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“What hath a more adamantine power to draw unto it the consent and attraction of the idle, untoward, and wretched number of the many than liberty and fullness of sensuality?”

Excerpted from The Many-Headed Hydra
by Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker
THE MANY-HEADED HYDRA by PETER LINEBAUGH AND MARCUS REDIKER

CHAPTER ONE

The Wreck of the Sea-Venture

On July 25, 1609, the sailors of the Sea-Venture scanned the horizon and spotted danger. Separated from their convoy of eight other vessels sailing from Plymouth westward to Virginia, England’s first New World colony, they spied a tempest—or what the Carib Indians called a hurricane—scudding swiftly toward them. With “the clouds gathering thick upon us and the winds singing and whistling most unusually,” wrote passenger William Strachey,

a dreadful storm and hideous began to blow from the northeast, which, swelling and roaring as it were by fits, some hours with more violence than others, at length did beat all light from Heaven; which like an hell of darkness, turned black upon us, so much the fuller of horror and fear use to overrum the troubled and overmastered senses of all, which taken up with amazement, the ears lay so sensible to the terrible cries and murmurs of the winds and distraction of our company as who was most armed and best prepared was not a little shaken. The approaching fury “startled and turned the blood and took down the braves of the most hardy mariner of them all.” The less hardy passengers aboard the ninety-eight-foot, three-hundred-ton vessel cried out in fear, but their words were “drowned in the winds and the winds in the thunder.” The shaken seamen recovered and went to work as the ship’s timbers began to groan. Six to eight men together struggled to steer the vessel. Others cut down the rigging and sails to lessen resistance to the wind; they threw luggage and ordnance overboard to lighten the load and reduce the risk of capsizing. They crept, candles in hand, along the ribs of the ship, searching and listening for weeping leaks, stopping as many as they could, using beef when they ran out of oakum. Water nonetheless gushed into the ship, rising several feet, above two tiers of hogsheads, in the hold. The crew and passengers pumped continuously during “an Egyptian night of three days perpetual horror,” with the common sort “striped naked as men in Galleys.” Even gentlemen who had never worked took turns pumping, while those who could not pump bailed with kettles and buckets. They had no food and no rest as they pumped an estimated two thousand tons of water out of the leaky vessel.1

It was not enough. The waterline did not recede, and the people at the pumps had reached the limits of their strength, endurance, and hope. Now that the exhausted sailors had done all that was humanly possible to resist the apocalyptic force of the hurricane, they took comfort in a ritual of the sea, turning the maritime world upside down as they faced certain death. Defying the strictures of private property and the authority of Captain Christopher Newport, as well as the Virginia Company gentlemen such as Sir George Somers and Sir Thomas Gates, they broke open the ship’s liquors and poured all of their supplies into the sea.2
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The Sea-Venture was wrecked—miraculously, without loss of life—between two great rocks in the islands of Bermuda on July 28. The 150 wet and terrified crew and passengers, men and women originally intended by the Virginia Company of London as reinforcements for the company’s new plantation, stranded on a strange shore, a place long considered by sailors to be an enchanted “Isle of Devils” infested with demons and monsters, and a ghoulish graveyard for European ships. Charted in 1511 but shunned by seafarers for a century afterward, Bermuda was known mostly through the accounts of a few mariners, renegades, and castaways, such as Job Hoptop, who had escaped galley slavery in the Spanish West Indies, passed by the island, and made it to London to tell his tale. Silvester Jourdain, a passenger on the Sea-Venture, would later write that Bermuda afforded “nothing but gusts, storms, and foul weather, which made every navigator and mariner to avoid them as Scylla and Charybdis, or as they would shun the Devil himself.” The eeriness of the place owed much to the harsh, hollow howling of nocturnal birds called cahows, whose shrieks haunted the crews of passing ships.

The reality of Bermuda, as the shipwrecked soon discovered, was entirely different from its reputation. The island, in their view, turned out to be an Edenic land of perpetual spring and abundant food, “the richest, healthfullest and pleasantest [place] they ever saw.” The would-be colonists feasted on black hogs that had swum ashore and multiplied after a Spanish shipwreck years earlier, on fish (groupers, parrot fish, red snapper) that could be caught by hand or with a stick with a bent nail, on fowl that would land on a man’s or woman’s arms or shoulders, on massive tortoises that would feed fifty, and on an array of delicious fruit. Much to the chagrin of the officers of the Virginia Company, Bermuda “caused many of them vitally to forget or desire ever to return from thence, they lived in such plenty, peace and ease.” Once the common people found the land plentiful, they began “to settle a foundation of ever inhabiting there.” Theirs was “a more joyful and happy meeting in a more blessed world” after all.

It is not surprising that the shipwrecked commoners responded as they did, for they had been told to expect paradise at the end of their journey. In his “Ode to the Virginian Voyage” (1606), Michael Drayton had insisted that Virginia was

*Earth’s only Paradise
Where nature hath in store
Fowle, venison, and Fish;
And the fruitfull’st Soyle,
Without your toyle,
Three harvests more,
All greater than you wish.*

In 1610 Richard Brow would conveniently confuse the Bermuda and Virginia experiences in his poetic propaganda for the Virginia Company:

*There is no feare of hunger here,
for Corne much store here grows,
Much fish the Gallant Rivers yield [sic]
’tis truth, without suppose.*
He concluded that in Virginia, “there is indeed no want at all.” Another Virginia Company advocate knew that such reports were false, that some in England had dismissed them as utopian, but he nevertheless maintained the lie, promising prospective laborers a six-hour workday in which the “sappe of their bodies” would not “be spent for other mens profite.”

