slaves were accidentally killed by planters who whipped them as a form of punishment (Morgan 1975). The capitalist system requires repression, keeping colonized people in a constant state of terror, attempting to prevent them from resisting oppression and exploitation. Imperialism is a brutal genocidal system. European imperialism or “white power” has gained and maintained its power through violence and the threat of violence.

European imperialism generally justifies its brutal and exploitative practices with the lies that it will help indigenous or colonized people in some way. In the present day, United States imperialism justifies imposing its “free market” exploitative policies and its violence and wars with the lie that they are bringing “democracy” to the victims of their exploitation (Parenti 2011). Today, the United States Empire claims that their interventions abroad are intended to defend national security or other unspecified “U.S. interests,” or fight terrorism, or protect human rights, oppose tyranny, prevent genocide, bring democracy to other peoples, maintain peace and stability in various regions, and protect weaker nations from aggressors (Parenti 2011: 24). Behind these lies are always the interests of the investors, making the world safe for them and their continued profitmaking (Parenti 2011). Similarly, the colonial promoters insisted that they would bring the indigenous people true religion and civility while establishing a settler colony that would send the mother country natural resources to be manufactured into commodities.

Justifying the brutal treatment and mass killing of the indigenous people was the early ideology of white supremacy that defined the Indians as unchristian, savage, infidels who needed to be civilized and brought true religion. This seemed to be part of a beginning process when the English defined themselves as “white” in relation to the Indians, an “inferior race.” In an effort to wipe out the culture of the indigenous people, the Virginia Company planned to set up colleges to kidnap indigenous children and teach them Christianity. The job of the oppressor is to wipe out the culture of the oppressed and make them believe that they have the exact same culture as the oppressor. This racist ideology was given power through the superior weapons of the English, giving them power over the colonized Indians (Gleach 1997). As Kwame Ture said, “if you’re racist against me and want to lynch me, that’s your problem. If you’re racist against me, you want to lynch me, and you have the power to do it, that’s my problem” (Ture 2013). Race was also being constructed through law as Africans and English people were being distinguished. An English colonist was punished for having sex with an African, and he was sentenced to be whipped in front of Africans. Interracial sex was made illegal. The law also said that all non-Christians were worthy of slavery, justifying enslaving Africans and indigenous people. African descendant people and indigenous people faced brutal capitalist state repression from the beginning of North American colonialism due to the fact that they were labeled as “inferior races” by English colonial elites and other European powers.

In the laws of the colony of Virginia, Indians were defined as “the enemy” by the colonizing power. Also, colonized people today are always viewed as “threatening” by

the oppressor white population, and the imperialist system. This is why black men are racially profiled and pulled over for “Driving while black.” This is why police mistake car keys and wallets for guns when black men are holding them and use this excuse to justify shooting black people. Similarly, any country abroad that resists the hegemony of U.S. imperialism and refuses to be a U.S. imperialist vassal state is demonized as an “enemy” by the U.S. imperialist system such as Cuba and its former president, Fidel Castro, Venezuela and its former president Hugo Chavez, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, to offer an incomplete listing (Parenti 2011). The U.S. imperialist system also seeks to overthrow leaders that do not comply with the profitmaking interests of its transnational corporations at the expense of the masses of their people (Parenti 2011). If colonized people rise up and become self-determining, the system of U.S. and European imperialism will decline and die like a parasite without a host because it requires their economic exploitation of colonized people to survive (Yeshitela 2010; Parenti 2011). In this case, for the colony’s existence and the existence of plantation crops, it required the death of the indigenous people of the land. The elites of England were driven by profitmaking (Morgan 1975). This never ending drive for profitmaking is one of the key characteristics of the capitalist system (Robbins 2008). The more England expanded its economy, the more suffering they inflicted onto colonized native people. Their continued profitmaking required the theft of more land and consequently the conquering and the annihilation of the vast majority of indigenous nations of North America.

In the early colony of Virginia, the English feared that the Indians would attack the English plantation. The English colonists were justified in fearing indigenous attacks

on the colonial settlement because the English received their unjust enrichment as a result of the stolen land that the native people inhabited, and an attack on the English settlement would threaten the prospects of Europeans enriching themselves at the expense of the rest of the world. This was essentially an attack on the European dominated capitalist system.

