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 This note, along with the accompanying spreadsheet “IntraAmertoSpanAmer2014.xlsx,” is intended as a supplement to Alex Borucki, David Eltis, and David Wheat, “Atlantic History and the Slave Trade to Spanish America,” *American Historical Review,* 120 (2015). In what follows here this publication is referred to as “the main essay.” The argument it presents is heavily dependent on two new exercises in quantitative history. The first is a fresh attempt at tracking the size and direction of the early Spanish transatlantic slave trade. The procedures involved as well as their results are incorporated directly into the main essay. The second exercise is a reassessment and aggregation of the intra-American slave trade into the Spanish Americas – in other words the inflow of captives that originated not in Africa but in other parts of the Americas - controlled for the most part by Spain’s European rivals. Because of the many routes of the intra-American traffic and the complexity and variety of the extant sources, we have chosen to develop estimates of its size and direction in a separate essay presented here.

 Our estimates of the Intra-American slave trade to Spanish America are developed in five interlinked spreadsheets. The first - “*Summary intra” -* is explained at the end of these explanatory notes. We begin here with the Dutch connection shown on the second sheet of the set, before turning to the pre-1790 British traffic on the third. The post 1789 inflows into Cuba take up the fourth sheet, with the much less well-known movement of slaves out of Brazil forming the subject of the final sheet. Examining the formulae embedded in the cells of the summary sheet will show the reader how the summary is linked to the other four sheets, the tabs for each of which are displayed at the foot of the spreadsheets.

*Departures from the Dutch Americas before 1790 (tab = “pre1790Dutchdepart”)*

 The intra-American traffic from the Dutch possessions to the Hispanic world is probably the easiest of the major branches of the trade to re-construct. Column H shows arrivals in the Dutch Caribbean broken down by 60-year periods (no arrivals assumed after 1789). The data are taken from: <http://slavevoyages.org/tast/assessment/estimates.faces?yearFrom=1660&yearTo=1789&disembarkation=501>. The total for each period is then distributed across the two Dutch entrepots of Curacao and St. Eustatius using ratios calculated from the slavevoyages data (as opposed to the estimates page) shown in column F. The source is: http://slavevoyages.org/tast/database/search.faces?yearFrom=1660&yearTo=1789&mjslptimp=32100.

Curacao was the dominant Dutch distribution center before the mid-eighteenth century and St. Eustatius thereafter. Given that the slave population at Curacao – much the larger of the two - averaged about 10,000 when the traffic was its height, ninety percent of the transatlantic arrivals at both islands would have been re-exported with almost all the Curacao departures taken to the Spanish Caribbean mainland.[[1]](#endnote-1) St. Eustatius supplied mainly the French and British possessions, but the O’Malley database suggests that ten percent of departures went to Spanish colonies in the seventeenth century rising to forty percent in the late eighteenth century. Of the 148,700 captives disembarked in the Dutch Caribbean before 1790 (Cell H18), 115,900 are estimated to have reached Spanish colonies.

*Departures from the British Americas before 1790 (tab =“pre1790Britishdepart”)*

 Records of the traffic in slaves between the British colonies and the Spanish Americas begin in 1662. Both British monopoly companies – the Company of Royal Adventurers and the Royal African Company - who comprised the major sellers of slaves to the Spanish from their bases in Barbados and Jamaica monitored the great fluctuations the Spanish market. For 50 years down to 1712 there are comments every few months on the activity (or lack of it) of Spanish buyers. For several years it is clear that there was no Spanish interest whatsoever, particularly in the 1670s.[[2]](#endnote-2) However, no systematic records of sales are extant. Three Company of Royal Adventurers ledger books survive for the 1660s, one for Barbados for 1662-64 and two for Jamaica for 1665-69.[[3]](#endnote-3) From these it appears that one third of captives brought to Jamaica, and 15 percent of those going into Barbados were sold to the Spanish.[[4]](#endnote-4) Cell A201 to cell F208 in the *“pre1790Britishdepart”* spreadsheet displays annual arrivals, 1662-67 into Barbados and Jamaica from the slavevoyages estimate page at <http://slavevoyages.org/tast/assessment/estimates.faces?yearFrom=1662&yearTo=1667&disembarkation=301.302> and applies these ratios to derive estimates of captives sent off to the Spanish Americas from British islands. The results are displayed in columns I11-I16 and L11-L16. For 1668 to 1700 we estimate an annual average of 1,000 based on departures from Jamaica and Barbados in the first 11 years of the eighteenth century (see next paragraph) - immediately prior to the beginning of the British Asiento. The resulting series is thus not based on hard data but is broadly consistent with comments on the Spanish traffic supplied by company agents in Jamaica and Barbados referenced in note 2.

