Why Spain and Portugal Were So Important to the Way Slaves Were

Posted on September 17, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/why-in-particular-were-spain-and-portugal-so-important-to-the-way-slaves-were/

The Atlantic slave trade was a system of forced migration in which millions of African people were captured, sold, transported, and enslaved across the Atlantic Ocean. It developed over several centuries and connected Europe, Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas through commerce, warfare, colonization, and plantation production. Portugal and Spain were especially important in the early development of this system because their maritime expansion created some of the first sustained European routes along the African coast and across the Atlantic. Portuguese merchants became major carriers of enslaved Africans, particularly to Brazil, while Spain built an empire whose demand for labor was often supplied through licensed contracts known as the *asiento*. Their involvement helped establish legal, commercial, religious, and racial practices that later European powers expanded. However, they did not create slavery itself. Slavery existed in many societies before Atlantic colonization, but Iberian expansion transformed it into a massive transoceanic system tied to plantation agriculture, mining, imperial competition, and consumer demand (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Klein & Luna, 2010).

Why Were Spain and Portugal So Important to the Way Enslaved People Were Viewed in the Atlantic Slave Trade?

Portugal began sustained voyages along the West African coast during the fifteenth century. Portuguese traders initially sought gold, trade routes, and access to Asian markets, but they also purchased and transported enslaved Africans. By the sixteenth century, Portuguese America—especially Brazil—had become a major destination because sugar plantations demanded intensive labor. Spain's American colonies likewise depended on coerced labor, first through the exploitation of Indigenous populations and later through large-scale importation of Africans. Spanish law formally recognized enslaved people as persons with limited legal and religious standing, but it also treated them as property that could be bought, inherited, punished, and transferred. Portuguese and Spanish colonial institutions therefore helped normalize a contradiction: enslaved people were baptized and recognized as human beings while being denied freedom and controlled as economic assets (Klein & Luna, 2010; Schwartz, 1985).

Iberian religious and legal arguments influenced racial thinking. Early enslavement was justified through warfare, religious difference, alleged captivity, and claims that conversion would benefit Africans. Over time, African ancestry became increasingly associated with permanent and inheritable slavery. This shift was not immediate or identical across colonies, but it helped create racial categories that outlived the original commercial circumstances. Children inherited the legal status of enslaved mothers in many Atlantic systems, making bondage self-reproducing. Portugal and Spain were therefore important not only because of the volume of people carried under their empires, but because their colonial practices helped connect African identity with commodification, forced labor, and inherited status (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Klein & Luna, 2010).

The Middle Passage and the Atlantic System

The Middle Passage refers to the transatlantic voyage that carried captive Africans from coastal embarkation points to the Americas. People were confined aboard ships under brutal conditions, with inadequate space, food, sanitation, and medical care. Disease, violence, resistance, and suicide caused many deaths. The term “triangular trade” is useful for describing some routes linking European goods, African captives, and American commodities, but actual trading networks were more complex. Ships did not always travel in a neat triangle, and merchants operated through many ports and routes. The Slave Voyages database estimates that more than twelve million captive Africans were embarked on Atlantic voyages and that fewer survived to disembark in the Americas. Portugal and Brazil accounted for the largest national share of this forced migration (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Slave Voyages, 2026).

Why Was the Life of an Enslaved Person So Different in the United States, the Bahamas, and Brazil?

The lives of enslaved people differed because labor systems, environment, law, demography, plantation scale, and economic purpose varied. In Brazil, many enslaved Africans worked in sugar production, mining, coffee cultivation, urban trades, domestic service, transport, and skilled crafts. Sugar mills demanded exhausting labor during harvest and processing seasons, while mining exposed workers to dangerous conditions. Mortality was high in many regions, and slaveholders continued importing Africans in enormous numbers. Brazil received more enslaved Africans than any other country in the Americas and did not abolish slavery until 1888. Enslaved communities nevertheless created families, religious practices, mutual-aid networks, resistance movements, and maroon settlements such as Palmares (Klein & Luna, 2010; Schwartz, 1985).

