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INTRODUCTION
Slavery was introduced in the French Caribbean possessions around 1640 and in Réunion some three decades later, to provide labor for tropical plantations. It was sanctioned and subsidized by the French government as early as 1670. Certain of slavery's worst features were regulated by the Code Noir of 1685 and it continued to enjoy official support until the Revolution of 1789. There was, however, considerable anti-slavery agitation outside official circles among the philosophes, including Montesquieu and Condorcet, and among members of the Catholic hierarchy, notably Abbé Raynal. In 1788, an abolitionist society, the Amis des Noirs, was created which directed the campaign against the slave trade and slavery. Surviving until 1799, it numbered among its ranks many prominent Frenchmen—Condorcet, Necker, Lafayette and the Abbés Sieyes and Grégoire.

Anti-slavery propaganda and agitation during the Revolution of 1789 caused much unrest in the overseas colonies, with the Negro slaves dreaming of liberty and the free blacks of equality. Civil war developed when the white residents showed themselves opposed to any reforms. Hopelessly outnumbered, whites in Santo Domingo offered the island to England if she would maintain the old order. It was a desperate step, born of fear but savoring of treachery, which prompted the National Convention to abolish slavery on February 4, 1794, in the hope that this would win black support against British seizure. Shelby McCloy held that political motivations, rather than humanitarian considerations, patently lay behind this notable step.
This first abolition decree was put into practice, however, only in Guadeloupe, Haiti and French Guiana, for the colonists of Réunion drove away the representatives of the National Convention who were sent to enforce it. Meanwhile, Martinique in 1793 had gone over to the British who preserved slavery during their nine-year rule on the island.

Slavery in France's overseas possessions was revived by Napoleon in May 1802. Gaston-Martin shed light on his reasons for doing so:

The persistent troubles in the islands, Leclerc's difficulties, his conflict with Toussaint-Louverture, the cries of the colonists who didn't stop attacking the government and continued to bribe ministerial functionaries or state advisers, led the first consul to present (such a) project to the Corps Législatif.

The blacks of Guadeloupe fought valiantly against the Napoleonic expedition commanded by General Richespanse but were beaten. On Haiti it was another story, for Leclerc's army failed in its objective and the island proclaimed independence. Victor Hughes restored slavery rather quietly in Guiana.

Slavery may have been restored but emancipationist sentiment still rode high. Many Frenchmen picked up the scattered threads of the cause in the 1830's. One of these was Victor Schoelcher, the hitherto obscure son of a Paris porcelain manufacturer.

A series of letters by Schoelcher on Cuba, New Orleans, and Mexico appeared in the Revue de Paris for 1830. In the fifth, the author expressed his indignation over slavery, demanded that the illicit slave trade be suppressed and made vague recommendations for emancipation after "fifteen or twenty years, if you (would)." The letter for the most part was only an impassioned protest, for it contained few suggestions as to how to accomplish abolition. Schoelcher's first book, De l'Esclavage des Noirs et de la Législation Coloniale (Paris 1833), found him more at home with the
subject for he was then able to submit a detailed scheme for eventual emancipation. Seven years later in his second book, *Abolition de l'Esclavage* (Paris 1840), he revealed himself as an incisive analyst of race and slavery and an ardent champion of immediate emancipation. In the 1840's he completed four studies of slavery: *Des Colonies Française: Abolition Immédiate de l'Esclavage* (Paris, 1841), *Colonies Étrangères et Haiti: Résultats de l'Émancipation Anglaise* (Paris, 1842-3), *L'Egypte en 1845* (Paris, 1846) and *Histoire de l'Esclavage pendant les Deux Dernières Années* (Paris, 1846-7). He was also writing in several journals (*Réforme, Revue Indépendante* among others), and was editing a number of anti-slavery petitions.

Schoelcher was not alone in demanding immediate emancipation. In the Chamber of Deputies, influential figures like Ledru-Rollin argued in its behalf, using Schoelcher's articles and petitions. A number of departmental councils petitioned in the 1830's and 1840's for emancipation. They were at times guided by altruistic motives, but in other cases, their requests were based on economic reasons, for they represented beet sugar interests which reasoned that emancipation would ruin their cane sugar competition in the colonies.

But Schoelcher and those favoring immediate emancipation were outside the mainstream of the contemporary French anti-slavery movement. The bulk of the anti-slavery forces—led by the Duc de Broglie and Alexis de Tocqueville—favored gradual elimination of slavery. They contended that legislation had to be enacted to prepare the slaves for freedom and that it was necessary to avoid too abrupt a transition to a new society. A survey of colonial legislation enacted by the Chamber in the 30's and especially in the 40's discloses many measures designed to ameliorate the
slaves' lot and to insure their better understanding of the duties as well as the joys of liberty when this might come.

Whether the assaults came from moderates like Broglie or "radicals" such as Schoelcher, all were badly received in the colonies. The planters had been in difficult straits for years. The economies of French Caribbean possessions had suffered general decline since the Seven Years' War, and a resurgence of the beet sugar industry in the 1830's (aided by governmental support) worsened their lot. Like members of any deteriorating society accused of being retrograde, they reacted in a highly emotional way. The sessions of the General Councils of Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion given over to the discussions of the ameliorative laws handed down from Paris in the 1840's varied between vehement opposition, self-pity and martyr-like resignation. Martyr-like resignation? Yes, because requests for abolition came from Guiana and Guadeloupe during this same period. They were, in both cases, to be accompanied by indemnities for the masters, and periods of forced labor following the end of bondage.

Clearly, slavery was crumbling and one might suspect that it would simply have vanished during the liberal tide of 1848. So it did, but not without crucial aid from Victor Schoelcher. The colonies and their allies, the French ports—notably Nantes and Bordeaux—which had close economic relationships with the Antilles, made one final attempt to avert emancipation. The colonial delegates in Paris—Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion each supported two salaried agents or lobbyists—put pressure on François Arago, the New Minister of the Navy, to postpone any governmental settlement of the slavery issue. Arago, more at home in the realm of astronomy than politics, much less colonial affairs, nearly acceded to their fervent urgings. But Schoelcher, who arrived in Paris on March 4,
soon changed Arago's mind. He stressed the necessity for an act granting emancipation after a brief delay. In the interim period, Schoelcher, appointed by Arago as Assistant Secretary of State of the Colonies, presided over the Commission instituée pour préparer l'acte d'abolition immédiate de l'esclavage. He had by this time secured a reputation as an expert on slavery and seemed well-suited for the post. Commission proceedings were dominated by the president and its work strongly reflected his convictions respecting the desirable structure of an insular, free society. On the 27th of April, by the Décret d'Abolition, slavery was irrevocably abolished in French overseas possessions. Schoelcher's role in the epoch-making decision to end slavery in 1848 has been covered in detail in biographies by Leonard Sainville and Leon Bougenot, and hence will not be dealt with in detail in this study.

On the other hand, Schoelcher's thoughts on race and slavery have never been analyzed to any great extent. Even Sainville's biography which was more thorough in every respect than the previous works devoted but one chapter to Schoelcher's anti-slavery writings. This neglect is most unfortunate since Schoelcher's comments on racism mark him as a man ahead of his time. It is believed, therefore that a detailed and critical appraisal of his ideas may be of value to sociologists, psychologists, and historians.
CHAPTER I
SCHOELCHER'S EARLY
ANTI-SLAVERY WRITINGS
In 1828 Victor Schoelcher went to Mexico at his father's request—the latter hoped to find a market for porcelain there. Schoelcher visited not only Mexico, but Cuba and New Orleans as well. He witnessed slavery for the first time in these last two places, was horrified, and later depicted it as a "sad spectacle." And, though Schoelcher was not to champion abolition for five years, he was now definitely a foe of slavery. He himself explained it best:

In 1828, I made a voyage to Mexico, Cuba and to the United States; I was twenty-three years old. I had left without a preconceived idea about slavery, that question had never concerned me. I saw slaves in Cuba and in the southern part of North America as I'd seen all the rest, as a tourist, without bringing the necessary attention to it. Nevertheless, the unhappy lot of these men had left a profound impression with me.

It would appear that one need go no farther in search of the sources of Schoelcher's anti-slavery conviction. A brief sketch of his life however, reveals certain factors which may have conditioned his initial antagonism toward slavery.

Many authors who have dealt with emancipators have been able to discover circumstances in their lives—religious upbringing, shocking personal experiences, contact with other abolitionists and the like—which aroused their violent opposition to slavery. This may be attempted in Schoelcher's case only with reservations because of the inadequacies of materials bearing upon him until approximately 1848. Sainville remarked about Schoelcher's activities in the 1830's: "About this period of his life, what can be called the sources, rather than long or short biographies show great confusion. . . ." He would have been more accurate had he
applied this statement to the first half of Schoelcher's life, for the only data until the abolition act comes from memoirs, mentioning Schoelcher only casually. 

Victor Schoelcher was born in Paris, July 22, 1804, of bourgeois origin, for his father Marie Schoelcher of Alsatian background, was a well-to-do porcelain manufacturer. The nature of the older Schoelcher's business gave him a familiarity with artistic circles and consequently he provided his son with an initiation into artistic knowledge. Later, when the younger Schoelcher was in his twenties, his father was disturbed by the political activity of his son, and by his lack of interest in business. The father was a respectable entrepreneur with a tendency towards conservatism who might not approve of slavery but who hardly would advise his son to launch a campaign against it. The possibility exists that Schoelcher's antipathy towards slavery was partially brought on by this somewhat strained relationship with his father. Everett Hagen in attempting to trace the reformist impulses of certain individuals, notably Woodrow Wilson and Martin Luther, noted tensions between them and their fathers to which he ascribed considerable importance. Lack of evidence makes it difficult to apply Hagen's theories in blanket fashion to Schoelcher. In part, however, his career does resemble that of the Wilson-type reformer. Schoelcher was a perpetual flaw-finder, that is, an individual who never rested content with his environment—witness the numerous humanitarian causes he eventually became involved in. (See chapter four for an account of them.) Too, he gave up working at his father's porcelain establishment and for awhile, at least, partook of a career touching, however remotely, on his father's as an art critic for the periodical L'Artiste before charting his course as a foe of slavery.
Very little is known of Schoelcher's mother, born Victoire Jacob. His biographers pointed out one peculiar episode involving mother and son over a customs violation, but nothing else. Schoelcher, though, did say of her in answering a detractor in 1849: "my mother but it's to that austerely virtuous woman that I owe the rigid principles, thanks to which . . . . you have never been able to discover anything reprehensible in my entire life . . . ."  

Aside from his birthdate, it is also known for certain that Schoelcher entered the lycée, Louis-le-Grand, probably in 1818.  

This venerable institution was then staffed for the most part by men disenchanted with the Restoration, who decided to "throw themselves into the battle and propaganda for liberty." On occasions between 1815 and 1825, there were minor demonstrations against the Bourbon Dynasty in which they participated. The basis for Schoelcher's lifelong republicanism was probably laid here. 

Following graduation from Louis-le-Grand, and at some time between 1820 and 1830, Schoelcher joined a Masonic Lodge in Paris, Les Amis de la Vérité, and a secret society, Aide-Toi.  

Sainville suggested that his membership in these organizations served to provide a deeper initiation into republican idea, for they were only secondarily interested in colonial matters. Leon Bougenot went farther than Sainville in defining what "republican ideas" signified in Schoelcher's case. According to Bougenot, his tour at Louis-le-Grand and his associations in these secret societies served to bring him into contact with the ideas of the Enlightenment which left an indelible stamp on his mind. 

Schoelcher's anti-slavery writings were permeated by the ideas of the Enlightenment. His rejection of Christianity as an obstacle to progress, his exhortations to France to banish slavery because it was out of place in the nineteenth century, but above
all his faith that man could achieve a kind of earthly millenium (reflected by the happy pictures he invariably conjured up of imaginary post-slavery societies where whites loved blacks and vice versa) all revealed his Enlightenment heritage. And it does not seem too far fetched to see Schoelcher as a young man journeying to Cuba and New Orleans possessed of this notion of a heaven on earth, being rudely shocked by slavery and immediately loathing it because it was so at variance with his ideal society.

There is one more possible explanation which ought not be ignored. Schoelcher returned to France in 1830, his merchandising expedition a failure, for he seemingly spent more time studying the folkways and mores of Mexico and slavery, than he did prospecting for customers. He resumed his work in the parental porcelain establishment but found it less than satisfactory. "Schoelcher's self-respect was revolted by the idea of sitting down at a cashier's desk." He spent far more time discussing art and literature with friends than he did pushing porcelain. He became an habitué of various salons whose chief concerns were the arts and his particular tastes probably tended towards Romanticism. In 1832, he wrote Les Amours de Diligence, a romantic adventure story. He became a close friend of Victor Hugo and Hector Berlioz. This intense interest in aesthetic matters, especially of the Romantic variety, opens up a new field of conjecture about Schoelcher's anti-slavery impulse.