In 1637, Africans were denied arms in the colony of Virginia while all English colonists were required to have arms to protect the colonial settlement against the colonized Indians. This was another aspect in the development of the white capitalist state.

The Africans and the few enslaved Indians in the colony became internally colonized within the colony and they would be super exploited, allowing the elite planters and English bourgeoisie in England to further profit on their backs. Although there were still indigenous nations all across North America at this time, the need for the capitalist system to constantly expand and exploit everything in its path would later destroy the vast majority of these indigenous nations. Due to white supremacy which justifies English imperialism, the vast majority of people of color that enter the system automatically become super exploited colonized slaves as the European dominated capitalist system requires the exploitation of the majority of people on the planet earth in order to uplift and enrich European descendant people. For instance, When English fought wars with Dutch, no Dutch prisoners of war were sold into slavery, although, many captured Indian prisoners of war were sold into slavery either in Virginia or taken to the Caribbean (Morgan 1975).

In some ways, English elites and other European workers came to North America in unity in their colonial mission. The English and other European workers came because they had little economic opportunity in England and Europe. The “new world” provided economic opportunities for poor Englishman unavailable in England. The English colonized Virginia and shifted their economic burden onto the Indians of the territory of Virginia and later African slaves. At the time of colonization, England was in economic crisis, as there were poor people roaming the streets with little or no economic opportunity. The tobacco crop was a factor, along with other colonial commodities in expanding the economy of the English, contributing to the strengthening and enrichment of the English Empire (Hornsby 2005). The colonial promoters gave unemployed people in England, opportunities to go to the “New World” to attempt to advance economically (Taylor 2001; Hornsby 2005). This resulted in the vast majority of white colonizers uniting violently against the indigenous people was a dialectical process between English elites and the European workers. Some English laborers ran away to join the Indians early on in hopes of living a more leisurely life. As a result of this, runaways were caught and punished with brutal deaths in order to terrify others, preventing them from doing the same. Eventually, the white capitalist state developed as all white settlers became armed against the Indians of the territory, due to the wishes of the colonial elites. This resembled an early version of the white capitalist state, an organization of repression in the hands of the white ruling class that separates of colonized people from their stolen land, stolen resources, and expropriated labor.

Capitalism, imperialism, colonial domination (systemic racism) are one in the same, all three systems are ruled by elite white men through their bloodthirsty drive for constant profitmaking and wealth generation at the expense of the masses of people on earth. Capitalism was given birth through the process of the European deadly assault on the rest of the earth starting with the genocide of the Indians and the slavery of Africans. The system of global capitalism was built on and continues to survive on colonial exploitation, domination, and oppression or systemic racism of Africans, indigenous Americans, Asians, Latinos, and other “people of color.” White supremacy is the ideological underpinning of this global political, economic, and social system. Every strata of white society rests on a pedestal of colonial and neo-colonial domination of “people of color” beginning with the slavery of Africans and the genocide of the Indians. The process that enriched Europe, created the concept of “whiteness” and “race,” and enriched the white world was the same process that impoverished Africa, African descendent people worldwide, indigenous Americans, Latinos, Asians, and generally “people of color” around the world. The white bourgeoisie all the way down to poor and working class whites have generally united as an oppressor nation to maintain this relationship of colonial domination of other oppressed nations or people of color. The white bourgeoisie has shared much of their stolen colonial loot with the general white population in order to keep a base of support for their brutal looting, raping, plundering, exploitation, and oppression of the rest of the world. The European-North American (white dominated) capitalist system is a parasite living off of the stolen land, stolen labor, and stolen resources of the colonized people of the earth such as Africans (Black

people), Indigenous people, Latinos, Asians, Arabs, and generally “people of color.” When the colonized people of the earth destroy the shackles of colonialism and neo-colonialism, take control over their own lives, become self-determining people, using their land, labor, and resources for their own use and independent economic development, the capitalist system and the white power structure will decline and die like a parasite without a host. Europe and North America will lose their elite status on the planet earth and “whiteness” will no longer be privileged.