In the mainland colonies that became the United States, labor also varied by region. Enslaved people cultivated tobacco in the Chesapeake, rice and indigo in the Lowcountry, and cotton across the

nineteenth-century South. Some worked as artisans, domestic servants, sailors, and industrial laborers. After the legal end of the transatlantic import trade in 1808, the enslaved population grew largely through natural reproduction and the domestic slave trade. Families were formed under conditions of extreme vulnerability because sale could separate spouses, parents, and children. The United States developed a particularly rigid racial slave system in which free and enslaved Black people faced extensive legal discrimination (Berlin, 1998).

The Bahamas had a different environment and economic history. Its soil and geography did not support plantation agriculture on the same scale as major sugar colonies such as Jamaica or Barbados. Enslaved people worked in smaller agricultural units, salt production, domestic service, wrecking, maritime labor, construction, and other occupations. After the American Revolution, Loyalists brought enslaved people to the islands and attempted cotton cultivation, but soil exhaustion and pests limited the industry. Smaller-scale production did not make slavery humane. Enslaved Bahamians remained subject to ownership, punishment, family separation, and exploitation, but the mix of labor, island geography, and population patterns shaped daily life differently from Brazil or the United States (Morgan, 2007).

How Were Enslaved Populations Sustained in Different Locations?

Enslaved populations were maintained through continued importation, natural reproduction, domestic sale, and coercive control. The balance differed greatly among regions. Brazilian and Caribbean plantation economies often experienced high mortality, unequal sex ratios, and repeated importation from Africa. Harsh labor, disease, poor nutrition, and dangerous environments limited natural population growth. In the United States, birth rates were higher and mortality patterns differed, enabling the enslaved population to grow internally even after international importation was prohibited. This demographic growth was not evidence of benevolent treatment. Enslaved women's reproductive capacity was economically exploited, children were born into bondage, and families lived under constant threat of sale (Berlin, 1998; Klein & Luna, 2010).

Slaveholders used violence, surveillance, legal restrictions, patrols, and racial ideology to maintain control. They also sometimes permitted small gardens, religious meetings, marriage-like unions, or skilled employment because these arrangements could reduce costs and stabilize labor. Such concessions did not transform slavery into a voluntary relationship. Enslaved people created family and community life through their own resilience, often despite the system rather than because of it. They preserved languages, music, foodways, beliefs, and kinship practices while adapting to new environments. Population survival should therefore be understood as evidence of both coercion and human agency (Berlin, 1998; Klein & Luna, 2010).

Was Slavery Entirely a Result of Consumer Culture?

It would be inaccurate to say that slavery was entirely caused by consumer culture. Slavery existed long before modern consumer markets, and Atlantic bondage grew through imperial conquest, racial ideology, warfare, state policy, merchant finance, and plantation ownership. Nevertheless, consumer demand was a major force. European and colonial consumers wanted sugar, tobacco, coffee, cotton, rum, rice, indigo, and other commodities. Plantation owners sought large labor forces to produce these goods at low cost, while merchants, insurers, shipbuilders, bankers, and governments profited from the trade. Consumers rarely saw the violence behind the products, allowing everyday habits to support distant exploitation (Morgan, 2007; Schwartz, 1985).

Sugar provides a powerful example. Once a luxury, it became increasingly common in European diets. Expanding demand encouraged plantation growth in Brazil and the Caribbean, where enslaved Africans performed exhausting cultivation and processing. Cotton later became essential to textile manufacturing, linking slavery in the United States with industrialization in Britain and elsewhere. Consumer culture did not independently invent slavery, but it increased the profitability and scale of coerced labor. The Atlantic system connected intimate consumption choices with imperial violence (Morgan, 2007; Schwartz, 1985).

Could the Introduction of Agriculture Have Caused Slavery?

Agriculture did not create slavery in a simple universal sense, but settled agriculture and surplus production made large-scale labor exploitation possible in many societies. When landowners controlled valuable land and produced crops for markets, they had incentives to obtain workers through debt, conquest, serfdom, tribute, or enslavement. Plantation agriculture intensified this process because crops such as sugar and cotton required coordinated labor over large areas. The Atlantic system relied not merely on agriculture but on commercial monoculture—production of a limited number of export crops for distant consumers (Schwartz, 1985; Morgan, 2007).