Edward Seeber observed that slavery did not attract attention simply as a "social or legal problem" but also because of its association with the primitive and exotic life of the tropics. To sustain this thesis, Seeber cited Victor Hugo's Bug-Jargal and Prosper Mérimée's Tamango. Both Hugo and Mérimée were Romantic writers for whom the Caribbean had that far-
off allure. The slaves who were part of this area had the same kind of charm in their eyes. So they wrote with sympathy about them, and in fact, in Bug-Jurgal and Tamango the "negro slave was transformed from a despised bête de nommé into an exalted hero." That Schoelcher was a friend of Hugo's and shared his bent for the Romantic, and that, according to Gaston-Martin, he might have provided Mérimée with documentation for Tamango lead one to consider the possibility that he was drawn to the anti-slavery viewpoint by Romanticism. In fact, Jean-Louis Jeune stated that Schoelcher "belonged to the time which witnessed a literary revolution being born, Romanticism," and that he read and was influenced by Madame de Staël and Chateaubriand, precursors of the Romantics, who also glorified the African slave. Above all is the fact that, on occasion, Schoelcher gave utterance to feelings which indicated the powerful attraction that the faraway and the primitive had for him. Here is a sample:

Often in the middle of the magnificent forests of the Antilles, absorbed by their silent and imposing grandeur, stirred by that beautiful sky always so gentle, always beneficial, I have forgotten political economy with its imperious necessities for work, and have wondered...if men who would consider the banana a sufficient food and spring water a drink preferable to the fermented liquors with which we poison ourselves; who would find whatever was necessary to satisfy the most unbounded needs of their imagination in contemplating the sun and nature, would these be men whose distraction would seem particularly worthy of contempt? If ignorance, the companion of primitive life, did not paralyze the development of sensibility, I would be of the primitive school.

Actually Bug-Jurgal and Tamango were only samples of an extensive French Romantic literature sympathetic to the Negro. Others included Ourika (Paris, 1824) by the Duchesse de Duras, and Alexandre Dumas Georges (Paris, 1843). One might go back nearly a generation and find other such works, more famous than any cited thus far. Bernard St. Pierre's Paul et
Virginie (Paris, 1796), Chateaubriand's Génie du Christianisme (Paris, 1802) and Madame de Staël's Mirza (Paris, 1795) were favorable to the blacks as exotic creatures. Even earlier were Abbé Prévost's Manon Lescaut (Paris, 1731) tangentially sympathetic to the Negro, and Oronoko or the Royal Slave. The last-named was a play by the English dramatist Thomas Southerne which appeared first in London in 1696, and created a sensation when it was produced in Paris in 1745. The crucial point for consideration here is that there was a sizeable stock of Romantic literature which was more or less negrophilic, and which Schoelcher might have encountered as a member of the prosperous middle class family, and the bourgeoisie, indeed, often sought relief from the tedium of the counting house in fiction of this kind.

It would seem likely that in Schoelcher's case the Enlightenment and Romanticism blended to create an outlook which David Evans labeled as Social Romanticism. As Evans saw Social Romanticism, it evolved in the following manner: Romantic writers like Hugo, George Sand and Albert de Vigny suddenly were attracted by the Saint-Simon idyll of a classless society, "organized on rational lines" and headed by France's leading artists, industrialists and scientists. Evans implied that social ferment concomitant with French industrialization triggered their addiction to Saint-Simonianism. Arnold Hauser traced it to the reactionary policies of Charles X. Though Saint-Simon provided the initial spark for this movement, its followers were later moved by the similarly utopian plans of Fourier and Etienne Cabet. That Schoelcher moved among circles where such ideas were fashionable is, of course, noteworthy.

Several conclusions should be drawn. Schoelcher was fed a steady diet of Enlightenment ideals at the lycée, where he could also have been
introduced to Romantic fiction and the "noble Negro" concept, although he could just as easily picked up Chateaubriand's or Madame de Staël's books at home. In his twenties he was exposed by his contacts with Sand, Hugo and others to the exciting programs of Saint-Simon, and became a Social Romanticist. Then came the shock of his first encounter with slavery and the disparity between this tropical reality and his new-found idealism. Returning to France, he made up his mind to throw himself into the fight against slavery, and abandon the parental porcelain business, a decision possibly influenced by a reaction against fatherly high-handedness.

Schoelcher's first effort in anti-slavery writing was based on his 1828 experiences in Cuba and New Orleans. The Rêvue de Paris in 1830 published a series of five letters by Schoelcher. The first four dealt solely with Mexico. In the fifth, he recorded his shock after his first collision with slavery, and the lowly situation of the free Negroes. As to the latter, one could have no "idea as to the enormous difference which exists in the colonies between the blacks and the whites." The former were really not part of the society in which they lived. They could pursue only the most menial occupations, such as coachmen, barbers or porters. Any white who stooped to such employment would be degraded and "certainly expelled." Some free blacks were able to amass fortunes but were still pariahs and were "not admitted to ride in carriages; in New Orleans they had to submit to segregated seating in churches and theaters.

But the slaves' state was even more abysmal in Schoelcher's eyes:

For me, that is a sad picture which will never leave my memory. When the blacks arrived from Africa, they emerged, blinking in the bright sunlight to be felt over and pawed like horses by prospective buyers. Once purchased, a slave belonged without restrictions to his buyer. Some
masters let their chattels find work for themselves on the condition that they brought back a piastre (a Spanish coin worth about one dollar) or two daily. But most slaves worked in cane fields and in tropic heat under the whip. At night they were crowded into hovels where they slept on planks. If they failed to do their work properly, they were whipped or placed temporarily in a cachot. Governments (in this case the New Orleans city administration) took some of the burden of punishment off the masters by setting up daily punishment for erring slaves in their jails. Schoelcher noted ironically: "Such is the sort of intervention which the legislator has devised to bring between the barbarism of the master and the weaknesses of the victim." 29

Some slaves, however, had sufficient character and physical strength so that they could not be forced to work under any circumstances. Schoelcher had great admiration for such intractables since "some of these indomitable blacks...would doubtless have been great men in the civilized world." Some of them escaped and became fugitives, living in the jungles where they were relentlessly sought by their masters, using savage dogs to pursue them. These dogs also patrolled the plantations on the watch for arsonists, attacking them ferociously. Schoelcher commented: "I doubt if the records of the most barbaric peoples offer anything so horrible." 30

Female slaves were no better off, for they were similarly viewed by masters as merely instruments for work. Under such conditions, immorality and a "frightening" concubinage prevailed. Some women at first appeared to be respectable and married, but they were quickly corrupted when hired out to other males by their husbands for fifty sous. The colons were basically to blame for this, as they disgracefully closed their eyes to it because it enriched them. After all, the offspring born of these
liaisons belonged to them. The slave children, Schoelcher added, were usually brought up by white women, for their mothers were either at work or indifferent to them. A kind of tenderness frequently developed between the slave children and their temporary guardians, but, in the long run, these relationships helped make such slaves intractable when they matured since: "they have known liberty. . . . they have understood it and yet they remained slaves."\(^{31}\)

Slavery, then, was misery. Was there no way out from this hell for the blacks? If they had especially brutal masters, they were entitled by law to seek new ones, but most slaves were so stupified that they were hardly aware of that benefit. The few familiar with this right were afraid that, if they attempted to take advantage of it, they would suffer "the cruelest punishments" from their masters. Also, according to law, slaves could purchase their freedom. Schoelcher reported that a few were able to do so by selling milk or raising chickens until they had saved three to five hundred piastres (roughly the same number of dollars)—freedom's price. But the great majority were altogether unable to better themselves in this manner because:

The greatest obstacles oppose themselves to a slave's becoming free. In order for them to succeed at it, they must be clever, industrious and energetic men (as there are so few of) who are able to acquire (money) by a thousand different means with a will-power that ten years of privations and persistent work don't shake.\(^{32}\)

The only relief most slaves found was at the plantation infirmary where they went on the slightest pretext "to take the harshest and most injurious drugs. . . . to deliver themselves over to their natural laziness."\(^{33}\)

This did not mean that this indolence was inherent, for a few lines later, he wrote in answer to white arguments that slaves did not deserve sympathy or attention because they were mere animals:
I admit it, the Negroes, as they are today in slavery, compromise the most miserable, abject and immoral class that one can imagine. But why? It's due to the fact that their intellect, estranged from all reasoning, circumscribed by misery in a fatal circle, cannot attain that stage of development where it conceives of good actions. The black who reasons knows that he will never be anything but a despised slave, that his actions, whatever they be, will never lead him to an honorable station, or at least an honored one; and always oppressed, confronted by the idea of remaining in slavery indefinitely, he no longer thinks of anything save avenging himself against his oppressor....He is carefree because nothing could concern a slave; he is lazy because his work is not compensated, because he does not receive any of its fruits; he is a flatterer because that's the way to avoid beatings, and to secure some sweetening of his lot; he is cowardly because courage is a virtue acquired only by reflection; he is a thief because he has nothing; he rarely has good opinions because his brutalized condition prevents him from conceiving them or because he recognizes that no one will take account of him; he is, finally, completely vice-ridden because ignorance and servitude are the sources of vice, much more than laziness.34

Negroes, thus, might have indeed been degraded, but only because of slavery. He continued that blacks were not animals: "it's been demonstrated to me that Negroes are a variety of the animal species called men." That African children before servitude revealed "all the elements of a man" was proof to Schoelcher that blacks and whites had equal mental capacities.

Schoelcher, at this stage, seemed to be relying more upon a sense of compassion than upon his own experiences or factual evidence. Recognizing this, he raised hypothetical objections which might be posed by supporters of slavery--that the Negroes in Africa were less well-off than under slavery; that they must have liked slavery since they did not revolt; that cruelties toward the slaves were rare since they were contrary to the master's economic interest; that emancipation would ruin the colonies. To these he could only respond that they "were frightening arguments."35
He did, however, maintain as a kind of partial answer to the last mythical disputant's point: "The Negroes are not indispensable at all on a plantation;" that whites could work in the Antilles, and he vaguely foresaw a day when "the fields" would "be cultivated by daily or yearly workers, blacks or whites, always equal." Yet Schoelcher did not press the matter: "It's not such an act (to provide for this situation) at all that I am asking for." 36

What Schoelcher did strongly urge was suppression of the illicit slave trade by a general European convention: "It's an alliance of peoples that will declare the trade abolished forever." 37 He proposed that to implement such an arrangement, all slave ships be declared the property of those who seized them, and that the officers of such vessels be imprisoned for life and crews for ten years. He was caustic towards England in this respect, declaring that she was philanthropic at the expense of others; capturing slave ships, and confiscating their human cargoes--according to a convention prepared at the Congress of Vienna which defined the trade as piracy--but then transporting them to her own West Indian colonies and re-enslaving them. Besides opposing the trade, Schoelcher also looked forward to emancipation which was to be accomplished "at a fixed time, fifteen, twenty years hence if you will," 38--probably by a world congress.

In 1830, the idea of emancipation made Schoelcher shudder. He chided idealists who failed to see "a circumstance which presented" insurmountable difficulties to immediate emancipation. That"circumstance" was the moral condition of our protégés." For, the slaves, liberated but ignorant and addicted to vice, would be good for nothing. He closed this warning, advising that he could not "see anymore than anyone else the necessity of infecting present society (already bad enough) with several
million brutes conferred with titles as citizens who would only be, in the final analysis, a vast hodge-podge of beggars and proletarians."

This letter, then marked the start of Schoelcher's anti-slavery crusade. Conservative though it was, it did contain one idea that Schoelcher would never renounce: if the Negroes were the dregs of humanity, this was due to slavery, and slavery alone; that they were not part of humanity, he would always deny. At least two of his later theories were contained here in rudimentary form. In his ironic statements respecting government-sponsored punishment of slaves in New Orleans could be detected the origins of his bitter diatribes of the 1840's against the Orléanist regime which he looked upon as an accomplice in the continuance of slavery. In his contention that slaves normally unable to purchase their freedom were found the roots of his opposition to gradual emancipation some ten years later.

Having taken his first plunge into anti-slavery writing Schoelcher waited three years before he published his second work, *De l'Esclavage des Noirs et la Législation Coloniale*, in 1833. On the whole, there was a more confident and aggressive tone to the latter for, in it, Schoelcher propounded plans for dealing with slavery: one for its amelioration and another for its eventual elimination. Basically, however, there was no change from his position in "Des Noirs," for he still shied away from immediate emancipation.

How does one account for the bolder, more self-assured character of *De l'Esclavage?* Tersen advanced the theory that Schoelcher's disillusionment with the July Monarchy caused his republicanism and anti-slavery sentiments to fuse. He went on to cite two infamous massacres of republican demonstrators by Louis Philippe--the affairs of the Cloître Saint-Merry
and Rue Transnonain—which he claimed caused Schoelcher's republicanism and abolitionism to harden simultaneously. This explanation has some merits, but it also has its drawbacks, for Schoelcher was hardly "revolutionary" in this second work as Tersen claimed.