Other case studies to be examined from this anti-colonial perspective could be English colonialism in New England, English colonialism in the Carolina colony, the New Amsterdam colony, the colony of Pennsylvania, English, Spanish, French colonialism in the Caribbean. Other studies could be British, French, Belgian, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish colonialism in Africa. Others could also examine Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, and Dutch colonialism in Central and South America.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Fran. 1998. *Oxford Encyclopedia of World History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander, Michelle. 2012. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Allen, Robert L. 1970. *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Allen, Theodore, W. 1998. *The Invention of The White Race: Volume II: The Origin of Racial Oppression in Anglo-America*. London: Verso.
- Ani, Marimba. 1994. *Yurugu: An African-Centered Critique of European Cultural Thought and Behavior*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Berkeley, William. 1663. "A Discourse and View of Virginia." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1003>).
- Blackburn, Robin. 2011. *The American Crucible: Slavery, Emancipation, and Human Rights*. New York: Verso.
- Blomley, Nicholas. 2007. "Making Private Property: Enclosure, Common Right and the Work of Hedges." *Rural History* 18(1): 1-21.
- Blommaert, Jan and Chris Bulcaen. 2000. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 447-466.
- Bonacich, Edna. 1980. "Class Approaches to Ethnicity and Race." *The Insurgent Sociologist*, 10(2): 9-23.
- Bradley, Harriet. 1918. *The Enclosures in England, An Economic Reconstruction*. London: P.S. King & Son, Ltd.
- Bullock, William. 1649. "Virginia, Impartially examined, and left to publick view, to be considered by all Judicious, and honest men." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1073>).

- Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The Extended Case Method." *Sociological Theory* 16(1): X-33.
- Castro, Fidel. 2000. *Capitalism in Crisis: Globalization and World Politics Today*. Melbourne, Australia: Ocean Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2010. *Hopes and Prospects*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- United Nations. 1948. *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. Australia: General Assembly of the United Nations.
- Cushing, John D. 1978. *Colony Laws of Virginia 1619-1660*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier Inc.
- Domhoff, G. William, 2006. *Who Rules America? Power Politics & Social Change*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1920. *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880*. New York: The Free Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1965. *The World and Africa: An inquiry into the part which Africa has played in world history*. New York: International Publishers.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of The Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Farrer, John. 1649. "A Perfect Description of Virginia." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1080>).
- Feagin, Joe R. 2006. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2010. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counterframing*. New York: Routledge.
- Frethorne, Richard. 1623. "The Experiences of an Indentured Servant." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1012>).
- Gleach, Frederic W. 1997. *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures*. Lincoln, NE: The University of Nebraska Press.

- Goetz, Rebecca Anne. 2012. *The Baptism of Early Virginia: How Christianity Created Race*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Greer, Allan. 2012. "Commons and Enclosure in the Colonization of North America." *American Historical Review* 117(2): 365-386.
- Haklyut, Richard. 1609. "Virginia richly valued by a Portuguese gentlemen..." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1079>).
- Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John N. Clarke, Brian Roberts. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hamor, Ralph. 1615. *A True Discourse on the Present Estate of Virginia*. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library Publications.
- Haney Lopez, Ian F. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: NYU Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 1993. *The "Racial" Economy of Science*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Hariot, Thomas. 1588. "A Brief and True Report..." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1009>).
- Harris, Cheryl. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106: 1707-91.
- Hening, William Waller. 1823. *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of All The Laws of Virginia From the First Session of the Legislature In The Year 1619, Volume 1*. New York: R. & W. & G. Bartow.
- Hening, William Waller. 1823. *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of All The Laws of Virginia From the First Session of the Legislature In The Year 1619, Volume 2*. New York: R. & W. & G. Bartow.
- Herndon, Melvin. 1957. *Tobacco in Colonial Virginia*. Williamsburg, VA: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation.
- Hess, Penny. 2000. *Overturing the Culture of Violence*. St. Petersburg, FL: Burning Spear Publications.