Many colonists had headed toward Virginia, on the Sea-Venture and other vessels, with the “heate and zeale” of a “romain year of lubile.” The biblical jubilee (Leviticus) authorized the call for an end to bondage and for the return of the commons to the dispossessed. Bermuda seemed the perfect place to enact this biblical prophecy. Strachey, a shareholder in and secretary of the Virginia Company, noted that among the shipwrecked there quickly arose “dangerous and secret discontentts” that began among the sailors and spread to others. A “disunion of hearts and hands” soon followed: those who wanted to go on with the money-making adventure in Virginia were at odds with those whose hands were supposed to get them there. The chief complaint of the seamen and the other “hands” was that “in Virginia nothing but wretchedness and labor

The New World as paradise, by Theodore de Bry, 1588. Thomas Hariot, A breife and true report of the new found land in Virginia (1590).
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hunted (Virginia white-tailed deer, bear, wild turkey, goose, quail, duck); they fished (herring, shad, sturgeon); they captured eels and shellfish (crabs, clams, oysters, mussels); they gathered (fruits, berries, nuts); and they practiced tillage (maize, beans, squash). They were nourished upon a better all-around diet than the Europeans. The Confederation consisted of small-scale societies without ownership of land, without classes, without a state, but with all paying tribute to Wahunsonacock, “the subtell owdle foe.” They pursued little economic specialization and attempted little trade; they were self-sufficient. Their society was organized around matrilineal descent, and both men and women enjoyed sexual freedom outside marriage. There existed no political/military bureaucracy for their roughly fifteen hundred warriors. Even Wahunsonacock performed the tasks of an ordinary man and was addressed by all not by his title but by his personal name. All the items Gonzalo “would not have” in his utopia were likewise missing in Powhatan society, except one: corn, or Indian maize. In search of food and a way of life that many apparently found congenial, a steady stream of English settlers opted to become “white Indians,” “red Englishmen,” or—since racial categories were as yet unformed—Anglo-Powhatans. One such was Robert Markham, a sailor who came to the region with Christopher Newport on the first Virginia voyage (May-Jun 1607) and ended up a renegade: he converted to Algonquian culture and took the name Moutapass.

The defections continued, especially among soldiers and laborers compelled by harsh discipline to build fortifications to the west, at Henrico, out of which would grow Richmond. In 1611, a few of those who “did Runne Away unto the Indiayns” were retaken by a military expedition. Sir Thomas Dale “in A moste severe mannor caused [them] to be executed.” Of these, “Some he apointed to be hanged Some burned Some to be broken upon whales, others to be staked and some to be shot to death.” These “extreme and cruellyt tortures he used and inflicted upon them” in order “to terrify the rest for Attempting the Lyke.” When he caught a few others pilfering goods from the Virginia Company’s supplies, Dale “cawed them to be bownd faste unto Trees and so sterved them to death.” Terror created boundaries.

Thus did popular anticapitalist traditions—a world without work, private property, law, felony, treason, or magistrate—find their perfect antithesis in Thomas Dale’s Virginia, where drumbeats called settlers to labor and the Laws Divine, Moral, and Martial promised terror and death to any who dared to resist. Military men transformed Bermuda and Virginia from places of “liberty and the fullness of sensuality” to places of bondage, war, scarcity, and famine. By 1613 colonists on Bermuda were starving to death as their bodies, bent and blue, spent their vital forces laboring on fortifications that would make of the island a strategic military outpost in the early phase of English colonization. One unnamed man refused to give in to the new reality, preserving the older vision of Bermuda as he “hid himself in the Woods, and lived only on Wilkes [whelks] and land Crabs, fat and lusty many moneths.” The destruction of the Bermudian paradise was signaled by a massive rat infestation and an ominous visitation by “a company of Ravens, which continued amongst them all the time of the mortality and then departed.”

To defend their liberty, some of shipwrecked “promised each unto the other not to set their hands to any travail or endeavor” that would take them off the island, and with this vow they withdrew into the woods to form their own settlement. They later planned to settle another island by themselves. A strike and marronage thus stood at the beginning of English colonization. Among the leaders of these actions were sailors and religious radicals, probably antinomians who believed that God’s grace had placed them above the law. The effort to establish an autonomous community failed, but the struggle between heart and hand continued. Stephan Hopkins was a learned Puritan and follower of Robert Browne, who advocated the creation of separate, congregational churches in which governance was based on mutual consent rather than on deference to elder, king, or nation. Hopkins extended the logic of the sailors’ ritual in the storm as he argued that the magistrate’s authority had ended the moment the Sea-Venture was wrecked. He affirmed the importance of “abundance by God’s providence of all manner of good food” on the island, and he resisted proceeding to Virginia, where the common people would only slave for the adventurers. Hopkins’s mutiny, too, was defeated, but he himself was not, as he survived to make another mutinous speech aboard the Mayflower as it approached America in 1620. Other conspirators on Bermuda were likewise unvanquished, for no sooner had the manacles been slapped on Hopkins’s wrists than a third plot was afoot, as another band of mutineers plotted to seize the supplies saved from the shipwreck and to attack the governor, Thomas Gates. Although their plan was disclosed to the authorities, resistance continued. Another rebel was soon executed for verbal mutiny against the governor and his authority, in response to which several others took again to the woods as maroons, where they lived, grumbled Gates, like savages.