It would seem more probable that the book's tone was due to Schoelcher's researches into the Negro race and slavery after 1830. These equipped him with the factual knowledge and confidence to confront those imaginary foes whom he could meet in "Des Noirs" with only the meek words: "Those are frightening arguments," and enabled him to convert the nebulous feeling that slavery should be ended, into a positive plan for its realization after forty to sixty years. That Schoelcher had pondered seriously upon the matter should be evident from the following:

The self-assured tone of De l'Esclavage became manifest in the opening pages where the author announced himself as no mere sympathizer with the slaves: "I have made myself the champion of the weak, of the outcast." The Negroes were without representation in the legislatures where: "The contest is too unequal, the slightest notions of justice... are violated with the most inconceivable scorn, and in the final analysis it's the liberty of the Negroes which is at stake." He answered critics who took him to task for seeming to know the fact that the slaves were materially better off than France's proletarians, by asserting that the workers at least were free, were considered citizens, and had a party. And he doubted that valets would care to change their lot with that of the slaves despite the fact that the latter possess two-room apartments. In the same breath, Schoelcher pitied the French laborers and denounced enactments by the rich which crushed the poor classes so
mercilessly. But he was not concerning himself with the metropolitan workers' plight—it was the slaves who were his obsession.

Sitting atop the vicious edifice of slavery were the masters. They were all-powerful and did as they pleased with their chattels because, though there were laws designed to regulate such conduct, they were largely a dead letter. The colonial administration, "itself imbued with colonial prejudices," did not look after the execution of the few statutes enacted in favor of the slaves. Even worse was the fact that the functionary with integrity who would want to do his duty, could not do it. If he attempted honestly to enforce the laws, he would be driven from his job. No group in history, according to Schoelcher, scorned the laws as did the masters: "Never have the high barons of feudalism surrounded by their vassals expressed a more complete contempt for the common law than do the whites in the colonies." There might have been, it was true, a few good masters, some who did not take advantage of their situation, but they were rare, like a "good king." Most felt that, by laying out the purchase price of 2,500 to 3,000 francs for a slave, they received license to give vent to their sadistic impulses against him, "to give oneself over to an excess of anger and be seized by the whim to kill a man." Excessive brutalities were generally not indulged in because they impaired the blacks' working abilities, so barbarism towards a slave stopped when "one might render him useless."

From the preceding, Schoelcher concluded that, under slavery, Negroes were "domestic animals." Therefore, they acted like beasts. They did not marry, for marriage would interfere with the "disorders" they were accustomed to give themselves up to. And like expendable animals, they
died off at the rate of five to ten per cent per year. Some were hanged after acts of revenge against their masters, who, in such cases, received 1,100 francs compensation. 46

Did Negroes merit such a cruel fate? Not so, Schoelcher concluded, for, though slavery made them animal-like, they were human beings. He distinguished between man and beast in this fashion: animals could not think and compare; men could. Negro slaves, in not running during a beating, were thinking and comparing; an animal, guided only by its instincts, would run away. Negroes were not only human but, away from slavery, were a civilized race. They had built schools, refined iron, and developed a complex agricultural system in Africa. This did not prove that the negroes were as advanced as the whites, but only that they were "able to live together... at a certain level of civilization." So one could "no longer infer among the blacks that moral incapacity which for so long has been made title against them." 47

Schoelcher drew these data bearing upon Negro achievements in the Dark Continent from a number of books by celebrated travelers there: Rene Callié, who reached Timbuktoo in 1828 and observed that certain African tribes had money systems and even levied customs; Richard and John Lander, who explored the lower Niger in 1820 and found the Negro settlement of Yaoone on the river, a city of "prodigious extent," with a twenty-to-thirty mile wall around it and whose inhabitants made gunpowder; and Gaspard Mollien, 48 who recorded in his Voyage dans l'Intérieur de l'Afrique, that he had found Negroes making iron in Upper Senegal.

These several explorers wrote on race and slavery only tangentially and none was negrophilic. Indeed, the Landers appeared at times to have been negrophobes, admitting to an"aversion for their jelly complexion"
and elsewhere labeling the Negro as "discourteous" and "rapacious". Nevertheless, they made note of a female slave far from her birthplace in a sympathetic way.

Who or what was responsible for the rigors of slavery? Schoelcher did not condemn the masters for they were "generally obliging and good men" whom it was a "pleasure to know." No, it was servitude itself, which begat its own cruelties, for it corrupted the master's heart. Depressingly, young whites, "naturally generous people," were poisoned by slavery, and wanted to maintain it. It also corrupted the blacks, some of whom sought to imitate their masters and own human property. When they did so, they became "fiercious, inexorable masters."

Equally important to Schoelcher was the reason for slavery (and the trade) and he was quick to establish their origins:

So, this much is clear: it's necessary to violate all of what little society holds sacred to assure workers to the planters; such is the final motive, the only justification for the horrors of the trade. It's to give bodies to the planters.

Some whites endeavoured to purge themselves of this guilt by blaming Africans, charging that they sold their own brothers and sisters to traders. Schoelcher's response was simple and to the point: might one not "conclude that, if we did not go to buy Negroes, they (the Africans) would not give themselves over to so many crimes?" Besides, whites would do the same if Turkish or Chinese traders came seeking white slaves.

There was a contradiction in Schoelcher's reasoning here, for he stated on the one hand, that the colons were not fundamentally bad, but were, rather, calloused by slavery. On the other hand, he held their labor demands responsible for the establishment of slavery. This, by the way,
was the first of many contradictions in Schoelcher—contradictions were a feature of his life. He later resolved it (of which he seemed unaware) when he stated that, "Individual man is inclined to goodness; men in society are inclined to corruption when they are not submitted to any good influences—" presumably by their governments.

Having outlined the evils of slavery and Negro intellectual capabilities, Schoelcher felt strongly that slavery should be outlawed. He proposed a long and rather complicated plan for its ultimate elimination. The Negro was not yet, in his eyes, ready for freedom. In the first place, he was indolent and would not work unless constrained to do so: it was "a completely natural consequence of the disgrace that he sees attached to work, that he give himself over to laziness." Furthermore, he would misuse his freedom. After all, the slaves "degraded by servitude, incapable at first, after discarding their irons, of understanding the duties any more than the rights of their new condition," would abuse liberty and it would become in their hands "a destructive instrument, fatal to their own existence, and to that of neighboring societies."

Here was Schoelcher's emancipation plan: a law proclaiming slavery's end after a period of between forty and sixty years should be passed immediately. It should also provide that children born of slaves after the date of the law would be free. This would, in his opinion, cause the illicit slave trade to die out, for "as the end . . . (of slavery) nears the slave traders' merchandise will, of necessity, decline in value, and, soon, no longer finding any profit in it, they will renounce this business themselves." The illicit trade, Schoelcher reminded his readers, must be abolished. It was inhumane, as twenty-five per cent of the cargo died in transit. There was a far more vital incentive, though, for ending the
trade, and that was the threat of a general Negro uprising. This would be a bloody affair and "doubtlessly, whites would be sacrificed." The blacks were entitled to resort to such violence: "Man has the right to take by force what has been seized from him by force ... and insurrection for the slave is the holiest of his tasks."58

Another decree supplementing the initial one would forbid the planters to import new slaves. Functionaries known as "protectors of the blacks" would inspect the estates periodically to enforce the law. If the masters violated it, they would be fined, their slaves liberated and sent to a government workshop to learn a trade. With this accomplished, the Negroes could return to Africa if they so desired. This, Schoelcher insisted, was the only way to end the trade. Statutes which merely fined and punished offenders were not enough because they "would not be executed."59

When, after a maximum of six decades, slavery no longer existed in the colonies, whites would emigrate there in large numbers. It must not be forgotten that the French working class, crushed "by misery and cold" was "completely disposed to go colonizing ...." He underscored the necessity for such emigration lest the residents be overwhelmed by sheer numbers of blacks or Latin Americans.60

The emigrants could readily follow agricultural pursuits in the tropics:

One is being prejudiced if one believes that they cannot endure the hot climate; isn't it the whites, Europeans, and unacclimated Europeans at that, who cleared the land and created all the colonies without the help of a slave?51

With the whites at work in the fields, the Negroes would overcome their aversion for agriculture labor. A golden age would then ensue for Caribbean and Indian Ocean dependencies. Their sugar would be produced at lower costs and could meet that from the East Indies, traditionally
cheaper, on the open market. Industry would have developed, and the same could be said of the arts; they were the "product of liberty." The colonies would then manufacture good, inexpensive goods which would greatly reduce their dependence on imported goods from Britain and the United States. In other words, the French colonies would then be self-sufficient. 62

Schoelcher was not yet finished. Tacked to the end of De l'Esclavage was another emancipationist scheme contained in three petitions by one Felix Milliroux, 63 identified as a "French citizen in charge of commercial affairs" at New Amsterdam in British Guiana. Milliroux denounced the clandestine slave trade and considered that the best way to end it was by the establishment of free trade. How free trade would attain this desired result was never clearly explained by either Milliroux or Schoelcher, who acted as commentator. Their reasoning seemed roughly like this: Free trade would compel the colonists to compete with cheaper sugar from India, which would, in its turn, force them to be gentler towards their slaves so that they might be more productive. They would, of course, have to mechanize sugar production to reduce expenses. 64 There seems implicit in this train of thought the notion that the trade and slavery would cease when the planters realized that sugar was cheaper to produce with free labor. Free trade would benefit the colonies in another way, too, according to the second petition. The ports in the French Antilles would become commercial centers serving as reembarkation points for goods made in and shipped from France.

All this theorizing by Schoelcher had serious deficiencies. It seems hard to accept his notion that the blacks needed only the white example to lose their prejudices against agricultural pursuits. Furthermore,
the twentieth century observer finds it impossible to believe that Schoelcher could actually expect the colonies to become industrialized when they lacked basic raw materials like coal and iron. The application of the free trade principle to the colonies made a little sense, but was still without a factual base. He seemed at this stage to have memorized a great many laissez-faire doctrines and applied them indiscriminately to the colonial scene—where the basic problem was a decline in the price of sugar (which will be discussed in the next chapter). This situation defied simple solutions such as he advanced.

The incorporation of Milliroux's petitions in De l'Esclavage raises the question: Did Schoelcher borrow his emancipationist ideas from others, besides Milliroux? The possibility that he drew from Montesquieu, Condorcet, and Sismondi has already been raised, so it might be suspected the question may be answered in the affirmative. In part, it may be, for Schoelcher's program bore certain resemblances to those of the others. All of the anti-slavery authors cited by Schoelcher in De l'Esclavage were advocates of gradualism. They feared that the Negroes in one way or another were not ready for freedom. Montesquieu was afraid that, out of bondage, the blacks might enact an "abominable law." Frossard rated the slaves uncivilized and stressed the need for their education and acquaintanceship with the duties of citizenship before emancipation. Dufau found them similarly unfit.

Montesquieu proposed no specific date for slavery's extinction but merely advised that it would end when the Negroes had all purchased their freedom. Frossard put forth a gradualistic program with several features. Savings banks were to be set up, in which the slaves would deposit their
money. When they had accumulated a sufficient amount, they were to start making payments to their masters, acquiring liberty by the installment plan, so to speak. Black children were to be freed after brief service to recompense their masters for the expense of raising them. Mulatto children were to be free at birth, while all slave mothers who had given birth to at least three children could expect but fifteen more years of servitude, and those who had had five were to be immediately freed. The first step in Dufau's arrangement was the abolition of the trade, to be followed by the suppression of racial bias and strict enforcement of the Code Noir for the benefit of the blacks. The slaves could then receive their freedom but they would have to serve their former masters as laborers for ten years.

Schoelcher, who seldom explained the sources of his ideas, might very well have leaned on Froissard and Dufau for certain aspects of his scheme. He might also have consulted Thomas Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, which was translated into French in 1786, and contained two projects which Schoelcher advocated at this time—the abolition of the trade and the freeing of all those henceforth born in slavery. There is, however, no record of Schoelcher ever having consulted Jefferson. His notion that industry could develop in the colonies only after slavery was exterminated apparently came from Jean Baptiste Say who was of the opinion the two could not operate side by side.

Strangely enough, in the 1830's at least, Schoelcher seemingly was not familiar with Abbé Raynal's Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Établissements et du Commerce des Européens dans les Deux Indes (Amsterdam, 1770) whose ideas in some respects coincided with his. Like Schoelcher,
Raynal viewed the Negroes as a generous and affectionate people, debased by slavery. He proposed measures to alleviate their lot and proposed to abolish slavery but then apprentice the blacks to their ex-masters for five years. In 1883, however, Vie de Toussaint Louverture Schoelcher advised his readers that he was acquainted with Raynal, as well he might have been in 1833.