- Higginbotham, A. Leon. 1998. *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process Race and the American Legal Process, Volume II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- His Majesties Couseil for Virginia. 1620. "A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia..." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1050>).
- Hornsby, Stephen J. 2005. *British Atlantic, American Frontier: Spaces of Power in Early Modern British America*. Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England.
- Jackson, George L. 1971. *Blood In My Eye*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
- Jaffe, Hosea. 1988. *A History of Africa*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- James, C.L.R. 1963. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Vintage.
- Kingsbury, Susan Myra. 1935. *The Records of the Virginia Company*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Ladner, Joyce A. 1998. *The Death of White Sociology: Essays on Race and Culture*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
- Lenin, V.I. 1932. *The State and Revolution*. Moscow: Publishing House.
- Lipstiz, George. 1998. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Luhby, Tami. 2012. "Worsening wealth inequality by race." CNN Money. Retrieved April 27, 2014 (<http://money.cnn.com/2012/06/21/news/economy/wealth-gap-race/>).
- Malcolm X Grassroots Movement. 2013. "Operation Ghetto Storm: 2012 Annual Report on Extrajudicial Killings of 313 Black People by Police, Security Guards, and Vigilantes." Jackson, MS: Malcolm X Grassroots Movement. Retrieved April 27, 2014 (<http://mxgm.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Operation-Ghetto-Storm.pdf>).
- Marx, Karl. 1867. *Capital: Volume One*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1955. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- Marx, Karl, Frederick Engels, edited by Phil Gasper. 2005. *The Communist Manifesto: A Roadmap to History's Most Important Political Document*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Marx, Anthony W. 1998. *Making Race and Nation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McIlwaine, H.R. 1924. *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia*. Richmond, Virginia: The Colonial Press, Everett Waddey Co.
- Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Morgan, Edmund. 1975. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Virginia*. New York: Norton.
- NAACP. 2013. "Criminal Justice Fact Sheet." National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Retrieved April 25, 2014. (<http://web.calstatela.edu/library/guides/3asa.pdf>).
- Newton, Huey P. 2002 *The Huey P. Newton Reader*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. 1965. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Ollman, Bertel. 2003. *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
- Parenti, Michael. 2011. *The Face of Imperialism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Percy, George. 1612. "A Trewe Relacyon of the Proceedinges and Occurentes of Momente..." London: The Virginia Company of London.
- Pory, John. 1619. "Letter of John Pory, 1619, Secretary of Virginia, to Sir Dudley Carleton." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1033>).
- Queen Elizabeth. 1584. "The letters patents, granted by the Queenes Majestie to M. Walter Raleigh, now Knight, for the discovering and planting of new lands and Countries, to continue the space of 6 yeeres and no more." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014. (etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/Jamestown-browse?id=J1013).

- R.I. 1609. "Nova Brittania," Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1051>).
- Robbins, Richard H. 2008. *Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism: Fifth Edition*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 1983. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Rodney, Walter. 1980. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Great Britain: Black Classic Press.
- Solomos, John. 1986. "Varieties of Marxist Conceptions of Race, Class, and the State: A Critical Analysis." *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations* 84-109.
- Smith, John. 1612. "A Map of Virginia: With a Description of The Countrey, The Commodities, People, Government and Religion." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014. (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1008>)
- Smith, John. 1627. "The general historie of Virginia..." London: Virginia Company of London.
- Sparks, Randy L. 2004. *The Two Princes of Calabar: An Eighteenth Century Atlantic Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Taylor, Alan. 2001. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Ture, Kwame and Charles Hamilton. 1992. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation*. New York: Random House.
- Ture, Kwame. 2013. "Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael) at UDC (Full)." San Bruno, California: You Tube. Retrieved October 4, 2013 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tug8RJyLoz0>).
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Virginia Assembly. 1619. "Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly." 1619. Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1036>).
- Virginia Planters. 1623. "The Virginia Planters answer to Captain Butler." Blacksburg, VA: Virtual Jamestown. Retrieved April 25, 2014 (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1042>).
- Vincent, Ted. 1988. *Black Power & the Garvey Movement*. Oakland: Nzinga Publishing House.
- Waterhouse, Edward. 1622. "A declaration of the state of the colony and affaires in Virginia: with a relation of the barbarous massacre in the time of peace and league." London: The Virginia Company of London.
- Williams, Eric. 1944. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Yeshitela, Omali. 1989. "Chairman Omali Yeshitela Speaks on Huey P. Newton." San Bruno, California: You Tube. Retrieved October 7, 2013 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bd5vfY9Fpj0>).
- Yeshitela, Omali. 2005. *Omali Yeshitela Speaks*. St. Petersburg, FL: Burning Spear Publications.
- Yeshitela, Omali. 2010. *One People! One Party! One Destiny! A Political Report to the Fifth Congress of the African People's Socialist Party*. St. Petersburg, FL: Burning Spear Publications.
- Yeshitela, Omali. 2012. *Quotations From Chairman Omali Yeshitela*. St. Petersburg, FL: Burning Spear Publications.
- Yeshitela, Omali. 2013. "Africa Live." St. Petersburg, Florida: Uhuru News. Retrieved July 14, 2013 (http://uhurunews.com/radio/show?show_id=lt).