Eventually the authorities prevailed. They built two vessels, pinnaces named the Deliverance and the Patience, to continue the voyage to Virginia, and launched them on May 10, 1610. Yet during their forty-two weeks on the island, sailors and others among the “idle, untoward, and wretched” had organized five different conspiracies against the Virginia Company and their leaders, who had responded with two of the earliest capital punishments in English America, hanging one man and executing another by firing squad to quell the resistance and carry on with the task of colonization. As the others sailed off to Virginia, two men, one a seaman, decided to stay and “end their daies” in Bermuda.
Joined by another man, they “began to erect their little common wealth…with brotherly regency.” One sure sign of the wisdom of those who stayed behind came less than a month after the ships’ arrival in Virginia, when Sir George Somers was dispatched by Sir Thomas Gates to Bermuda to get food, a six-month provision of meat and fish, for the struggling mainland colony. Sir George himself, however, never made it back to Virginia: having rediscovered the joys of Bermuda, he expired from “a surfeit in eating a pig.” Although we do not know what individual fates befell the sailors and passengers who sailed from Bermuda to Virginia, it is likely that many of them shared in the frightful mortality of the mainland settlement and died soon after they arrived. Collectively, however, they made up what Virginia’s swashbuckling leader, John Smith, called the third supply, an infusion of humanity that helped the young plantation to survive.

The wreck of the Sea-Venture and the dramas of rebellion that played out among the shipwrecked suggest the major themes of early Atlantic history. These events do not make for a story of English maritime greatness and glory, nor for a tale of the heroic struggle for religious freedom, though sailors and religious radicals both had essential roles. This is, rather, a story about the origins of capitalism and colonization, about world trade and the building of empires. It is also, necessarily, a story about the uprooting and movement of peoples, the making and the transatlantic deployment of “hands.” It is a story about exploitation and resistance to exploitation, about how the “sappe of bodies” would be spent. It is a story about cooperation among different kinds of people for contrasting purposes of profit and survival. And it is a story about alternative ways of living, and about the official use of violence and terror to deter or destroy them, to overcome popular attachments to “liberty and the fullness of sensuality.”

We are by no means the first to find historic significance in the story of the Sea-Venture. One of the first—and certainly the most influential—was William Shakespeare, who drew upon firsthand accounts of the wreck in 1610-11 as he wrote his play The Tempest. Shakespeare had long studied the accounts of explorers, traders, and colonizers who were aggressively linking the continents of Europe, Africa, and the Americas through world trade. Moreover, he knew such men personally, and even depended on them for his livelihood. Like many of his patrons and benefactors, such as the Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare himself invested in the Virginia Company, the spearhead of English colonization. This situation helped to call forth the Laws Divine, Moral, and Martial, sanctioned by the Second Charter of the Virginia Company (1609) with the advice of Francis Bacon, who was, according to Strachey, a “most noble foster [favorer] of the Virginia Plantation, being from the beginning (with other lords and earles) of the principall counsell applied to propagate and guide yt." The charter, as suggested above, empowered Sir Thomas Gates to declare martial law in order to bring the colony to discipline and thereby to make money for the new stockholders. The first nineteen articles of the new law, imposed by Gates the day after he arrived in Virginia, had likely been drawn up amid the conspiracies that challenged his rule on Bermuda and against that island’s backdrop of liberty, plenty, and ease. These mostly martial laws established military discipline for labor and dispensed harsh punishments, including execution, for resistance. In all, the laws contained thirty-seven articles, promising whippings, galley service, and death galore: twenty-five of them prescribed capital punishment. Thomas Dale adapted the latter sections of the Laws Divine, Moral, and Martial “from a Dutch army book of ordinances which he had brought with him.” One of the main purposes of laws was to keep English settlers and Native Americans apart.

The people to whom the colonists deserted in defiance of Dale’s laws were a Tsenacommacah, or loose alliance, of thirty-odd smallish groups of Algonquians. Their paramount chief, Wahunsonacock, a Pamunkey Indian whom the English called Powhatan, was a “tall well proportioned man, with a sower look,” sixty years old and possessed of “a very able and hardy body to endure any labour.” The fourteen thousand Algonquians inhabited a rich ecological zone made up of mixed forest and Chesapeake waterways, on which they exercised an economy of collecting and horticulture. They
I have great comfort from this fellow: methinks he hath no drowning mark upon him; his complexion is perfect gallows. Stand fast, good Fate, to his hanging: make the rope of his destiny our cable, for our own doth little advantage. If he be not born to be hanged, our case is miserable.

Gonzalo, of course, can do nothing about the verbal mutiny as long as the ship remains in danger, so he recalls the plebeian proverb “He that’s born to be hanged need fear no drowning” and takes comfort in the prospect of a hanging. Shakespeare thus suggests the importance of deep-sea sailing ships (“the Jewels of our land,” as they were called by a Virginia Company official) and sailors. Both, he advises, have to be firmly controlled by the rulers overseeing the process of colonization. The ship and the sailor were necessary to the international accumulation of capital through the transport of commodities, which included, as we have seen, the expropriated workers who would create that new capital. One critical instrument of control was the public hanging.