Also curiously conspicuous by their relative absence in De l'Esclavage des Noirs were references to the British anti-slavery writers and orators. Schoelcher indicated that the only British abolitionist tract that he was familiar with was the aforementioned "Thoughts upon the African Slave Trade." In 1840 in Des Colonies Françaises, Schoelcher was to call attention to Thomas A. Clarkson's works on the slave trade, and indeed, as will be seen in the next chapter he was at this later stage to employ the writings and speeches of certain English emancipationists—notably Buxton and Joseph Sturge. Despite his failure to cite England's anti-slavery writers at this earlier date, it is important to note that his fear that ameliorative measures were failing because of colonial opposition had already been expressed by Wilberforce, and James Stephen. Too, his program for the eventual abolition of slavery (just detailed) bore a certain resemblance to those then being urged in Britain and the same could be said of his plan to soften slavery.

Schoelcher, also submitted a plan for the amelioration of slavery, which presumably he wanted set into action before his emancipation plan. The colonies should be asked to participate in it, but France should be chiefly responsible. The islands were, after all, "much more inclined to tighten the slaves' chains than loosen them" and to deny France the key role would be "to deny her her noblest prerogative."
The most striking trait of Schoelcher's ameliorative program as of 1833 was its conservatism. Articles V, VI, and XXVI dealt with the education of slaves which was to be compulsory and under clerical direction. The churchmen must sedulously avoid any discussion of the "political" aspects of slavery, for this would entail "great danger". Article II stipulated that slave marriages must have official approval, since French law did not permit minors to marry without parental consent, and the slaves in some respects were like minors. The experience gained "by wise administration" would indicate "what salutary delays . . . to their marriages" were necessary.

Articles VIII - XI would punish masters who abused their chattels, and would free the mistreated slave, or all of a man's slaves in extreme cases. Yet, the latter must show proof of their beatings. Article VII provided for savings banks to encourage thrift. Schoelcher was rather pessimistic about them for

most . . . (of the slaves) won't understand them at all, and will much rather sleep than go to school, and get drunk rather than put money in a savings bank.

Article XIII confirmed the slaves' right to buy their freedom under the Code Noir of 1685, but they must prove that they had come honestly by their funds for this purpose. In Article XV, Schoelcher wanted masters to free their slaves, but only the most deserving ones. And even when they were free, they probably would not enjoy political privileges since, by Articles XXI, a citizen must pay one-hundred and fifty francs a year in taxes to qualify for this voting right. Above all, there was Article XXIV which forbade slaves to strike their masters even in self-defense.

Despite its conservative flavor, Schoelcher's plan singled out some specific evils for elimination. Article VII would halt the practice by which masters received an indemnity for a slave executed by law. Article XVII
would punish masters who freed their older slaves without making economic provisions for them. Article XVIII would require that the names of all slaves be legally recorded, to identify readily new arrivals brought in by the illicit trade. Finally, Schoelcher was determined to reduce the power of the colones in island affairs by Article XXX, which would prohibit any but Europeans from serving as churchmen in the colonies. This would lessen the chances that the clerics would "identify themselves with the whites." Schoelcher did not expound at length on this but he was hinting at Catholic acquiescence in slavery. In a postscript, Schoelcher urged that special courts of appeal to set up in Paris, on which no colon would sit, to assure fair decisions for the slaves.

In De l'Esclavage, Schoelcher was resolving the uncertainties which had assailed him in "Des Noirs." In this earlier writing, his conscience had been his guide, telling him that Negroes were not innately inferior and that slavery was an abomination. But he could not satisfactorily document his case for either, witness the many unanswered questions. Consequently, he could hardly press for more than early end to the illicit trade and emancipation at some vaguely distant date, with scant explanation as to how either was to be effected. In short, at the outset, Schoelcher was simply not familiar with the subject he was treating.

De l'Esclavage revealed that he was no longer plagued by a basic ignorance of slavery. He had scrutinized the works of other emancipationists, and pondered their conclusions, together with his own. No less important, he had discovered proofs of Negro intellectual capacity in various African travel accounts. With a confidence born of knowledge he could now analyze the entire structure of slavery and offer specific instances of its injurious effects on both Negroes and whites. Furthermore, he was now able to submit
detailed plans for both the amelioration and eventual extinction of slavery, accompanied by nebulous allusions to the economic advantages of abolition. By citing the latter, Schoelcher, had perfected the method of his anti-slavery crusade. That is, thereafter, his attacks would be of a dual nature: he would call attention both to slavery's injustices and the material benefits of emancipation. Emile Terson related: "this stand where idealism and realism are mixed very clearly characterizes the dual nature of the attacks that Schoelcher is going to conduct." And despite the unconvincing plan for the eventual abolition of slavery, Schoelcher had at any rate identified two problems associated with emancipation in the French colonies—the Negro aversion for field labor and the future of the cane sugar industry.

Even while advancing his programs for the mitigation and eventual abolition of servitude he must have hesitated. The seeds of doubt about their worthwhileness already existed in his mind, an indication of how important these early years were for the development of his anti-slavery thought. Even in "Des Noirs" he had had suspicions that the Negroes could not or would not avail themselves of the right to buy their freedom. Here too he had noted the complicity between civil and religious authorities and the slaveholders, a complicity which he openly blamed in De l'Esclavage for the failure to enforce ameliorative legislation. He must have had a presentiment, then, concerning his programs that they might not succeed. By 1840, this presentiment had been jarred into a total repudiation of gradualism.
CHAPTER II
THE MATURE
ABOLITIONIST
When Victor Schoelcher wrote in *Abolition de l'Esclavage* that there was "no transition possible between slavery and liberty," he announced his conversion to immediate abolitionism. Intermediate schemes he looked upon as useless as they would satisfy neither the slaveholders nor their chattels; the former would regard them only as an attack on their property rights and seek to prevent their implementation; while the slaves would find themselves subjected to the old abuses including corporal punishment when they had been expecting liberty. At the same time, he denounced any gradualist approach—ameliorative measures or manumissions as merely the maintenance of the status quo.

The key factor in Schoelcher's conversion was his interpretation of English emancipation between 1834–8. Some of the events associated with that period should now be recalled: the abolition of slavery took place on August 1, 1834, with a six-year apprenticeship to their former masters to follow for praedial (agricultural) slaves, and one of four-years for the non-praedials. Bodily punishments were to be retained but were to be administered only by paid governmental officials known as stipendary magistrates. The apprentices were to spend approximately three-fourths of each week working for the planters, and the remaining time on their own land. In Antigua and Bermuda, none of these arrangements prevailed for the masters in both places voted for emancipation without the apprenticeship period, as was their option. In 1838, the apprenticeship system was done away with in the other colonies at the request of the planters.

Schoelcher presented apprenticeship as a fiasco. The British planters generally regarded it as an extension of servitude, exacted excessive labor from their charges, and often bribed the stipendary magistrates into administering unlawful beatings. The blacks on their part detested
the set-up and presumably were uncooperative and unproductive. The masters found the transitional program so bad that they voluntarily asked Parliament to discard it.4

This interpretation was only partially correct. Violations of the sort described by Schoelcher took place mostly on Jamaica (where nearly half of Britain's West Indian slaves lived). On the whole apprenticeship worked out reasonably well for both races on the other islands. If the masters voted to end it there in 1838, it was due to their fear that the release of the non-praedial apprentices in that year would unsettle the others whose terms still had two years to run.5

Schoelcher's picture of the workings of the apprenticeship period was at variance with reality mainly because he employed partisan sources in putting it together. Nearly all of the latter were by zealous immediate abolitionists: Zachary Macaulay, Détails sur l'Emancipation des Esclaves dans les Colonies Anglaises pendant les Années 1834 et 1835 (Paris, 1836); Joseph Sturge and Thomas Harvey, The West Indies in 1837 (London, 1838); Parliamentary speeches by Thomas F. Buxton; Josephy Gurney, Familiar Letters to Henry Clay of Kentucky, Describing a Winter in the West Indies (London, 1840); George Alexander and John Scoble, Liberté Immédiate et Absolue ou Esclavage (Paris, 1844); the two exceptions being an address by the then governor of Jamaica Sir Lionel Smith to that island's colonial council in 1838 and Précis de l'Abolition de l'Esclavage dans les Colonies Anglaises (Paris, 1840, 1841), an official publication of the French Ministry of the Navy.6 Nevertheless, since the apprenticeship system was a failure in Jamaica where the majority of English slaves dwelt, his interpretation was reasonably accurate.
Having opted for immediate emancipation, Schoelcher felt it necessary to support it by securing evidence on its behalf. This he strove to do for the next eight years by gathering statistics showing English emancipation after 1838 to be a success, and by presenting data which demonstrated gradualism's failings. He had little to offer factually in 1840 beyond a brief survey of the conclusion of the apprenticeship period, purporting to show it was negotiated without serious disturbances: the blacks were jubilant but not violent. His attacks on gradualism at this date were somewhat statistical in nature, but equally short, and finally, must have had a certain lack of pertinence for Frenchmen since they concerned English apprenticeship.

To remedy these deficiencies Schoelcher journeyed to the Caribbean in 1840, toured the British West Indies to observe first-hand the results of complete emancipation, and visited Guadeloupe and Martinique to assess the condition of the slaves there. In this way he could disprove the masters' contention that voluntary manumissions and amelioration of slavery were proceeding satisfactorily. He might also determine if the Royal Ordinance of 1840—a gradualist device which required periodic visits of special magistrates to the plantations to make sure the bondsmen were decently treated and receiving lay and religious instruction—was functioning as badly as he supposed.

In some ways the voyage did not prove immediately fruitful to Schoelcher. He spent several months in various British islands compiling information, but he needed time to evaluate and collate the data so he did not present a survey in depth of English emancipation until 1842 in Colonies Étrangères. His four-page survey of the event in Des Colonies, therefore, contained nothing concerning the years after 1838.
His stay in the French Antilles resulted in his discovery of only one possible evasion of the 1840 ordinance. The blacks, he claimed, were not getting the religious and primary instruction they were entitled to. This was because the colons understood that the blacks could not receive a genuine indoctrination into Christianity or any formal schooling without damage to slavery, "without compromising the institution and weakening its base." If, for example, the Negroes really understood Christianity, they would rebel against their lot. So instead the blacks were merely introduced to a highly simplified form of the Catechism and advised to be resigned to their status by the priests, who if they attempted to do more, were likely to be expelled by colonial authorities. Their primary education was non-existent as far as Schoelcher could determine, as there was not one slave child among Martinique's 1500 pupils, because local authorities, who were colons of their allies, forbade them. The potency of the Schoelcherian argument was weakened somewhat because the ordinance of 1840 had only been recently promulgated and had been in effect too short a time to be judged.

Schoelcher also charged that the colons since 1830 were responsible for very few manumissions on their own—all told some 5,250 on Martinique and approximately 4,500 on Guadeloupe, and he noted that among the latter figure were 2,290 women and children, the least valuable kinds of slave property. Schoelcher drew the apparent conclusion that with the slave population reproducing, it would take forever to free the slaves in this manner. Here he was on surer grounds.

He had, then, convincing evidence that voluntary manumissions were an ineffective device, but this was the only clearcut proof he had of
gradualism's failings. And he had to admit to a considerable softening of the rigors of slavery. He expressed a "sort of thankfulness at finding it changed into a bearable institution as a result of the "intelligent kindness of some masters." Many blacks had been given vegetable gardens by their masters, while the wives of the colons were caring for slave orphans. The whip was "less active than we thought" and the general relations between bondsmen and slaveholders had a "more intimate character than (those) ... between us and our servants."¹³ As late as 1843, Schoelcher in a letter to a resident of Guadeloupe paid homage to the betterment in the slaves' lot as he had witnessed it during his 1840 sojourn.¹⁴

He was suspicious, however, of the motives behind these changes and denied that they were inspired by humanitarian considerations—in spite of his praise for the "intelligent kindness of some masters." The colons were gentler with their chattels, reasoned Schoelcher, because they could no longer acquire new slaves via the trade. "Domestic economy," then, which was "quite easy to appreciate" dictated that the masters take care of their slaves with "the same interest as farmers who care for their beasts." Moreover, Schoelcher hypothesized that the betterments he saw were probably superficial: "This had to be so. The best (masters), even, couldn't let us penetrate to the heart of things, that is ... listen to the wishes and views of the Negroes."¹⁵ Finally, in spite of these ameliorations, there were "accidental acts of violence, exceptional occurrences which (were) enough to earn for slavery the hatred of all good and honest hearts."¹⁶ Some three years after his colonial tour, Schoelcher granted little credit to the colons for the better life slaves led, suggesting it derived from tropical abundance and not servitude.¹⁷
Somewhat short of definitive evidence that gradualism would not work, Schoelcher hypothesized that it would come to nought because of its intrinsic shortcomings or unforeseen circumstances that might hinder its implementation. Three gradualist devices which he refuted in this manner were: the rachat des enfants by which children born to slaves would be freed; the rachat forcé under which the slave would have the legal privilege of purchasing his freedom; and the rachat by which the French government would buy the slaves their freedom and then be reimbursed out of their wages as free men.