 In the second decade of the eighteenth century, the major source of slaves for the Spanish circum-Caribbean became the British Caribbean. For Jamaica we employ three separate sources to derive estimates for departures. Column C comprises the annual sum of slave departures on individual voyages taken from an augmented version of Greg O’Malley’s intra-American slave trade database (labeled “intragreg14” on the spreadsheet).[[5]](#endnote-5) Column D provides 5-year summaries of the same data. Where columns C and D are voyage-based data, columns E and F report annualized or quinquennial totals from a re-exports series compiled from Jamaican tax returns. Sheridan presents five-year totals only (shown in column E), but from 1739 annual figures are available from Lambert (col F). Column G integrates columns E and F choosing the higher of the two for any given year to create a composite series.[[6]](#endnote-6) It should be noted that from at least as early as 1660 both Barbados and Jamaica embarked on a more than century-long struggle with the imperial government to impose a tax on slave exports from the islands. Given that the tax was in place more often than not and that the re-export series is based on revenues raised by this tax, we should take the Fuller-based figures as a lower-bound indication of departures. Column G thus not only combines E and F, it incorporates a ten percent to reflect unreported departures.

 Having estimated the size of the outflow from Jamaica we now need to know the destination of the flow. By no means all went to the Spanish Americas. Fortunately O’Malley’s database has destinations for 722 voyages leaving Jamaica before 1789 as displayed in cells A112 to D199. These are grouped in 25-year periods to allow for a crude adjustment to changes over time. Cells F119 to H199 show further re-grouping, this time of destinations into broad regions as well as the derivation of ratios for each of these broad regions within the quarter century periods. As column H indicates, the share of Jamaican slave re-exports going to the Spanish Americas fell from 95 percent in the first half of the century to 60 percent in the second half. But within the Spanish Americas Cuba’s share expanded threefold between the first and last quarters of the century. These ratios now allow us to compute columns G and I – an annual series for Cuba in G, and one for the Spanish Americas as a whole in I. This procedure suggests that 84 percent of departures from Jamaica (or 155,500 the sum of I19 to I107) went to Spanish America, mainly Cartagena, Portobelo and Havana, between 1701 (when the Jamaican series begins) through to the end of 1789. To these should be added a further 32,000 departures for the pre-1701 era (the sum of column I11 to I16).

 Islands other than Jamaica that served as conduits for British-borne captives sold in Spanish slave markets are shown in columns J though M. Barbados is by far the most important of these. The figures are imputed arrivals by which is meant that ships that are known to have delivered slaves but left no record of the exact number are assigned an average – a procedure that is part of the O’Malley database. O’Malley actually provides three series for slaves arriving in ten different groups of mainland British colonies. The first is a count of slaves as the numbers appear in the historical record, the second based on the aforementioned imputed arrivals, and a third intended to “cover gaps in the port records” such gaps often spanning several years at a time.[[7]](#endnote-7) To make an allowance for missing data on departures from islands other than Jamaica to Spanish America we again draw on O’Malley’s work. We adopt the ratio of O’Malley’s second series to his third - which across the ten tables comes out to be 62.5 percent (see cells K111 to N125 for a summary). Total imputed departures from the smaller islands shown in columns J through M are thus first summed and then divided by 0.625, with the results shown in column N.[[8]](#endnote-8) The sum of arrivals in Jamaica (column I) and the rest of the British Caribbean (column N) is displayed in Column O. These procedures result in estimates of movement from the British to the Spanish sectors of 38,500 before 1701, and 178,900 between 1701 and 1789.