When Gonzalo prays to fate that the rope of the boatswain’s destiny may become the cable of life for the ruling class, he is making explicit a real relationship. Sir Walter Raleigh had a similar experience when exploring the waters of Venezuela: “At the last we determined to hang the Pilot, and if we had well known the way back again by night, he had surely gone, but our own necessities pleased sufficiently for his safety.” Hanging was destiny for part of the proletariat because it was necessary to the organization and functioning of transatlantic labor markets, maritime and otherwise, and to the suppression of radical ideas, as on Bermuda. In 1611, the year The Tempest was first performed, in Middlesex alone (which county already contained the most populous parishes of London) roughly 130 people were sentenced to the gallows and ninety eight were actually hanged, considerably more than the annual average of about seventy. The following year Bartholomew Legate and Edward Wrightman, both followers of the Puritan separatist Robert Browne and brethren of Stephan Hopkins, were burned at the stake for heresy. Even grislier punishments were enacted at sea, where any sailor caught on watch with a three time would be bound to the mainmast with a basket of bullets tied to his arms; after a fourth offense he would be hanged with a biscuit and knife from the bowsprit, forced eventually to decide whether to starve or to cut himself down to drown. A man designing to steal a ship would be hanged by his heels overboard until his brains were beaten out against the ship’s sides. Shakespeare evaded such realities in his play, but he and his friends in the Virginia Company knew well that capitalist colonization depended on them.

Gruesome kinds of capital punishment were not the only notions of class discipline aboard the Sea-Venture, and one of these would have long-term implications for the colony of Virginia and indeed for all of England’s Atlantic empire. The source of it lay in the Netherlands in the late sixteenth century, in the new forms of military discipline develop by Maurice of Orange for Dutch soldiers. In what would prove to be a centerpiece of the “military revolution,” Maurice redesigned military work processes, breaking soldiers’ movements into component parts and recombining them to create new cooperation, efficiency, and collection power. These ideas and practices were carried by Sir Thomas Gates and Sir Thomas Dale to Virginia in 1610 and 1611, and from there to future Governor Daniel Tucker to Bermuda. This new way of organizing military cooperation relied ultimately on the terror of the gallows and the whipping post (on one occasion Tucker personally whipped forty men before breakfast). Its reality and its as the Atlantic maritime states of northwest Europe (France, the Netherlands, and England) challenged and overtook the Mediterranean kingdoms and city-states of Spain, Portugal, Algiers, Naples, and Venice as the dominant forces in Europe and, increasingly, the world. The faster, better-fortified, less-labor-intensive northern European ship, the most sophisticated engineering feat of the time, eclipsed the Mediterranean galley. The ruling class of England was especially eager to challenge the Iberian countries’ grip on the New World and to enrich itself while doing so. A group of English investors thus in 1606 formed the Virginia Company, which according to its leading chronicler, Wesley Frank Craven, was “primarily a business organization with large sums of capital invested by adventurers whose chief interest lay in the returns expected from their investment.” Here, in the pooling of capital for a new world-trade organization, lay the origins of the voyage of the Sea-Venture.

The advocates of the Virginia Company engaged in a broad public campaign throughout England to rally support for colonization, explaining again and again why their private capitalist initiative was good for the nation. They advanced multiple arguments: All good Protestants in England had an obligation to help convert the savages in America to Christianity and to battle their Catholic enemies abroad; all had a duty to extend English dominion and to embrace beckoning national glory. But the most consistent, and most resonant, argument they made presented colonization as a solution to domestic social problems in England. The company, its propagandists never tired of repeating, would provide a necessary public service by removing the “swarmes of idle persons” in England and setting them to work in Virginia, as Richard Hakluyt, the main propagandist for English colonization, had been suggesting for twenty years. The New World was the place for “irregular youths of no religion,” for persons dispossessed by “ract rents,” for anyone suffering “extrem poverty”—in short, for all those “who cannot live at home.” Although we do not know the names or the individual backgrounds of most of the people aboard the Sea-Venture, we know that a number of dispossessed were among them. In 1609 the Virginia Company applied to the mayor, aldermen, and companies of London “to ease the city and suburbs of a swarme of unnecessary inmates, as a contynual cause of death and famine, and the very originall cause of all the plagues that happen in this kingdome.” Robert Rich, a gentleman shipwrecked on Bermuda, would write of “those men that vagrants liv’d with us,” while an anonymous author close to Sir Thomas Gates (perhaps even Gates himself) would complain of “those wicked Impes that put themselves a shipboard, not knowing otherwise how to live in England.”

The Virginia Company, like capitalism more broadly, originated in a series of interrelated social and economic changes in late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century England, changes that propelled the Sea-Venture toward Virginia in 1609 and informed the writing of The Tempest soon after. We can list these changes as the shift in agriculture from arable subsistence to commercial pasturage; the increase of wage labor; the growth of urban populations; the expansion of the domestic system of handicraft or putting-out; the growth of world trade; the institutionalization of markets; and the establishment of a colonial system. These developments were made possible by a profound and far-reaching cause: the enclosure of land and the removal of thousands of people from the commons, who were then reemployed to the country, town, and sea. Expropriation was the source of the original accumulation of capital, and the force that transformed land and labor into commodities. This is how some of the workers aboard the Sea-Venture had become “hands.”
Shakespeare recognized the truth of expropriation in *The Tempest* when he had the “savage and deformed slave” Caliban assert his own claim to the land against his aristocratic master, Prospero:

>This island’s mine by Sycorax my mother;  
Which thou tak’st from me.