The rachat des enfants would not achieve what Schoelcher presumed was its objective, the spiritual and physical regeneration of the liberated children. In some cases their parents would be unable to feed and clothe them (as the system required); in others, the children would have a bad example set for them by their elders since the latter were still "submitted every day to bodily punishments." Besides, the fact that a child had received his freedom without having to struggle for it while his parents had to, would inspire "the father's envy toward his son, and the son's scorn for his father." 18

The rachat forcé would not work for several reasons. Many slaves would be unable to avail themselves of this privilege. Was it not too much to ask of a slave who had "been accustomed since birth to seeing his needs provided for . . . to save by dint of self-deprivation the money that he would earn?" Moreover, there were slaves who could not redeem themselves by this method even if they had the will to do so; those who had poor masters, for example, since the Negro's fortune followed the "fortune of his possessor;" there were others who had no way of earning money, such as house slaves and domestics. Schoelcher contended, too, that
whatever figure might be set for the price of freedom, it was bound not "to satisfy anyone," since the master would think it too low, and the slave too high. There would then ensue, logically, a great deal of "discontent" and many legal proceedings. Of course, even if none of these difficulties arose in connection with the rachat forcé, it would most certainly be obstructed by the masters who would consider it "abhorrent to their own interests."19

Finally, the rachat by the French government would fail because it left too many questions unanswered. What was to be the status of the Negroes after they were freed and working for their former owners? What would happen to those who for some reason were unable to pay back France for the "humanitarian service rendered?"20

Schoelcher also had objections in principle to all these schemes. The rachat des enfants was unjust because "every child who comes into this world is free;" the rachat by France was "more than loathsome", since it cheated "in a niggardly fashion both owners and slaves;" the rachat forcé he designated as "profoundly unmoral", since no man should have to purchase his freedom.21

These attacks against gradualism as a matter of principle point up Schoelcher's absolute intransigence towards slavery. Lest anyone should regard his comments concerning the slaves improved lot as a relaxation of his antagonism toward slavery he made it clear that it was slavery's root principle--the idea that one man might own another--which he detested, and no amelioration of the chattels' plight would alter that opinion.22 He went so far as to find in amelioration a further argument against servitude, for it resulted in additional deterioration in Negro character. Schoelcher argued that generous acts by the masters--donating land to the bondsmen for instance--had a providential character; the slaves had no
sense that they deserved them for they were granted without their having made a special effort. Under such a system, the blacks lost all initiative, becoming "incapable of anything" on their own. They no longer had the "instinct of self-preservation" for all responsibilities of this sort were "unloaded on their proprietors." In other words they evolved into robots "without vices or virtues," and existed only "by the will of others." Slavery in this respect was like the army, where one received a uniform and food but surrendered one's liberty.

In what certainly must be regarded as the climactic statement of Schoelcher's anti-slavery crusade he stressed the necessity for abolition at any cost. In answer to a colon's warning that without slavery, the cane sugar industry and the colonies would be ruined, he wrote that it would then be "necessary to renounce . . . sugar and . . . the colonies." As Robespierre had put it in a heated debate on emancipation during the French Revolution: "Let the colonies perish rather than a principle." This peroration was typical of the tone of Des Colonies throughout, in which Schoelcher rehashed the old arguments about the moral abuses of slavery—how it debased the blacks, acted as a deterrent to marriage and an encouragement to concubinage; and promoted the Negro's laziness denying him any incentive to work.

The West Indian tour of 1840 had a tremendous impact on the development of Schoelcher's anti-slavery thought, since he now inculpated the Catholic Church and France for their connections with slavery. As a result, apparently, of contacts with certain church prelates and his own observations, he concluded that Catholicism had to bear a portion of the blame for the failure of the 1845 ordinance, and therefore, of gradual laws in general.
True, many priests had been pressured by the colonos into disseminating a bland type of Christianity, or one which actually helped shore up slavery because it urged resignation on the part of the blacks. Yet it was also true that the clergy was at fault; it had "lost . . . its deep sympathy for the distressed," and did not "want to . . . suffer for truth," was "too exclusively concerned with dogma" and so contented itself "with preaching resignation." The church "placed itself at the service of slavery's diabolic work," by segregating its cemeteries. On one occasion Schoelcher asserted there were "no good priests in the colonies." Schoelcher compared the colonial Catholic churchmen unfavorably with their Protestant brethren in British possessions who had placed themselves "at the head of the crusade against . . . slavery." Yet he predicted a change in the Catholic outlook on the basis of a Papal encyclical by Gregory XVI of December 3, 1839, denouncing servitude. This turn of events did not augur well for the colonos. Hereafter, the blacks would hear no more of resignation, would learn more than the catechism, and be introduced to the "universal brotherhood of Christianity" which was "egalitarian." When they were, they"would no longer consent to continue as slaves." Later, Schoelcher would virtually repudiate this generous remark concerning Catholicism, and again attack the Church violently for its relations with slavery. Indeed Schoelcher eventually held Christianity at fault for having encouraged slavery from its beginnings, thereby helping to retard its destruction.

Far guiltier in these respects, ultimately, was France because her rulers neglected to take steps to enforce reforms. After all, if the colonial regimes were controlled by slaveholders or those sympathetic to them, the fault lay with the mother country which had not removed them.
Schoelcher then traced the history of French connections with slavery. Louis XIII had supported the creation of the institution. Under Louis XIV, Colbert had issued the edict of May 28, 1664, which had set up the West Indian Company and permitted it to traffic in slaves. Louis XIV had authorized the exclusion of blacks from political office according to a ministerial letter of January 7, 1767, while Napoleon, Schoelcher pointed out, had revived slavery and the trade in 1802.30

In the nineteenth century, he went on, the position of French authorities—meaning Louis XVIII, Charles X and Louis Philippe and their subordinates—was equivocal. Before the nation they presented themselves "as wanting abolition;" before the colons they depicted themselves as being driven to reform by the Chambers. The colons were quick to recognize that this vacillating tendency indicated "that the administration (did) not want emancipation"—an appraisal with which Schoelcher agreed.31

The concept that France ultimately was answerable for slavery had long been implicit in Schoelcher's thinking. In De l'Esclavage he had stated that men as individuals were good, but that collectively they would do evil unless they experienced "proper direction from above."32 He continued in this vein in Abolition de l'Esclavage where he professed not to blame the colons for their addiction to slavery because it was lucrative, for they were only "following the law of human egoism," something quite universal.33

It required his Caribbean trip of 1840 and conversations with the colons for Schoelcher to carry such a train of thought to its logical conclusion. He noted many masters who individually and privately declared slavery detestable but were afraid to speak out publicly lest they be taken for "bad creoles." Undoubtedly many of them in confidential discussions
with Schoelcher avowed their distaste for slavery (to make a favorable impression on him) and then, in self-defense, implicated France in its establishment. Schoelcher after these parleys conceded that when the masters held France guilty for slavery they were not "saying one word that (wasn't) true."  

By 1842, Schoelcher had finished sifting and interpreting the information he had collected on English emancipation after 1838, and presented his version of the event, periodically over the next five years, especially in Colonies Étrangères. It was rather an optimistic account showing mainly the economic advantages of immediate emancipation. He hoped in this way to appeal to men of affairs, "practical men" who feared the financial disturbances that abolition would entail. It must have been a difficult task to compile such a report for there were two serious difficulties which arose in the British colonies after 1838—a labor shortage—because of a reluctance on the part of the ex-slaves to work—and a concomitant decline in sugar production.  

Schoelcher did not turn his back on these problems but rather attempted to either minimize their significance or disassociate their origins from emancipation per se. If, for example, the blacks declined to work it was, in part, because of wage disputes with the planters. The British authorities were at fault here, as they should have anticipated squabbles of this sort and taken precautionary measures to prevent them from arising. Of course, at other times, the aversion for labor among the blacks arose from different causes, was traceable to "the excitement of the first moments of emancipation," or to a "prejudice against sugar cultivation" which was only a "natural" reaction to the "excessive work"
imposed on them as slaves—a prejudice which was only "temporary" and was starting to disappear.\textsuperscript{37}

Moreover, while agreeing that the fall in sugar production was related to the black reluctance to work, Schoelcher counseled the planters that they might have avoided it had they followed the Antiguan example and refused apprenticeship. On Antigua 60\% more sugar was grown between 1838 and 1841 than during 1830-4. The blacks here were more productive since they had not been apprenticed and hence, did not have "the injuries of an intermediate period to avenge." Schoelcher was aware of the other causes for Antigua's flourishing state—the indemnity which enabled her planters to pay back debts and the mechanization of the sugar industry but rated the absence of apprenticeship as crucial.\textsuperscript{38}

Schoelcher might have mentioned (but did not) that Antiguan prosperity was achieved in spite of a five-year drought.\textsuperscript{39} However, he did call attention to a long dry spell on Jamaica which greatly curtailed production there—yet another effort on his part to disassociate any economic disturbance from emancipation.\textsuperscript{40}

Schoelcher belittled the drop in sugar production—25\% less in 1838-41 than during 1830-4 was the average figure for Britain's West Indian colonies as a whole—in light of other economic advances. Total exports from some colonies notably Jamaica had increased, where also property values were on the rise,\textsuperscript{41} and on that island and on Trinidad railroads were being constructed. These latter undertakings Schoelcher classified as "material, palpable proof of West Indian prosperity."\textsuperscript{42} Antigua had no new railroads—at least Schoelcher did not mention any—but there labor costs had declined which was of far greater importance.\textsuperscript{43}
Schoelcher's reports on British emancipation after 1838 were statistically accurate but interpretatively misleading. Mathieson pointed out that the decline in sugar production was of distinct importance. The planters' income from sugar remained the same since prices rose, but their profits were considerably smaller because of increased labor costs on all the islands save Antigua. In fact their situation became so bad that they asked for immigrant workers. For this reason one can only theorize that the hard-headed men of affairs were not particularly impressed with Schoelcherian commentary on this score.

Nevertheless, the happy Antiguan situation, accurately portrayed by Schoelcher, must have been a compelling argument on behalf of immediate emancipation. At any rate Schoelcher had a stronger case than he did in *Abolition de l'Esclavage* and *Des Colonies Françaises*, and an infinitely better one than in *De l'Esclavage des Noirs*, where he could merely conjure up undocumented laissez-faire, anti-slavery theories. When Schoelcher ended his discourse on the practical advantages of English emancipation, he promptly indicated that even if it would not prove beneficial in the same way for French colonies, slavery had to be destroyed because "no material consideration" could "compete with moral interest."