*Departures from French and Danish islands for the Spanish Americas before 1790 (tab = “summary intra”)*

 Finally in the pre-1790 era, slaves also arrived in Hispanic areas via the French and Danish islands. The French were more likely to buy slaves from the Dutch and English than to sell them to the Spanish given the dominance of St. Domingue in the eighteenth century Caribbean plantation economy. The O’Malley database shows several thousand slaves moving from British to French islands, but only a few leaving St. Domingue (and these for Louisiana). Wars, however, had a major effect on trading patterns. In the late stages of the American war of independence French planters could not get their sugar to market and slave prices in St. Domingue declined temporarily as a result. These lower prices made sales of slaves to Spanish colonies feasible. Between 1781 and 1783 there are Spanish records of 7,000 slaves entering Cuba from St. Domingue, unspecified further numbers in the three preceding years, and nearly 5,000 slaves into Venezuela.[[9]](#endnote-9) Such inflows appear to have been confined to wartime, however and a doubling of the documented number of 7,000 allows for unrecorded inflows into Cuba resulting in a total of 19,000 shown in cell H9 of the “summary intra” page of the spreadsheet.[[10]](#endnote-10) The Danish Islands of St. Croix and St. Thomas were the smallest of the re-export centers examined here. From 1680 to 1789 they received only 64,300 captives from Africa and the great majority were put to work on sugar plantations the value of whose output was only slightly behind that of Cuba and Puerto Rico in 1770.[[11]](#endnote-11) Although the islands became important suppliers of slaves to Cuba after 1790, clearly they could not have supplied large numbers before that year.[[12]](#endnote-12) The O’Malley database indicates 1,500 captives leaving Danish islands for Spanish colonies, with destinations distributed bi-modally over time, first centered on Cartagena before 1710 and then later, Puerto Rico in the 1780s. Six thousand taken to the Spanish colonies for the whole period is not likely to be an overestimate of arrivals from Danish Caribbean ports. These figures too are shown on the “summary intra” page of the spreadsheet.

*Arrivals in the Spanish Caribbean after 1789 (tab = “post1789SpanArriv”)*

 After 1789 slaves could be entered at most ports of the Spanish Americas without restriction, with the result that records of arrivals become more abundant and more reliable. We therefore change the basis of our estimates of the intra-American traffic into the Hispanic Caribbean. Where pre-1790 we focused on departures from non-Spanish possessions, we now base our figures on *arrivals* in the Spanish colonies. Only three colonies received slaves at this time – Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela – and for the third of these we already have a published estimate of 10,000.[[13]](#endnote-13) The best records for these years are for Cuba.[[14]](#endnote-14) Nevertheless the documents do not always separate out the intra-American from the transatlantic voyages. Indeed, the origins of seventy percent of the voyages are not specified in any of the sources. Captains’ names, number of captives on board, and length of time since the same captain and vessel last entered Havana all provide clues as to a voyages starting point. It has thus been possible to assign all voyages to the transatlantic or intra-American categories. Needless to say we cannot guarantee total accuracy. The intra-American voyages have been added to the O’Malley database (*intragreg14)*. Column D of the *post1789SpanArriv* sheet draws on the augmented database to provide an annual breakdown of captives coming into Havana from the non-Spanish Americas. Between 1790 and 1820 54,842 captives came into Havana – 90 percent of them before 1808 after which arrivals direct from Africa became dominant. But while Havana was the designated free port of entry for Cuba there are records of landings in Matanzas and Santiago de Cuba. Column E increases the Havana total by ten percent to allow for unrecorded entries in the rest of Cuba giving a total of 60,326 for the island as a whole.