APPENDIX A
[PRIMARY SOURCES]

Sources

“A Relation of the Barbarous Massacre,” by Edward Waterhouse (1622). “The letter patents,...” published in 1584 by Queen Elizabeth. “Nova Britannia: Offering Most Excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia,” by R.I. 1609. “A Map of Virginia: With the Description of the Countrey, the Commodities, People, Government, and Religion,” by John Smith (1612). George Percy’s, “a True Relation” (1612). “Virginia richly valued by a Portuguese gentlemen...” by Richard Haklyut (1609). “A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia,” by Thomas Hariot (1588). “Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly” (1619). “A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia...” by “His Majesties Couseil for Virginia” (1620). “Richard Frethorne's Letter to his Mother and Father, concerning the experiences of an indentured servant.” by Richard Frethorne, 1623. “Virginia Partially Examined” by William Bullock (1649). “A Perfect description of Virginia” by John Farrer (1649). *Colony Laws of Virginia 1619-1660*, edited by John D. Cushing (1978). “The Virginia Planters answer to Captain Butler” (1623). *Records of the Virginia Company Volume 1* edited by Susan Myra Kingsbury (1908). *Statutes At Large* by William Hening (1823). *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia* by H.R. McIlwaine (1924).

APPENDIX B

[EXTENDED DISCUSSION OF PRIMARY SOURCES]

The data on the colony of Virginia is voluminous. I collected the data that I used online through online historical primary source database called Sabin Americana, through the library of congress, and through a website called Virtual Jamestown. I picked narratives that would help me answer my questions. I picked out quotes from these narratives that I thought best exemplified the narrative. I also picked out quotes from the narratives that were illuminating in helping to answer my research questions. For instance, I picked out quotes from the colonial elites that discussed their intentions for colonizing Virginia, their racial views of the indigenous people, and their plans for the indigenous people. I attempted to expand the theories I used in the previous section, attempting to show as much detail as possible.

I used sources that other historians and scholars used such as Edmund Morgan, Fabian Tompsett, and Alan Taylor and others (Morgan 1975; Tompsett 2000; Taylor 2001). I also found other sources. I examined primary sources about the colony of Virginia such as narratives largely written by elites of the colony.

I used “A Relation of the Barbarous Massacre,” by Edward Waterhouse (1622). This is the Virginia Company of London’s official report of the 1622 Powhatan attack on the Jamestown settlement. For instance, I picked out a quote from this narrative that shows the primary motive for attacking the Algonquian people of the territory. As

Waterhouse states, the primary motive was the seizing of land for resource extraction to enrich the English elites.

I used “The letter patents,...” published in 1584 by Queen Elizabeth. This document granted Walter Raleigh settlement rights in the colony of Virginia. In this document, Queen Elizabeth discusses the motives for colonizing the territory of Virginia. This shows how the English planned to divide up the land of North America into parcels of private property. This concept of private property was foreign to the indigenous people North America. She also describes the indigenous people and their land as “heathen and barbarous.” The land and people are viewed in the same way: as objects to be exploited for the enrichment of the English elites.

I used “Nova Britannia: Offering Most Excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia,” by an author named R.I published in 1609. This was addressed to Sir Thomas Smith, then treasurer of the Virginia Company of London. This is a pamphlet that promotes the colony of Virginia to investors and it describes the rich land of the colony of Virginia and its potential to be exploited. I pulled quotes from this attempting to show exactly what resources the English colonial planners wanted from the colony of Virginia.

I used “A Map of Virginia: With the Description of the Countrey, the Commodities, People, Government, and Religion” by John Smith 1612. I selected this document because it is a detailed description of Virginia. It was also written out of the gaze of the white colonizer, also describing the potential for the land to be exploited, how it would be a good place for the establishment of a settler colony. This document describes the indigenous people in a racist way.

I used George Percy's, "a True Relation" (1612). This describes what is known as the first Anglo-Powhatan War from 1609 to 1612. Other scholars have used this source such as Edmund Morgan and Alan Taylor in describing events of the history of the colony. I used this to examine the framing of the Indians and also for factual accounts of events in the colony of Virginia. I selected these documents because of the way they discussed the intentions for colonizing and for the way they frame the indigenous people.