This was the crux of the epoch. As landlords dispossessed European workers and as European merchants dispossessed native peoples in the Americas, the Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius asked, “Can any nation...discover what belonged to someone else?” Whose was Bermuda? Whose was America? Whose was Africa? Whose island was England? Since the peoples of the world have, throughout history, clung stubbornly to the economic independence that comes from possessing their own means of subsistence, whether land or other property, European capitalists had to forcibly expropriate masses of them from their ancestral homelands so that their labor-power could be redeployed in new economic projects in new geographic settings. The dispossession and relocation of peoples have been a worldwide process spanning five hundred years. The Virginia Company in general and the *Sea-Venture* in particular helped to organize the middle passage between Old World expropriation and New World exploitation.

How did expropriation happen in England? It was a long, slow, violent operation. Beginning in the Middle Ages, lords privately abolished their armies and dissolved their feudal retinues, while in the early sixteenth century the rulers of England publicly closed the monasteries, rooted out the itinerant friars, pardoners, and beggars, and destroyed the medieval system of charity. Perhaps most important of all were the actions taken by big landowners in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as they responded to new national and international market opportunities. They radically changed agricultural practices by enclosing arable lands, evicting smallholders, and displacing rural tenants, thus throwing thousands of men and women off the land and denying them access to commons. By the end of the sixteenth century there were twelve times as many propertyless people as there had been a hundred years earlier. In the seventeenth century almost a quarter of the land in England was enclosed. Aerial photography and excavations have located more than a thousand deserted villages and hamlets, confirming the colossal dimensions of the expropriation of the peasantry. Thomas More had satirized the process in *Utopia* (1516), but he himself had enclosed land and had to be restrained. Shakespeare, too, participated in enclosure. He owned a half share in a lease of tithes at Welcombe, whose open fields William Combe proposed to enclose in 1614. Shakespeare did not object since his income would be undiminished, but the would-be dispossessed objected, filling in the ditches newly dug for enclosing hedges. Combe, mounted on horseback, opposed the diggers, calling them “puritan knives & underlings in their colour,” but Thomas Green, the leader of the diggers, returned the next day with women and children to continue the resistance. Green petitioned the lord chief justice and the Privy Council and eventually obtained a warrant to remove the enclosure.

Most agricultural laborers were less fortunate. Unable to find profitable employment, without land, credit, or occupation, these new proletarians were thrust upon the roads and ways, where they were subject to the merciless cruelty of a labor and criminal code as
could also refer to a colorful assemblage, such as a crowd of people whose tatterdemalion dress made it interesting. A motley crowd might very likely be one in rags, or a “lumpen”-proletariat (from the German word for “rags”). Although we write about and emphasize the interracial character of the motley crew, we wish that readers would keep these other meanings—the subversion of power and the poverty in appearance—in mind.

Expropriation occurred not only in England but also in Ireland, Africa, the Caribbean, and North America. The proletarians thus created worked as skilled navigators and sailors on early transatlantic ships, as slaves on American plantations, and as entertainers, sex workers, and servants in London. English participation in the slave trade, essential to the rise of capitalism, began in 1563, the year before Shakespeare was born. In 1555 John Lok brought the first Ghanaian slaves to England, where they learned English in order to return to Ghana and act as interpreters for slave traders. John Hawkins made huge profits selling three hundred slaves in Haiti to the Spanish in 1562-1563. Queen Elizabeth loaned him a ship and crew for his second slave expedition. In Ben Jonson's The Masque of Blackness (1605), Oceanus could innocently ask of the African Niger, “But, what’s the end of thy Herculean labors,/ Extended to these calm, and blessed shores[?]” Shakespeare, who himself admired Hercules, among other mythic figures, would help to answer that question: in 1607, the crews of the slave ships the Dragon and the Hector performed Hamlet and Richard II while anchored off Sierra Leone. Lucas Fernandez, “a converted negro, brother-in-law of the local King Borea,” translated the plays for the visiting African merchants. In 1618, soon after the first performance of The Tempest, English slave traders, chartered as the Company of Adventurers of London Trading to Gynney and Bynney by James I, built the first permanent English factory in West Africa.

Shakespeare presented the conspiracy of Caliban, Trinculo, and Stephano as a comedy of low characters, but their alliance was far from laughable: Drake had depended on the superior knowledge of the cimarrons, escaped Afro-Indian slaves, in his raids on the Spanish Main. And as we have seen, the actual mutinies on Bermuda, which threw up democratic, antinomian, and communist ideas from below, were more varied, complex, sustained, intelligent, and dangerous than Shakespeare allowed. Perhaps he had no choice. A recent law prohibited any mention of divinity on stage and therefore made it difficult to consider the arguments of dissenters such as Stephan Hopkins, who derived their notion of freedom from precisely such a source. The canons of 1604 also required that every English church acknowledge that each of the Thirty nine Articles of the Church of England was agreeable to the Word of God. The thirty-seventh article stated that “the Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death,” while the thirty-eighth asserted that “the Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.”