The free blacks of the British West Indies were not the only members of this race discussed in *Colonies Étrangères*. Schoelcher also had something to say about the slaves of Cuba and Puerto Rico, and his harsh statements concerning their degradation served to set the stage for his onslaught against French gradualism in 1844. Of Cuba's wealth (the source of which was sugar) he could only say it was an offense to humanity because it was accumulated at the expense of a "suffering mass of humanity." In Puerto Rico, he uncovered a new form of physical torture for male slaves—
sexual deprivation. They so outnumbered females (three to one) that they had to suffer "the tortures . . . of the cloister." Indeed, Schoelcher supposed that the bondsmen of Puerto Rico were the most miserable of all. Their food and living quarters were bad and they had not days off. Their owners, in his opinion, were only "speculators." Their plantations were only "place(s) to manufacture sugar" and their homes merely "commercial stores." The slaveholders of Puerto Rico were a far more despicable group than those in the French or British territories who "tried to make life agreeable" for their chattels. In Puerto Rico there was "none of that."\textsuperscript{46}

This was the last bit of flattery he had for the French colons. In 1844 he began an intensive and documented campaign against gradualism when he pronounced the slaves of Réunion as ill-clothed and ill-educated as ever, despite the Ordinance of 1840 which had been in effect for four years.\textsuperscript{47} A year later he ridiculed the same ordinance, because five years after its issuance he recorded that there were but twelve slaves in school in Martinique and Guadeloupe. The 650,000 francs set aside each year for educational purposes was, therefore, a total waste.\textsuperscript{48}

On this basis he forecast the failure of the celebrated law of 1845 which confirmed the provisions of the 1840 statute and also took steps to reduce physical punishments, including the use of irons, and to strengthen the blacks right to free themselves by the rachat forcé. Schoelcher related that:

The application of the new law (would) serve at least to prove that there (was) no other means of abolishing slavery except abolishing it all at once.\textsuperscript{49}

His opposition was not absolute to this measure, for he did advocate its passage by the chambers. Ineffective though it would be, it was still "progress over the past . . . a step towards abolition . . . (and) a warning that it was time to renounce . . . human property."\textsuperscript{50}
A year or so after its enactment he claimed his prediction had come true. Very few blacks were securing their freedom by the rachat forcé. Bondsmen were secretly and illegally being sold outside the colonies, placed in irons, whipped excessively and forced to eat excrement. The second volume of Histoire de l'Esclavage was essentially a catalogue of horrors, whose descriptions of the tortures the slaves went through were so grisly and detailed that one might almost suspect a morbid fascination in Schoelcher for such goings-on. The most sinister episode (which took over thirty pages to relate) involved a certain Jean-Baptiste, a slave whose calves had been chopped off. He generally blamed the gereurs or foremen for such atrocities, as they had no personal concern for the bondsmen and looked on them simply as a means to increase production. In Schoelcher's eyes, whoever was guilty was not sufficiently punished. He added up the sentences and fines of those charged with the deaths of and cruelties towards the slaves over an eighteen-month period and found they amounted to seven years imprisonment and 2700 francs. This he commented was "very little." Small wonder that Schoelcher complained in 1847 that "nothing or nearly nothing (had) changed in the colonies and that the blacks were as "materially and morally" unhappy as ever. It was the actions of the colons which negated the 1845 law, since— as Schoelcher had already predicted—they could allow no alteration of slavery "without weakening it at its base." The commissions created to determine the cost of the rachat forcé were dominated by colons and they invariably set the price too high. They deliberately refused royal inspectors access to the plantations to oversee the enforcement of the 1845 statute. Those who were arrested for violating or evading it were penalized lightly because their allies continued to control the colonial administrative and judicial systems.
The Schoelcherian view of the colonial scene between 1845 and 1847 was accurate but misleading. It was misleading because it must have left its readers with the impression that crimes against the blacks occurred in the colonies by the thousands—probably an impression that Schoelcher the polemicist did not disdain. On the other hand, his contention that the ameliorative measures of 1840 and 1845 were futile have been substantiated. Two eye witnesses corroborated his view. Abbé Dougoujon in Lettres sur l'Esclavage (Paris, 1846) and Rouvellat de Cussac in Situation des Esclaves dans les Colonies Françaises (Paris, 1846) both portrayed the two statutes as unenforced. Official accounts—Compte-Rendu au Roi de l'Emploi des Fonds Alloués Depuis 1839 pour l'Enseignement Religieux et de l'Exécution des Lois de 18 et 19 Juillet 1845 Relative au Régime des Esclaves (Paris, 1846) and Compte-Rendu au Roi de l'Exécution des Lois de 18 et 19 Juillet sur le Régime des Esclaves (Paris, 1847) reported the faithful execution of both measures. This, in reality, meant only that funds for Negro education had been allocated, that the commissions to determine the purchase price for each slave's freedom had been brought into being and that the royal inspectors had been appointed.

Gaston-Martin, the most recent interpreter of French colonial history showed the colons as refusing to implement either law, as they viewed both as "odious," and "fatal" to the preservation of slavery. The colons were assisted in their obstructionist policies by many in the Catholic clergy, who by word and deed helped to buttress slavery. These prelates issued racist pronouncements concerning the Negro's lack of aptitude, and a few owned and whipped slaves. Schoelcher believed that they had probably become pro-slavery because of training at seminaries where a brand of theology was taught which condoned the institution.
While not all clergymen were so described, the implication was that the majority suffered from a "gangrenous" tolerance toward slavery. This survey of Catholicism's relationship toward slavery was considerably more hostile than that offered in Des Colonies where he had merely chastized the priests for not doing their duty towards the slaves. At that time he had prophesied that they would not remain so derelict for long, since Gregory XVI had condemned slavery in 1839. It will also be recalled that while Schoelcher delivered this mild rebuke against Catholicism he had complemented Protestants for taking the lead in the abolitionist cause in the English colonies.

Schoelcher's opinion in 1846 that the colonial priesthood was pro-slavery was more than an attack on Catholicism. It exemplified, rather, his new view that Christianity in theory and practice had promoted slavery. In Colonies Étrangères he pointed out that the Spanish and Portuguese "the two most Catholic peoples on earth" had founded modern slavery. Furthermore the Knights Hospitaliers at Rhodes and the Maltese Knights, both militant Christian organizations, had enslaved infidels. More importantly Christianity had nothing to do with the demise of ancient servitude, for Christ had never said anything against it and Peter had authorized it. He finished this survey by stating that Christians had "always found" slavery justified in the Bible.

In L'Égypte en 1845 (1846) he carried this analysis further. Here Schoelcher was inveighing in a general way against Christian theory as basically conservative and narrow, but his diatribe was so worded as to leave no doubt he was implicating it in the establishment and perpetuation of slavery. The reputedly divine origin of the Bible enabled men to "legitimatize their own errors" when they were passed over uncritically
in that sacred text. In fact, there was "no crime or folly" for which there (were) not justifying verses in the Bible.  

For instance, the persistent lowly status of females, Schoelcher related to Paul's injunction to woman that she was created for man. Schoelcher made at least two declarations of atheism because of this built-in resistance to reform which characterized Christianity and, in 1849, he wrote that the persistence of misery and stupidity and their "deification" had driven him to lose faith.

Schoelcher discovered in Christian fatalism additional proof of the religion's inherent resistance to reform. Fatalism denied free will and bred in men a tendency towards powerlessness in the face of evil. Christianity was also a narrow faith characterized by a "barbaric exclusiveness" which prevented its practitioners from "embracing" non-believers with "love and charity." Christ was "familiar with the sublime principles of human solidarity and fraternity but had . . . only an uncertain perception of them . . . ." Did he not say (Matthew 15:24) that he was here only for the faithful of Israel, and didn't he advise his followers to stay away from the Samaritans? Yet the most telling proof of Christ's narrowmindedness was that he consented to his adherents' enslaving infidels. In 1846, Schoelcher announced Catholicism's part in founding slavery in the French colonies. The church seconded Louis XIII's decision to legalize slavery (in 1635) for it realized that servitude was "well-suited to the conversion of infidels." In this manner, the clerics "covered human greed with a religious cloak."

This hostile assessment of Christianity did not give credit to the egalitarian thrust behind Christianity which drove others like William Lloyd Garrison to embrace the slave's cause. Schoelcher's antagonism
toward Christianity did not vanish with the disappearance of slavery. In later years he compiled two other indictments: *La Famille, la Propriété et le Christianisme* (Paris, 1873) in which he maintained that the faith was destructive of the family and too often used as the grounds for an unequal distribution of wealth; and *Le Vrai Saint Paul. Sa Vie, Sa Morale* (Paris, 1879) in which that disciple emerged as reactionary, fatalistic, and immoral. His hostility towards Christianity sheds some light on his seeming neglect of the tracts of English abolitionists like Clarkson and Wilberforce whose anti-slavery sentiments had a strongly religious base.

If Schoelcher's evaluation of Christianity's stand with respect to slavery was one-sided, his conception of the pro-slavery part played by the Catholic Church in the French colonies in the 40's was exaggerated. Dongoujon, a reliable witness, granted that there were some prelates who upheld the institution and conceded that colonial priests had been taught in France that slavery was not an evil. Yet he implied that the majority changed their minds upon arrival in the colonies and sought to combat the institution by serious instruction of the bondsmen. If they had not been able to accomplish this, it was because of the harrassment they endured at the hands of masters and the authorities—a point with which Schoelcher was in partial accord.

Despite his prolonged discourse on Christianity's ties with slavery he maintained that it was France that bore the heaviest share of the responsibility for the failure of the statutes of 1840 and 1845. While the masters were adamant against them and rendered them ineffective, they had been emboldened in this course of action by the French government which "had . . . (a) duty to make war on these follies" but "on the contrary supported them," by not expelling all pro-slavery officials from office.
Schoelcher widened his assault on officialdom to include the Spanish and American governments which were equally accountable for slavery in areas under their jurisdiction. When Columbus bound into servitude the inhabitants of the Spanish Caribbean he was "only following the examples of his sovereigns" who had made chattels of the Moors and were later to let Cortez put the Mexicans in chains. He denounced the U.S. government for the Compromise of 1850 which amounted to "tightening the chains of slavery." He accused the United States of countenancing servitude's expansion when the Federal government made no effort to block the filibustering expeditions of 1850-1 by General Narciso Lopez and his American followers. (The purpose of these ventures was the annexation of Cuba, a slave island, to the United States.) Writing to Edgar Quinet in 1862, Schoelcher commented on "the maintenance of slavery by Washington," insisting that Federal support for it led to the Civil War. In the same letter he expressed his conviction that all "evil" came "from above", from governments and never from the people.

Looked at in perspective, Schoelcher's conviction that France was the prime culprit as far as slavery was concerned was unbalanced. Certainly, French monarchs and officials had founded and maintained the institution up to the beginning of the nineteenth century--as the evidence Schoelcher compiled showed. However, Louis XVIII, Charles X, Louis Philippe and their ministers were not pro-slavery. They hesitated to take the bold step and abolish slavery because they were beset by numerous influences which advised against it: the French ports, above all Nantes and Bordeaux, felt any interference with slavery might jeopardize their prosperity; the colonies, of course, exerted tremendous pressure for basically the same reasons. Caught between these groups and the anti-slaveryites it
is no surprise that their position seemed an uncertain one. However, the gradualist measures which they did sponsor—as ineffectual as they were—"paved the way for abolition." 76

At any rate, the ameliorative laws of 1840 and 1845, in his opinion had been made a mockery of. The slaves were aware of this, and Schoelcher cautioned in 1847 that they might revolt. 77 Actually he had likened the colonies to a "volcano" as early as 1841, following British emancipation, which, he advised, put the French slaves in a violent frame of mind. 78 Signs of their anxiety even then were many—especially their escapes in droves to nearby Dominique in spite of a French naval blockade. Schoelcher wisely put the meaning of these flights into concrete terms when he spoke of the costs of maintaining this fleet: "millions more francs (were) required to keep the Negroes in slavery... than to set them free." 79

The situation in 1847, though, was far more ominous as Schoelcher quoted letters from several colonos full of apprehension as they recounted several local uprisings. The blacks had a perfect right to protest against servitude in this manner and he held "as absurd and dangerous every credo which would deny the oppressed this right." 80 Similarly, Schoelcher, condoned transgression of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 in the United States suggesting that no one needed to obey it, for the statute was contrary to "the purest, most elementary notions of... justice" and "universal morality." 81

Naturally, black uprisings involved an additional danger—the loss of the colonies for France—for the rebels might turn themselves over to England or proclaim their own independence as happened in Haiti. Schoelcher, despite his "let the colonies perish rather than our principles" slogan, was alarmed by this possible loss and he consistently submitted pleas to the colonos to abolish slavery in order to forestall either possibility. 82
Regardless of his recognition of the prerogative of the blacks to use force, he always counseled against violence. His techniques for achieving emancipation were conventionally legal and democratic: he would maneuver the French government into a position where it had to abolish slavery because public opinion was so favorable to emancipation. His own writings and vigorous agitation by anti-slavery societies using the petition were his two principal weapons in arousing general resentment. He reasoned that France could "not hesitate" to free the blacks "the day public opinion" would "express itself in unison" against servitude. This theory was based on the Schoelcherian premise that England would never have done away with slavery save for repeated public pressure. Another means of provoking general distaste for the institution was to lift the colonial censorship for this would bring the masters' crimes into the open and perhaps even compel overseas authorities to obey the law and not the colons.

When the government could evade the issue no longer and would have to destroy slavery, Schoelcher had a number of instructions for the reconstruction of colonial society which he had spelled out as early as 1841, and added to or subtracted from in the years following.

He had long before identified the most trying problems of reconstruction in the French colonies: Negro dislike of agricultural pursuits, the fate of the sugar industry and the opposition of the whites. His remedies in 1833 for the first two seemed ineffectual—he had argued on behalf of emigration to the colonies of industrious white laborers who would set an example that the Negroes could not fail to profit by, and free trade which would somehow, in the long run, reduce sugar production costs. His recommendations for dealing with the colons had consisted in
a reduction of their power in judicial and religious matters—a more concrete approach than were the others.

Probably Schoelcher's 1833 solution for the problem of the sugar industry was inadequate since he did not really understand colonial history. Cane sugar was the key to colonial prosperity as it was by far the largest cash crop in the French possessions. Until 1789, the sugar industry waxed prosperous. In fact on the eve of the Revolution, France was the world's largest sugar supplier, outproducing her nearest rival, England by 40%.  

The Napoleonic wars proved disastrous for cane sugar. With the inauguration of the Continental System and the English blockade, sugar exports to Europe literally ceased. Napoleon at this juncture took a fatal step by lending aid to a nascent beet sugar industry within France to compensate for the loss of the cane variety.