 Columns F and G provide estimates for the other two Hispanic regions receiving captives via the intra-American traffic. For Puerto Rico we have arrivals information for only seven years between 1790 and 1811 totaling 1,376 slaves. Given that the intra-American slave trade declined rapidly after 1807 (as Denmark and Britain made it illegal), we have set Puerto Rican inflows at five percent of the total the annual Cuban figure for those years for which no data exist - yielding a sum of 3,933 arrivals in the colony. Column H is the sum of columns E, F, and G. For Venezuela, Cuba and Puerto Rico together we estimate that the total of intra-American entries from the non-Spanish Americas from 1790 to 1818 (1818 being the last year of a recorded arrival) is 74,300.

 Where in the non-Spanish Americas did this inflow originate? The final step for 1790 to 1820 is to distribute the aggregate figure of 74,300 across regions of departure. As cells C43 to D90 of the *post1789SpanArriv* sheet shows, the augmented O’Malley database contains port of departure for almost 20,000 of these 74,300 captives. Re-grouping the departure ports into broad regions and the two periods of 1790-1805 and 1806-20 (cells H44 to K85), allows us to calculate ratios for each region/period and apply these ratios to our annual aggregate series in column H7 to H38. Cells J7 to O38 shows the results. In summary, we estimate that 24,300 came from the British Caribbean, 1,800 from St. Eustatius, 40,000 from the Danish Islands and 2,700 from Brazil. As it is usually defined the intra American slave trade to the Spanish colonies came to an end in 1818. Arrivals after that date all came direct from Africa, except for an unspecified number that were moved from Jamaica and the Bahamas to Cuba and, according to David Turnbull, created an English-speaking enclave between [Holguín](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holgu%C3%ADn) and Gibara in the 1820s (5,000 are added for these).[[15]](#endnote-15) A second exception was the arrival in the Río de la Plata of 1,536 captives removed from Brazilian slave vessels by Argentine privateers between 1826 and 1828 during the Argentine-Brazilian War. Some of the detained slave vessels were carrying slaves from one part of Brazil to another when captured.

*Arrivals in the Rio de la Plata and Cuba from Brazil (tab = “Rio de la Plata”)*

The third large inflow into Spanish territory from the non-Spanish Americas was Portuguese, but based in Brazil. The *Rio de la Plata* sheet lists 166 voyages carrying slaves into Buenos Aires before 1641 all of which are very probably intra-American. Cell C7 gives the total number of slaves that captains declared these voyages to be carrying – 12,847. Smuggling, however, was as common here as in other ports in the Spanish colonial Americas.[[16]](#endnote-16) We have already devised a procedure that allows for contraband in our estimates of the transatlantic slave trade to the Spanish Americas as a whole for the pre-1641 era. For transatlantic voyages we found that for every captive that slave ship captains officially declared to be on board there were in reality on average two and one quarter slaves actually held below decks. We therefore apply this same multiplier to the data on intra-American arrivals into the Rio de la Plata. As cell D7 indicates, we estimate that in reality 28,777 came into Buenos Aires from Brazil before 1641. Zacarias Moutoukias has argued that arrivals in this era from both Brazil and Africa together ranged from 25,000 to 30,000, but archival sources discovered since his work was published indicate that the transatlantic traffic was much larger than he understood it to be.[[17]](#endnote-17)