Like the rebels of the Sea-Venture, the cooperation and combination of “strange bedfellows” who rose up in insurrection in The Tempest were represented as monstrous. Here Shakespeare contributed to an evolving ruling-class view of popular rebellion that would be summarized by the anonymous author of The Rebel’s Doom, a later-seventeenth-century history of uprisings in England. Early tumults in the realm, the writer claimed, had resulted almost entirely from the “Dissouncement of the most Eminent Personages of the Nation,” but after the Peasant’s Revolt of 1381, “the rabble”—as Prospero called Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo—“like a Monstrous Hydra, erecting their shapeless heads, began to hiss against their Sovereigns Regal Power and Authority.”

severe and terrifying as any that had yet appeared in modern history. The major statutes against robbery, burglary, and stealing were written during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, as crime became a permanent part of urban life. Laws against vagabondage meanwhile promised physical violence against the dispossessed. Under Henry VIII (1509-1547), vagabonds were whipped, had their ears cut off, or were hanged (one chronicler of the age put their number at seventy-five thousand). Under Edward VI (1547-1553) they had their chests branded with the letter V and were enslaved for two years; under Elizabeth I (1558-1603) they were whipped and banished to galley service or the house of correction. The criminal code elaborated under Edward VI was scarcely less vicious toward the propertyless. The Statute of Artificers and the Poor Law likewise sought to legislate taking hire, or wage labor.

Masterless men and women were the defining feature of late Tudor and early Stuart England, producing the characteristic turmoil of the era. Vagabonds were, A. L. Beier has written, “a hydra-headed monster poised to destroy the state and social order.” This description echoes the argument of philosopher and Solicitor General Francis Bacon, who from personal experience considered such people the “seed of peril and tumult in a state.” The combination of expropriation, industrial exploitation (through mining and the putting-out system), and unprecedented military mobilization resulted in the huge Tudor regional rebellions—the Cornish Rising (1497), the Lavenham Rising (1525), and the Lincolnshire Rebellion (1536)—as well as the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), the Prayer Book Rebellion (1549), and Kett’s Rebellion (1549), all of which took place in the countryside. Urban insurrections for their part intensified toward the end of the sixteenth century with the Ludgate Prison Riot (1581), the Beggars’ Christmas Riot (1582), the Whitsonside Riots (1584), the PLAisterers’ Insurrection (1586), the Felt-Makers’ Riot (1591), the Southwark Candle-Makers’ Riot (1592), and the Southwark Butter Riot (1598), whose very names evoke the struggle of handicraft workers to preserve their freedoms and customs. When Oxford commoners sought alliance with London prentices in the Enslow Hill Rebellion (1596), Bacon and Attorney General Edward Coke tortured one of the movement’s leaders and argued that any attack on enclosure was tantamount to high treason. The largest rebellion of the age was the Midlands Revolt of 1607, which transpired partly in Shakespeare’s home county and influenced his writing of Coriolanus. Those who took direct action to remove enclosures were now for the first time called Levellers. The exuberant resistance to expropriation slowed the pace of enclosure, delayed the undercutting of wages, and laid the basis for the concession and compromise that we misleadingly term “Tudor paternalism,” as if they had been a pure gift of parental goodness.

When it came time to sort out and analyze the dispossessed, Sir John Popham, chief justice of the King’s Bench from 1592 to 1607 and a leading organizer of the Virginia Company, listed thirty different types of rogues and beggars and classed them into five main groups. First there were the chapmen, the tinkers and peddlers, the men and women whose little transactions constituted the commerce of the proletarian microeconomy. Second were the discharged or wounded, or the pretended discharged and wounded, soldiers and sailors, whose labors provided the basis of the expansionist macroeconomy. Third were the remnants of the surviving substructure of feudal benevolence: the procurers, the proctors, the pardoners. The entertainers of the day—the jugglers, fencers, minstrels, keepers of dancing bears, athletes, and players of interludes—made up the fourth group. Next, in mentioning those feigning knowledge of a “crafty Scyence” such
as palmistry or physiognomy, as well as fortune-tellers and “persons calling themselves Schollers,” Popham designated a fifth group that supplied the intellectual and philosophical wants of the people. Finally, his preamble named “all wandering persons and common Labours being persons able in bodye using luytering and refusing to worke for such reasonable wages as is taxed or commonly given in such Parts where such persons do or shall happen to dwell or abide, not having lyying otherwise to maynteyne themselves.” Thus falling within the statutory meaning of “sturdy rogue and beggar” were all those outside of organized wage labor, as well as those whose activities comprised the culture, tradition, and autonomous self-understanding of this volatile, questioning, and unsteady proletariat. Marx and Engels called the expropriated a motley crowd.26

Expropriation and resistance fueled the process of colonization, peopling the Sea-Venture and many other transatlantic vessels during the first half of the seventeenth century. While some went willingly, as the loss of lands made them desperate for a new beginning, many more went unwillingly, for reasons explained by Bacon in the aftermath of Midlands Revolt: “For the surest way to prevent Seditions” was “to take away the Matter of them. For if there be Fuell prepared, it is hard to tell, whence the Spark shall come, that shall set it on Fire.” Arguments in favor of colonizing Ireland in 1594 or Virginia in 1612 held that the “rank multitude” might thus be exported and the “matter of sedition… removed out of the City.” An entire policy originated from the Beggars Act of 1597 (39 Eliz. c. 4), whereby vagrants and rogues convicted of crimes (mostly against property) in England would be transported to the colonies and sentenced to work on plantations, within what Hakluyt saw as a “prison without walls.” Here was the place for the inmates of London and indeed the whole realm. The first known English felon transported to the Americas was a dyer’s apprentice who took his master’s goods and absconded from a workhouse before being sent to Virginia in 1607. Thousands more would follow.27