Although beet sugar had had its precarious moments, it eventually throve, and became a prime competitor of cane. Total beet sugar production in 1812 was 2,000,000 kilograms; in 1836, 35,000,000; and by 1847 it had risen to 64,000,000. Meanwhile importations of colonial sugar had increased on an average from 79,000,000 kilograms for the years 1827-1836 to 84,5000,000 for 1837-1846. But, and this is crucial, the price for sugars of all varieties averaged 50% lower for the twenty year period after 1828.

Actually sugar prices had been falling in France ever since 1815, and between that date and 1822 the drop amounted to 11%. This was traceable mainly to Indian and Spanish sugar which, it seemed, found a considerable market within France. In 1822, both these rivals were, however, expelled by a high protective tariff.
It should cause no surprise that the colonies complained bitterly about governmental or private intrusions on behalf of the slaves, given their deteriorating economic situation. Any tampering with the "peculiar institution" could in their eyes result in additional hardship. Needless to say, they regarded beet sugar interests as the propagators of such philanthropy. Small wonder, too, that they pleaded for free trade and to end mercantilism which would enable them to purchase goods cheaper than those in France.

By 1841, Schoelcher began to display a clearer understanding of the social and economic problems which would result from abolition. In that year he counseled the enactment of a high protective tariff to keep out foreign sugar, which despite the measure of 1822, was still entering France, presumably from Puerto Rico or possibly the Philippines where it was grown and produced at costs far below those in French colonies, and whose price then was proportionately lower. Simultaneously, he stressed the utilitarian qualities of an indemnity for the masters, so that they would be able to pay the blacks their wages as free laborers. He went on and explained that though it had "always been illegitimate" to own human property, it had "always been legal." So they had a claim to this kind of compensation. Most significantly, he advised that beet sugar interests should be bought out by France. In other words the industry needed to be destroyed, for it was only an "accessory" to France, while cane sugar was "vital to the existence of the colonies"—a view to which Schoelcher consistently held. The Abolition Committee did not go this far, but it did suggest such a high tax on beet sugar that one member of the committee exclaimed, "the beet-root is dead."
In 1846-7, he had an additional, and again, realistic solution for sugar's post-slavery dilemma. He counseled the division of the sugar industry into its component parts—cultivation and manufacture. (It was then standard practice for each plantation to combine both functions—an expensive and wasteful proposition because it involved the employment of antiquated equipment.)

One final bit of Schoelcherian advice concerning cane sugar came in 1848 when he mentioned the necessity of expropriating indebted land and making certain that those who received it, the creditors or their designated, be enterprising, non-speculative men.

The problem of Negro dislike for agricultural labor was, of course intimately connected to that of cane sugar. And here again, Schoelcher, in 1841, began to apply common sense instead of theories. In fact his program of that year showed considerable apprehension lest this black revulsion for field work ruin reconstruction, since it contained several coercive features. The Negroes would have to sign government-supervised contracts of six months to a year with their ex-masters. These agreements called for the blacks to work nine hours each day, five days per week. If they failed to so engage themselves, broke the contracts, or were absent from their jobs at harvest times they could be sentenced to varying periods in the workhouse. There were similar penalties for vagabondage and pauperism, which was "inexcusable" in the colonies. Food thefts were to be severely punished. Nature was so abundant in the tropics that it was easy "to sustain oneself on fruit picked (stolen) along the way," a situation very deleterious to good work habits.

There were less coercive features to this program, figurative signposts dotting the colonial landscapes which extolled the virtues of agrarian labor. Textbooks were used in schools to emphasize the holiness
of such work, and it would even be a good idea, Schoelcher reasoned, to have plots of ground near schools which the children might cultivate for physical recreation. Savings banks would be created, and they would "encourage" the blacks to labor harder when they realized their deposits would accrue interest. Finally, there were to be special holidays, "fêtes d'agriculture," at which prizes of money or land would be rewarded to the most productive Negro.

By 1848, Schoelcher had toned down the coercive features in this earlier scheme, and was probably moved to do so by high opinion of Negro aptitude for work in the British colonies. (It will be seen in the ensuing chapter that Schoelcher regarded the freedmen in the British colonies as industrious and hard-working.) As a member of the Abolition Committee he no longer proposed government supervised contracts between the blacks and colons. Now, the Negroes themselves should bargain individually with prospective employers, and France would interfere only if things were "turning to the disadvantage" of the blacks. True enough, he continued to recognize the need for disciplinary workshops, but he fought against stringent follow-up measures such as the livret or pass book, a record of an individual's job performance. He also looked on a daily thirty centime wage as sufficient to keep a worker out of the disciplinary atelier, while most of his fellow Committee members favored a sixty centime figure, and he even stipulated that those Negroes who had an independent income need not work, and so would avoid confinement in a workhouse. He seemed to regard as far more important that France set up a non-disciplinary atelier for those who could not find work. Such an establishment he praised as the implementation of Louis Blanc's right to work credo.
As presiding officer of the Abolition Committee, Schoelcher was consistently badgered by the colons or their representatives to recommend contract labor schemes, comparable though severer than his of 1841. However, he resisted their entreaties. On one occasion in answer to a colon from Réunion who demanded forced labor, on the grounds that otherwise the blacks would merely fish or hunt, Schoelcher angrily stated that if the Negroes preferred to support themselves in this way, they should be free to do so. This episode brings into sharp focus his preoccupation with slavery as a moral issue; its practical problems had been and always would be secondary. There is one further proof of this: his insistence that all slaves who came on French territory should be immediately confiscated by officials and freed. He demanded this over the objections of his colleagues, who warned him that if this principle were applied, French commerce would be hurt, since Senegal chieftains who purchased goods from French outposts like Goreé were wont to bring their slaves to these places to carry out their purchases.

However, he still was concerned with the Negro's attitude toward work, for if he had muted his coercive projects, he again praised such devices as the fêtes d'agriculture and schoolbooks sanctifying agrarian pursuits. Taxes in 1848 he also regarded as an "inducement to work."

Taxation, however, fulfilled another function for "it had the advantage of accustoming them quickly to the duties of their new condition," as Schoelcher wrote in 1841. This was a clear reflection of his conviction that there could be no intermediate period between slavery and freedom and that Negroes could learn about liberty only by being free. They would also be invited to join the police, another way of "interesting them in the establishment of order" and of "getting them to lend their
support to it." Schoelcher went much further than this, even in 1841, and urged the assimilation of the colonies to French law, specifically favoring the extension of French electoral and office holding requirements to the colonies. 110

In 1848, he enlarged on this assimilation program so that he would permit blacks to be jury members, even if they could not read or write. He was now ready to extend complete freedom of the press to the colonists, despite the warnings of other members of the Abolition Committee that such journals would remain or come under white control. Schoelcher even fought against a government-sponsored paper on the grounds that it would be costly and represent a form of censorship. 111

This should not lead to the conclusion that Schoelcher was not alert to the danger that the whites might disrupt reconstruction or seek to revive slavery. On the contrary he was anticipating either possibility as early as 1841 when he explained that to combat them, he favored assimilation in order to help break the colonial "oligarchy". 112 Securing Negro suffrage and making them eligible for office were steps in this direction.

Seven years later he spelled out more fully this assimilative plan for checking the whites. The entire colonial governmental structure and its appendages--the colonial councils, the governorships, and the delegations in France--were to be suppressed, with the expectation that the National Assembly would then model their internal regimes after that of France. The latter should also allow colonial representatives in her legislative bodies. In the interim period the colonies were to be ruled by Commissioners sent from France--as creoles could not impartially perform this task. 113 Once again upholding the Negroes' right to vote, Schoelcher
cautioned that if they could not exercise it, elections would be abandoned "to the enemy" (the whites). To guarantee that they did not go against their own interests and cast their ballots for the enemy, Frenchmen sympathetic to the Negro cause should be sent to advise them.  

Assimilation was not the only technique to restrain the whites. Educating the blacks was another, and it represented "the surest means of making them able to defend themselves against . . . every political change which would tend to plunge them back into servitude." Again in 1848 education in this respect was "the most indispensable element to the success of emancipation."  

On occasions Schoelcher was quite specific as to his fears concerning the whites. His suspicions usually centered on attempts they would make to import immigrant labor from Africa. In reality this was merely "slavery in disguise," for he theorized that any blacks who came to the colonies under such an arrangement did so against their will. Why, he asked, would Africans go to a "territory" which had always perpetuated cruelties toward their race. On these grounds he opposed immigrant labor in the English colonies, though he amended his opposition somewhat, indicating African workers could be brought in forty or fifty years after emancipation or when the liberty of the indigenous blacks was "firmly established." In 1848, Schoelcher repeated his objections, for in Africa such goings-on "would be considered as a continuation of the trade."  

Schoelcher proposed placing a similar ban on emigrations by the ex-slaves after abolition. His reason for the restriction was quite straightforward, for he stated that they would not have been free long enough to "know right from wrong."
That the Negroes were still inept explained also why Schoelcher never tried to put into practice any of his utopian socialist ideals. He frequently made favorable allusions to Saint-Simon and Fourier.\(^{121}\) Leonard Sainville said of Schoelcher that "Fourier's doctrine seems particularly to have seduced his imagination . . ."\(^{122}\) No better proof of Sainville's contention can be found than Schoelcher's remarks on phalanstères in Des Colonies where he said that such organizations left "little to be desired." However, he submitted that they were unthinkable in the colonies, for the blacks were so debased by ignorance that they would be unable to comprehend "the mechanics of such an association."\(^{123}\) His affection for phalanstères persisted up until 1848 when he welcomed collective work by the Negroes, but warned that it had to be "voluntary".\(^{124}\) He apparently foresaw a time when they would be practicable, on "a day" when the "sentiment of universal brotherhood was stronger."\(^{125}\)

This latter sentence suggests that the distinguishing trait of Schoelcher as a mature abolitionist was realism. He was being realistic when he counseled immediate abolition because ameliorative programs did not work, in France's possessions, and there was at least some truth to his negative appraisal of transitional periods, since apprenticeship did not go well in England's largest colony, Jamaica. This appraisal was enforced by the clear cut success of immediate emancipation in Antigua.

Certainly too, he was far more down to earth in his propositions for dealing with colonial reconstruction in these later years. His assimilative projects particularly revealed him as a man fully aware of the dangerous potentialities of reconstruction.

Yet the powerful strain of idealism in his character persisted. Of course, he no longer prescribed laissez-faire dogma as a cure for colonial
ills, but he still could declare heatedly that the blacks "had every right" to raise bloody insurrections and that all good Americans should disobey the Fugitive Slave Law. Or, and this is most striking, if it was necessary for the colonies to be ruined to accomplish emancipation, "let the colonies perish rather than our principles." However his realism prevailed over such heated sentiments because, as has been shown, he always followed them up by indicating that he did not advocate violence, and did not want to lose the colonies.

These were contradictions of a sort in Schoelcher and were part of his nature. Ernest Legouve wrote that his character was "steeped in contradictions:" that he was a foe of the death penalty, but devoted to Robespierre; that he was an opponent of Christianity but honored what he considered its underlying principle; and, that he was calm and dispassionate at one moment and a "raging tiger" the next. 126

Apparently in the 1840's slavery which heretofore brought out only the "raging tiger" in him, also caused his cool and rational side to appear.
CHAPTER III

THE SOCIOLOGIST OF RACE
That Schoelcher would say as late as 1848 that the Negroes did not know right from wrong indicated a certain lack of confidence in the race—which had persisted over the years, his conversion to immediate abolitionism notwithstanding. From this point of view, he had something in common with racists and slaveholders who exhibited the same lack of faith in the blacks. But here the similarity of views ended for Schoelcher had held as early as 1830\(^1\) that any Negro inferiorities were the natural results of slavery, while the others looked upon them as innate. Schoelcher had early labeled such an outlook as prejudice, and had fought against it in *De l'Esclavage des Noirs* by pointing out Negro achievements in Africa before enslavement. Continuing this line of argument in later works, he expanded his attack on prejudice with biological and analogical arguments. Most importantly, he submitted in rebuttal to prejudice the Negroes' performances as free men in the English colonies and as slaves elsewhere.