The 1640s to the 1760s is a challenging era for tracking maritime movements of slaves between southern cone ports. Hard data are as scarce as multiple sources. There are no records of voyages arriving with slaves that are definitely from Brazil and thus cells C9 and C11 on the *Rio de la Plata* tab” are blank. For 1648 to 1687, however, Moutoukias documents 38 vessels coming into the Rio de la Plata with an estimated 8,494 slaves, but is unfortunately not able to identify their point of departure.[[18]](#endnote-18) Some of these might have been from Brazil. *Slavevoyages* tells us that 6,305 captives arrived directly from Africa to Buenos Aires in this same period – the peak of the Dutch transatlantic traffic to the region - so we subtract 6,305 from Moutoukias’ estimate and describe the remainder as arrivals from Brazil.[[19]](#endnote-19) But in addition to these we draw on a primary source for 1680-1765 – a period spanning most of the history of the Portuguese settlement of Colônia do Sacramento. It should be kept in mind that Colônia‘s raison d’être was trafficking contraband merchandise into its large Spanish neighbor. In 1766 the Spanish commissioned a long and detailed report (the author remains anonymous) on both legal and illegal traffic in the Rio de la Plata.[[20]](#endnote-20) The author stated that 600 slaves, on average, annually disembarked in Buenos Aires from Colonia, 400 of whom were bought in Buenos Aires, Tucuman (today’s Cordoba), and Paraguay, while the other 200 captives went to Chile, Potosi, and Peru. We accept this estimate and apply it to the years of peace between the Portuguese and the Spanish (1681-1705, 1716-1735, 1737-1762, and 1764-1777). The intervening years saw trade shut down as by intermittent Spanish sieges that eventually ended in Spanish conquest of this Portuguese outpost in 1777. For 1640 to 1700 this procedure generates an estimate of 13,589 shown in cell D9 (2,189 plus 19 years x 600), and for the following period, 1700-1760, 28,200 (47 years of peace x 600).

From 1761 to Spanish occupancy of Colônia do Sacramento in 1777 we continue use the 600 slaves per-year-of-peace estimate of our anonymous 1766 informant (15 x 600 = 9,000). From 1777 it is possible to draw once more on records of individual voyages and the slaves that disembarked from them. These show 43,252 coming in from Brazil by sea, mostly via Rio de Janeiro and Salvador (cell C13). To this number should be added the above 9,000 plus a small allowance for missing data explained in a separate essay.[[21]](#endnote-21) As cell D13 shows the total for 1760-1820 is 56,252. For the final period cell C15 shows 1,396 slaves entering from Rio de Janeiro to Montevideo between 1817 and 1833, (mostly 1817 to 1829 when Montevideo was under Brazilian jurisdiction).[[22]](#endnote-22) We multiply this number for 1.1 to allow for additional slave shipments from Salvador to Montevideo that have left no trace in the historical record. Overall we therefore estimate that 128,354 slaves were sent from Brazil to the Rio de la Plata by sea during the entirety of this traffic.

None of the preceding estimates take into account a small and largely ignored traffic that was carried on intermittently after 1807 between Brazil and Cuba. The first phase lasted from 1808 to 1817 and an estimate for it is derived in column N of the “*post1789SpanArriv”* tab. The traffic thereupon lapsed until 1831 when, with the Brazilian transatlantic traffic in temporary abeyance, slave merchants in Bahia and Maranhão sent hundreds of captives to Havana. The trade continued to 1835. By then the revival of the Brazilian transatlantic trade refocused Brazilian slave traders on Africa, but references to the Bahia-Havana link can be found in 1837, 1839, and several shipments of Portuguese-speaking slaves are documented as arriving in 1849 and 1850 with the last reference in November of 1850 coming just prior to the ending of the Brazilian transatlantic traffic.[[23]](#endnote-23) Voyage-based counts are not possible, but we have allowed 5,000 for the two decades 1831-50.

*Summary (tab = “summary intra”)*

 The “*summary intra*” tab brings together the various branches of the intra-American traffic to the Spanish Americas calculated on the other four linked spreadsheets. As noted above, the summary sheet also adds some smaller branches that do not warrant their own spreadsheet - such as the flow from the French and Danish Americas. Cell H35 shows our aggregated estimate of the movement of slaves from non-Hispanic to the Hispanic world between the late sixteenth century and 1850 – amounting to 566,000. Well over 90 percent of this inflow from foreign colonies was concentrated in the years 1661 to 1800 – the years when the transatlantic trade under the Spanish flag was largely moribund. Overall over one quarter of the African captives brought into the Spanish Americas did not come direct from Africa but rather via the colonies of Spain’s European rivals. There were far more trans-imperial intra-American slave voyages going to Spanish America than to any other colonial empire.
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