ALTERNATIVES

The partisans of the Virginia Company knew that expropriation created “swarmes of idle persons” who had once been sustained by the commons. The merchant, investor, and publicist Robert Gray recalled a time when the commons of our Country lay free and open for the poore Common[er]s to injoy, for there was roome enough in the land for every man, so that no man needed to enroach [on] or inclose from another, whereby it is manifest, that in those daies we had no great need to follow strange reports, or to seeke wild adventures, for seeing we had not onely sufficiencie, but an overflowing measure proportioned to everie man.

His tendentious view that encroachment and enclosure had been caused by population growth and overcrowding notwithstanding, Gray understood that many people in England had once lived differently—more freely, sufficiently, even abundantly. When the commoners of the Sea-Venture decided that they wished to settle in Bermuda rather than go on to Virginia, they explained to the Virginia Company officials that wanted the ease, COOPERATION AND RESISTANCE

The history of the Sea-Venture can be recounted as a microcosm of various forms of human cooperation. The first of these was the cooperation among the sailors, and eventually among everyone on the ship, during the hurricane, as they steered the vessel, struck sails, cleared the decks, and pumped out the water that was seeping into the hull. After the shipwreck, cooperative labor was extended and reorganized among the “hands” ashore, in part by the leaders of the Virginia Company, in part in opposition to them. This work consisted of building huts out of palmetto fronds for shelter and commoning for subsistence—hunting and gathering, fishing and scavenging. Beginning with the challenge to authority aboard ship, the commoners, led by the sailors, cooperated on the island in the planning of five distinct conspiracies, including a strike and marronage. Alongside and against that oppositional cooperation, the Virginia Company officials organized their own project of cooperative labor: the hewing of cedar trees and the building of vessels to carry the shipwrecked on to Virginia. The tensions between the subversive and official forms of cooperation constituted the drama of William Strachey’s account of life on Bermuda in 1609-1610.

Cooperation bound together many different kinds of people, with many different kinds of work experience: sailors, laborers, craftsmen, and commoners of several sorts, including two Native Americans, Namuntack and Metchamps, who were returning to the Powhatans in the Chesapeake after a voyage to England.28 Such cooperative resistance shaped Shakespeare’s conception of the conspiracy waged in The Tempest by Caliban the slave, Trinculo the jester, and Stephano the sailor, who combine in a plan to kill Prospero and seize control of the island (Bermuda). Caliban himself embodies African, Native American, Irish, and English cultural elements, while Trinculo and Stephano represent two of the main types of the dispossessed in Judge Popham’s England. “Misery acquaints a man with strange bed-fellows,” muses Trinculo as he joins Caliban beneath a gaberdine mantle, seeking shelter from a thunderstorm—but nor before asking himself, “What have we here? a man or a fish?” When Stephano arrives on the scene, he surveys what he thinks is a many-legged creature and wonders if a new kind of being has been created: “This is some monster of the isle with four legs.” It is not a fish, of course, nor is it a monster, nor a hybrid (a word originally used to describe the breeding of pigs and first applied to humans in 1620, when Ben Jonson referred to young Irishwomen); it is, rather, the beginning of cooperation among a motley crew of workers. Caliban promises to use his commoning skills (i.e., hunting and gathering) to show Trinculo and Stephano how to survive in a strange land, how and where to find food, fresh water, salt, and wood. Their cooperation eventually evolves into conspiracy and rebellion of the kind promoted on the island of Bermuda by the commoners of the Sea-Venture before they, too, were defeated.29

We have said that the meeting of Caliban and Trinculo under the gabardine is the beginning of the motley crew. We should explain the significance of the term. In the habits of royal authority in Renaissance England, the “motley” was a multicolored garment, often a cap, worn by a jester who was permitted by the king to make jokes, even to tell the truth, to power. As an insignium, the motley brought carnivalesque expectations of disorder and subversion, a little letting-off of steam. By extension, motley
the manifold human values of mutuality. Shakespeare knew the truth of the struggle for an alternative way of life on Bermuda, but he chose to turn a real place into a dreamy, literary “no-place,” a utopia. His fellow investors in the Virginia Company did something similar: against those who tried to seize a life of “plenty, peace, and ease,” they brutally pursued a utopia of their own.

pleasure, and freedom of the commons rather than the wretchedness, labor, and slavery awaiting them in Virginia.22

Inspired by the actions of the shipwrecked commoners, Shakespeare made alternative ways of life a major theme in The Tempest. Gonzalo, a wise old counselor in the play who is cast away with the king and other aristocrats on Bermuda, muses about the ideal “commonwealth” he would establish “had I plantation of this isle”:

I’ th’ commonwealth I would by contraries
Execute all things; for no kind of traffic
Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
And use of service, none; contract, succession,
Bourn, bound of land, tillth, vineyard, none;
No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil;
No occupation: all men idle, all;
And women too, but innocent and pure:
No sovereignty—

He continues,

All things in common Nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavour: treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine,
Would I not have; but Nature should bring forth
Of it own kind, all foison, all abundance,
To feed my innocent people.