Most of the history of the early colony of Virginia is recorded by colonial elites, although I found a letter written by an indentured servant named Richard Frethorne written in 1623 and used this. Frethorne describes the miserable conditions in the colony of Virginia at this time as the colonists are starving and are fighting the second "Anglo-Powhatan War." I used this because it is one of the few documents from the perspective of a European indentured servant.

I used "Virginia richly valued by a Portuguese gentlemen..." by Richard Hakluyt (1609). This document promotes Virginia as a probable site for gold. I selected this document to show how the colonizers wanted to search the land for resources, minerals, and precious metals.

I used "A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia," by Thomas Hariot (1588). This document is written to potential investors and describes all of the potential commodities that could be made out of the natural resources in Virginia. I selected this document to show how the colonizers wanted to search the land for resources, minerals, and precious metals.

I used “Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly” (1619). These are the official records of the first elected Assembly to be held in Virginia in 1619. I selected this document with the goal of providing more detail about the Virginia General Assembly.

I used “A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia...” by “His Majesties Couseil for Virginia” (1620). This was written to demonstrate the profitability of Virginia. I selected this document to show further that the primary motive for colonization of Virginia was the accumulation of profits for colonial elites and the extraction of natural resources.

I used “Virginia Partially Examined” by William Bullock published in 1649. This promotes settlement in Virginia and Maryland. Bullock gives advice to settlers on how they can profit by settling in the colonies. I took from this document Bullock’s description of the results of the wars against the indigenous people. I wanted to provide as much detail as possible on how the indigenous people were affected by colonization through primary sources.

I used “A Perfect description of Virginia” by John Farrer (1649). This is a collection of accounts by colonists in Virginia. This also describes the rich land, commodities, and opportunities for profiting in Virginia. I used the author’s account of the capture of Opechancanough and the demise of the surrounding Algonquian people that were largely conquered and wiped out at this point in history. I wanted to give more detail of how the indigenous people were affected by colonization through primary sources.

Many of these narratives promote the colony of Virginia to the potential investors, such as other narratives describe the history of the colony. In selected these documents I wanted to determine the intentions of these investors and promoters of the colony on why they wanted to colonize Virginia.

I selected these narratives because they are the primary sources that document the history of the colony of Virginia. I selected these specific narratives as my data because they showed the motives for colonizing Virginia. I want to illuminate the primary motive for the colonization of this territory and theorize about its broader implications for the system of Western imperialism. Other data could have been selected, but this data was also easily accessible because it was online. Also, I read through many narratives and all were similar in the ways they framed the indigenous people. I also selected using the laws and statutes as data because it helped extend my theory about the state and capitalism to this certain time period. I can demonstrate how the elite property owning class shapes society in their interests through their political and legal system. These are examples of how they preserve their power through the state.

Another one of my sources is the *Colony Laws of Virginia 1619-1660 Volume 1* that includes laws written by the General assembly from 1619 through 1640. This was edited by John D. Cushing and was published in 1978. This book includes the laws of the colony of Virginia and the charters relating to the settlement of Virginia. This document is useful because it is a manifestation of the capitalist state. I pulled out laws dealing with Indians and Africans. I also pulled out laws dealing with class exploitation. I used this to test theories about the capitalist state and colonial racist oppression. Racist

framing of the Indians and Africans in these documents is evident in the laws of the colony of Virginia.

I used William Hening's *Statutes At Large* (1823). I used this document to analyze about the development of race in the colony. I used these to connect to the repressive nature of the capitalist state and the development of the white capitalist state. I pulled out the statutes in regards to African servants and slaves in my time period.

I used, *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia* by H.R. McIlwaine by 1924. This document contains minutes of the proceedings of the proceedings of the Council and General court of the colonial court of Virginia.

I used the website, Virtual Jamestown: http://www.virtualjamestown.org/fhaccounts_date.html. This website had primary sources about the colony of Virginia listed in chronological order. Under the link to each source was a very short description of the document, so the reader knew the kind of information that the author wrote about. From these documents, I pulled out the most interesting and relevant quotes to critically analyze and the one's that also helped me answer my research questions. These documents helped me show the intentions and motives of the colonial elites and supporters of colonization for colonialism in Virginia. I also used secondary sources for support in telling the story of the early colony of Virginia.