Evidence from Brazil, the Caribbean, and the United States supports the connection between plantation agriculture and racial slavery. Sugar cultivation demanded cutting, transporting, crushing, boiling, and processing within strict time limits. Rice agriculture required specialized knowledge and dangerous work in wet environments. Cotton expanded rapidly after technological and territorial changes increased profitability. However, enslaved labor was also used in mining, domestic service, maritime work, construction, and urban trades. Agriculture was therefore a major engine rather than the sole cause of Atlantic slavery (Berlin, 1998; Klein & Luna, 2010; Schwartz, 1985).

Indigenous Enslavement and the Shift toward African Labor

The original account suggests that the Portuguese went to Africa to mine gold and then brought “natives” to America. The history was more complex. European colonists enslaved Indigenous peoples in the Americas through warfare, raiding, tribute systems, and forced labor. Disease, resistance, flight, legal restrictions, and missionary conflict affected these systems. Colonists increasingly imported Africans because Atlantic commercial networks were expanding and because African captives could be transported in large numbers. This shift did not result from Africans being naturally suited to slavery. It arose from political and economic choices, military power, racial ideology, and the ability of European merchants and African intermediaries to supply captives through violent trade networks (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Klein & Luna, 2010).

African Participation and European Responsibility

Some African rulers, merchants, and military groups captured or sold people into Atlantic markets. This participation must be acknowledged without using it to erase European responsibility. African societies were diverse, and those sold were often political enemies, war captives, kidnapped civilians, or vulnerable outsiders. European demand, shipping capacity, weapons, credit, plantation markets, and colonial law transformed existing forms of bondage into a vast hereditary racial system. Responsibility was distributed across many actors, but European empires and American slaveholders constructed and profited from the transatlantic structure (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Slave Voyages, 2026).

Resistance and Survival

Enslaved people were never passive commodities. They resisted through escape, revolt, work slowdowns, sabotage, negotiation, cultural preservation, and the creation of independent communities. Some purchased freedom or used courts and religious institutions to pursue limited rights. Maroon communities emerged in Brazil, the Caribbean, and North America. Everyday resistance could protect family members or preserve dignity even when it did not end slavery. Recognizing resistance restores enslaved people as historical actors rather than reducing them to labor units. Their struggle also shaped abolition, law, culture, and the development of Atlantic societies (Berlin, 1998; Klein & Luna, 2010).

Conclusion

Spain and Portugal were central to the early Atlantic slave trade because their maritime empires created routes, colonial labor demands, legal structures, and racial practices that later powers expanded. Portugal became the largest carrier of enslaved Africans, particularly to Brazil, while Spain used systems such as the *asiento* to supply its colonies. Enslaved life differed across Brazil, the Bahamas, and the United States because labor systems, mortality, law, demography, and geography differed. Populations were sustained through importation and forced reproduction, while consumer demand and plantation agriculture made slavery enormously profitable. Neither consumer culture nor agriculture alone caused slavery. The Atlantic system resulted from imperial power, commercial demand, racial ideology, and deliberate political choices. Its history must also include the families, cultures, and resistance created by enslaved people themselves (Berlin, 1998; Eltis & Richardson, 2010; Klein & Luna, 2010; Morgan, 2007; Schwartz, 1985; Slave Voyages, 2026).

References

Berlin, I. (1998). *Many thousands gone: The first two centuries of slavery in North America*. Harvard University Press.

Eltis, D., & Richardson, D. (2010). *Atlas of the transatlantic slave trade*. Yale University Press.

Klein, H. S., & Luna, F. V. (2010). *Slavery in Brazil*. Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, K. (2007). *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America*. Oxford University Press.

Slave Voyages. (2026). *Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database*. https://www.slavevoyages.org/

Schwartz, S. B. (1985). *Sugar plantations in the formation of Brazilian society: Bahia, 1550–1835*. Cambridge University Press.

Copyright © 2026 Academic Master.