His commonwealth, he concludes, would “excel the Golden Age.”23

The people of the Sea-Venture shared with Shakespeare numerous sources of knowledge about alternative ways of life, including the classical Golden Age, the Christian Garden of Eden (Gonzalo’s “innocent people”), and a broad array of popular traditions: antinomian (no law or felony, or magistracy); anarchist (no sovereignty or treason); pacifist (no sword, pike, knife, or gun); egalitarian (no riches or poverty); and hunting and gathering (no mining or agriculture). A society without succession was one without aristocracy of birth, while a society without use of service was one without wage labor. These traditions were enacted in pageants of the “world turned upside down,” featuring motley clad jesters such as Shakespeare’s Trinculo amid the banners, horses, artwork, and extravagance of courtly carnival, incorporating pagan rites, peasant traditions, and otherworldly utopian settings (alterae terrae, like Bermuda) into new, inclusive, spectacular entertainments. George Ferrers, lord of misrule at Edward VI’s celebrations of 1552, entered the festivity “vpon one strange beast,” as “the serpente with sevin heedes cauied hidra is the chief beast of myne armes.” Comic fables such as the “Land of Cockaigne” deriving from medieval satire kept a type of utopia alive, painting a picture of indolent pleasure and absolute satiation.24
The most immediate alternative, of course, was the experience of the commons, with its absence of the private property suggested by words such as *tilth* and *bourn*. *Tilth* was an ancient Frisian word referring to a plowing or a harrowing—that is, to specific labors, and by implication to the specific labors that stood in contrast to pasture, forest, and waste. It evoked, by association, a return to woodland conditions, which still existed in England and especially in Ireland, where English conquerors had already begun to defoliate the woods to defeat a kin-based society that shared its principal resources. *Bourn* was a more recent term signifying the boundary between fields, much used in the sixteenth century in the south of England and hence associated with enclosure. Those who had been expropriated had not only a grievance but a living memory and lore of open-field agriculture and commoning. Thus for many people the absence of “bourn, bound of land, tilth” was not an ideal dream but a recent, and lost, reality, an actual commons.

When Governor Thomas Gates complained that the mutineers of the *Sea-Venture* retired to the woods and lived like savages, what precisely did he mean? How did savages live? For Gates and his entire generation of Europeans, the classless, stateless, egalitarian societies of America were powerful examples of alternative ways of life. Virginia Company spokesman Robert Gray sounded an often-repeated note about Native Americans: “There is not meum and tuum amongst them.” They had no conception of private property and precious little notion of work itself, as William Strachey discovered: Virginia’s Indians were, he noted, “now for the most part of the year idle.” Idle, perhaps, but not starving: Sir Henry Colt wrote in 1631 that he saw in St. Christopher, in the West Indies, “many naked Indians, & although their bellies be to great for their proportions, yett it shewes ye plentye of ye Iland in ye nourishinge of them.” Such discoveries inflamed the collective imagination of Europe, inspiring endless discussion—among statesmen, philosophers, and writers, as well as the dispossessed—of peoples who lived without property, work, masters, or kings.

Tales of these alternative societies in America were carried back to Europe by sailors—the hundreds, and soon thousands, of real-life equivalents of Thomas More's Raphael Hythloday, the seafarer who returned from the New World to tell the story of *Utopia*. Members of cultures high and low depended on sailors and their “strange reports” for news of *alterae terrae*. Michel de Montaigne’s personal servant was a former seaman who had lived twelve years among the Indians of Brazil; this “plain ignorant fellow” was undoubtedly a “true witness” whose stories influenced his master's conception of human possibility. Through these and other tales that circulated through port cities such as London, Shakespeare had read and heard of the “golden world without toyle,” of the places “without lawes, without bookees, and without judges,” to be found in America. Centuries later, Rudyard Kipling would visit Bermuda and assert that Shakespeare had gotten many of his ideas for *The Tempest* from “a drunken seaman.”

Sailors in this way brought together the primitive communism of the New World and the plebeian commonism of the Old, suggesting—at least in part—why they played such a leading and subversive role in the events surrounding the shipwreck of the *Sea-Venture* on Bermuda in 1609.

Commoning was not a single agrarian practice, nor were the commons a uniform ecological place with a fixed human tenure. Both varied from time to time and from place to place, as William Strachey and many others well knew. Strachey explained that “whatsoever God by the ministration of nature hath created on earth, was at the beginning common among men,” and that the Native Americans he encountered—whom he called “the naturall”—were much like his own ancestors, the ancient Picts and Britons who had been subdued by the Romans. There existed a particular English open-field system of agriculture, including provision for common fields, which seems to have been replicated successfully in Sudbury, Massachusetts, until it, too, was overcome by the onslaught of private accumulation. Yet the commons were more than a specific English agrarian practice or its American variants; the same concept underlay the chichan, the sep, the rundale, the West African village, and the indigenous tradition of long-fallow agriculture of Native Americans—in other words, it encompassed all those parts of the Earth that remained unprivatized, unenclosed, a noncommodity, a support for...