Schoelcher was later to show that the only reason for prejudice was to buttress slavery. Those who surmised that it was rooted in an inherent inferiority in the Negro race were wrong. Schoelcher brought forth the findings of scientists which revealed the Negro as a member of the human species and just as capable of intellectual development as the whites.\(^2\) If Negroes were stupid it was because they were slaves, or if they were free, because they were deprived of education and training by discriminatory practices. To prove this contention, Schoelcher made an analogy between slaves and serfs. Serfs like Negroes had been described
"as almost entirely devoid of . . . intellectual faculties," but they were white not black! Whatever mental deficiencies that afflicted the blacks, stemmed from their environment and not from racial characteristics.³

Most of Schoelcher's evidence in support of Negroes rested on their past and present performances as a cultured race. He drew considerable testimony from African travelers—some of whom he had already cited⁴ and others whom he seemingly used for the first time namely Barbot, Bruce, Clapperton, Denham, Hornemann, Hoskins, Lander, Park, Rose and Stedman, all of whom wrote more or less appreciatively of African Negroes.⁵ At least two of these—Park and Bruce—he employed so extensively that they deserve brief comment. Mungo Park toured Gambia from 1795-97 as the representative of a commercial association. He agreed to take the job because of an intense curiosity about Africa and a desire to make the continent better known.⁶ From Park, Schoelcher picked up various bits of information about the civilization of African Negroes: for example, that in the realm of Bambara (in Gambia) they had governmental systems on the local level comparable to those in Europe, while the Mandingo tribe in Bambara made musical instruments, including a harp of eighteen chords.⁷ One statement by Park can lead one to believe that Schoelcher may have drawn upon him for more than simply factual data: in describing the Mandigoes as highly civilized he noted:

"In the account which I have thus given of the natives, the reader must bear in mind that any observations apply chiefly to persons of free condition . . . the other three-fourths are in a state of hopeless and hereditary slavery."⁸

The other African traveler used extensively by Schoelcher, James Bruce, spent four years in Africa from 1768-72, most of them in Abyssinia where he was searching for the sources of the Nile. Bruce observed that
the Abyssinians made a "very good beer" and an "inferior" brand of gun-
powder—which must have impressed Schoelcher. One of Bruce's contentions--
that Egyptian civilization was spawned by the Abyssinians who had built
the city of Thebes—Schoelcher apparently put great store by, as he
noted it carefully in Abolition de l'Esclavage and took great pains to
verify it.

In his quest for verification, Schoelcher relied chiefly on two
Greek historians, Diodorus and Herodotus, both of whom claimed the anter-
iority of Abyssinian over Egyptian society. Diodorus called the Abyssinians
"the first of all men" and the Egyptians he viewed as "colonists sent
out by the Ethiopians." Herodotus found the Colchians, an Egyptian
people with black skin and wooly hair, descendants of the Abyssinians.
No wonder that Schoelcher could say: "Herodotus and Diodorus agree (d)
in seeing in some Ethiopian emigration the beginning of the ancient
civilization of Thebes." As further proof of Bruce's theory, Schoelcher
offered his personal experiences at the Louvre where he saw that: "The
face of the Sphinx is of Negro type; the heads of the mummies are completely
like Negroes' heads (with) thick lips, flat nose, low forehead, prominent and square."

Nevertheless, Schoelcher claimed neither complete vindication for
the Bruce theory, nor a high cultural level for the Negro race as a whole:

We won't press the proposition about the anteriority
of African civilizations any farther; it would be out of
place here; and we don't have...the knowledge...to answer
such a question. We only wanted to point it out so that
the colons, who never stop harping on the native stupidity
of the blacks, (would see) that there were very knowledgeable
men who found blacks able enough to consider them as the
torch bearers of humanity.--One more word: when we speak
of the Ethiopian example, we're not pretending that it can
be extended to all of Africa; we've seen enough...to show
that one Negro group has been civilized, which does not
prove, that is clear, that the entire race has been, but
that it is capable of being so civilized, and this last
point is the only one our researches are tending towards.
However, he went on, if all African societies were not up to European standards, it was not to be forgotten that Rome, to which Europe owed so much of its heritage, never penetrated the African interior and so made no cultural impression there. Taking into account this fact and the rigors of the environment—the continent's intemperate climate, especially—one should have a healthy respect for what the Negroes there had done: "In spite of so many terrible circumstances, in spite of a climate whose fertility invite[d] eternal repose, the Negroes, left alone to their own devices, deprived of outside help . . . elevated themselves . . . ."17

Schoelcher did not limit himself to the Negroes' conduct in the distant past or in Africa. In addition, he favorably surveyed their more recent achievements, both as slaves and as free men away from their original homeland. In so doing, he revealed for the first time, curiously enough, contact with the writings of one of France's best known foes of slavery, Abbé Grégoire.18 De la littérature des Nègres (Paris, 1808), Grégoire's outstanding anti-slavery piece, was a complementary compilation of Negro literature and from it Schoelcher drew information on Juan Francisco Manzano. Manzano who had been a slave in Cuba, eventually made his way to Holland, learned four languages, and wrote poetry and drama. He ended his career as a member of the Prussian State Council.19

Those not so fortunate or able as Manzano, the enslaved blacks of the French colonies, nevertheless, as a group, displayed susceptibilities to civilization. In Des Colonies, Schoelcher depicted them as seldom stealing and as having a taste for good things, such as gourds, the only things provided them for eating and drinking. Like all members of the human species Negroes had an "instinct" for luxury.20
This favorable image of the blacks was not effaced by the fact that they also resorted to poison as a weapon against their owners. The use of poison was not a sign of some sadistic streak ingrained in the Negro personality, but rather was a built-in feature of servitude, as indispensable to the institution as the whip. Just as the whites had to utilize the latter to get work from their charges, so the blacks dosed their overseers cattle (or the whites themselves) with poison to prevent excessive cruelties. Poison was in this respect, Schoelcher admitted, a "moral force." 21

Even during 1845-7 when Schoelcher was putting together Histoire de l'Esclavage pendant Les Deux Dernières Années and portraying the slaves as seething with rage, he still took time to recount glimpses that he had had of their good character. While conceding that they seldom married (because, as he explained in Abolition slavery and marriage were incompatible), Schoelcher did say of many slaves who were heads of families, that they showed strong loyalties to their spouses and children. Some males, for example, who had fled to sanctuary in the English colonies came back voluntarily to slavery out of filial love or devotion to their wives. 22

The destructive earthquake which hit Guadeloupe in 1843 23 occasioned other examples of the slaves' humanity. They performed acts of heroism during the episode, and voluntarily contributed to a relief fund afterwards. Some of the free blacks on the island were no less praiseworthy, for they agreed not to take advantage of the situation and agitate for wage increases which they might have done considering the sudden augmentation in the need for labor after the earthquake. Schoelcher wondered that a race capable of "such sacrifices" could "dare to be declared unfit for independence." 24
The freedmen in the English colonies were also scrutinized closely by Schoelcher who found their conduct quite satisfactory. There was, of course, some difficulty in getting them back to cultivating sugar, but as was cited earlier, Schoelcher considered this only a "temporary" phenomenon which was "already beginning to disappear." Furthermore he considered the 25% drop in sugar production to be slight and, in fact, sufficient proof of the blacks diligence and productivity.26

Schoelcher premised his supposition that the black aversion for work was dissipating on the fact that they were buying land. He pointed to statistics which showed the number of small landowners (those who owned forty acres or less) had increased throughout the British West Indies by 400% between 1838-1840. That they were able to accumulate land in this fashion stemmed from their thriftiness, witness the deposits to the amount of L 7,400 in Jamaican banks, where incidentally the ex-slaves paid their taxes on time and in full.27

Indeed, outside of their understandable reluctance to work, their performance had been exemplary. The crime rate in Dominique, Jamaica, and Antigua had been negligible since total emancipation. On Jamaica, such law-abiding behavior was "all the more meritorious" as there were no police on the island when emancipation took place. So trustworthy and peaceful were the Negroes of Antigua that the British drastically reduced the size of the garrison there almost immediately after abolition.28

The blacks, Schoelcher discovered, were literally flocking to school. On Dominique as of 1840 there were 2,000 of all ages receiving primary education. The Antiguan Negroes were even more interested in education for 6,600 of their race were attending school in 1840. There, the blacks were already showing the effects of this training because their attitudes toward
the whites was characterized by courtesy and respect. On Jamaica the most important statistic of this sort pertained to marriages, which had increased probably by as much as twenty-fold since freedom. 29

Negro leaders in independent Haiti were also proof of the race's good qualities. Schoelcher was objective in his opinion of them—notably Toussaint and Henri Christophe. 30 They were both ruthless and ambitious but able military and administrative leaders. 31 Later he wrote a full scale biography of Toussaint in which the latter emerged as an ingenious, hard-fighting warrior who defeated all of France's enemies on the island, a capable engineer and a wise administrator who got the blacks back to the sugar plantations. 32 But he thereafter became a figure "corrupted by power" who established a despotism on the island. This, however, did not prove that Louverture's career was not a "brilliant protest" against the stereotype of the Negro as an inferior being. 33

However, the general citizenry of Haiti at least in more recent times had not performed particularly well. When Schoelcher saw the island in 1841, 34 it was laboring under a "spiritual and material debility." Out of a total population of 700,000 only 1,000 attended school. The majority of Haitians spent their time stealing, imbibing their country's biggest product, rum, or practicing a strange kind of Christianity by which they sacrificed animals, apparently to the indifference of the priests who were a corrupt and licentious gang. They certainly did not occupy themselves with constructive tasks, for their roads were a disgrace, their cities run down, tropical diseases abounded, and sugar production was at its nadir. Blissfully unconcerned with this deterioration, the natives survived on bananas plucked from trees. 35
The inhabitants were not to blame for this state of affairs, Schoelcher esteemed the Haitians as "polite, thoughtful, respectful and hospitable" and he recorded that they were endowed with a "profound respect . . . for family ties." This was best exhibited by the care and attention they gave their antecedents' gravestones, which in themselves were remarkable, and bespoke of a "civilization as advanced and as fastidious as there can be."36 Their low estate was a consciously contrived policy of their president, General Jean Pierre Boyer.37

Boyer was a veritable dictator who, to retain power, carefully kept the masses from education which would give them a sense of their dignity. He abandoned them to a corrupt clergy in whom they had faith but who "demoralized them." He encouraged laziness and ignorance which respectively, weakened the body and impoverished the mind, so that they could not even contemplate the idea of taking power. The Haitian people "encouraged in their indolent instincts"--instincts "common to all people"--were fond of Boyer's regime because it "flattered their voices, became completely degenerate, and exceedingly easy to manipulate."38

Under such conditions general discontent was rare and the few individuals who were dissatisfied were afraid of compromising themselves and their relations by speaking out. What few "noble spirits" were still around and protested would be very quickly crushed by a large army whose affections had been bought by Boyer and whose stupidity assured its blind obedience. Should mass dissatisfaction ever have appeared, Boyer would channel it against some foreign power by raising the cry that the nation intended to re-enslave Haiti. Whether true or not, the charge would be believed by the island inhabitants who feared invasion constantly and deeply.39
Boyer put especially effective use to racial prejudice—in this case the mutual hostility between the mulattoes and Negroes—in tightening his dictatorship. This antagonism was rooted in a certain sense of intellectual superiority felt by the mulattoes over the blacks. Naturally this sense of intellectual superiority was a derivative of the racial bias which the French colonists legated to that unfortunate land. Boyer blocked any coming together of the mulattoes and blacks which would have caused his downfall, by playing on this hostility, and putting each group against the other.  

The hatred between Negroes and mulattoes had reached an early and violent climax during the Revolution of '89 on Haiti when the mulattoes opposed emancipation and even took up arms against the slaves. It persisted after independence from France was declared, and was the "fundamental vice" which kept the "young republic from rising." The mulattoes were just as poor on the whole and as ill-educated as the blacks, but their sense of superiority gave them consolation, and prevented fraternization with the Negroes. Should some altruistic mulatto have called Boyer a tyrant and demanded a true republic, the dictator would have warned the other mulattoes that there was a traitor in their midst, one who wanted the blacks to "devour them."  

Schoelcher here had sketched a rather good picture of totalitarian societies as they developed in the twentieth century. Zenophobia, prejudice, superstition and ignorance were tools which Stalin and Hitler employed in building their regimes. He did, of course, declare that there was justification for Haiti's zenophobia and militarism—for there was a genuine fear of an attack from without, which would rob the republic of its independence and bring back slavery.
All these discourses on Negroes, free or slave, pointed up Schoelcher's contention that if they had not done well, this was not due to innate racial shortcomings. Prejudice, then, could not be maintained on these grounds. Why then did it exist?

Prejudice was a necessity, he asserted in a slavery society where the masters and bondsmen differed racially. The slaves greatly outnumbered the masters and might overwhelm them unless they were convinced that they could not succeed. Prejudice served to convince them that their rebellions would fail because it taught them that they were an inferior race and the whites virtually supermen. "The well-being of the masters . . . in the midst of black slaves three-hundred times their number dwelt in the myth of the superiority over the latter and . . . in the second myth of the inability of the blacks ever to acquire that superiority." Where slavery existed without these racial differences—in the Orient for example—prejudice was unnecessary.43

Furthermore, Schoelcher continued, prejudice was indispensable to modern slavery and its defenders as a means of justifying an out-dated, barbaric form of labor. The slavery of antiquity was a "recognized condition of social existence, and . . . the free (individual) ceasing to be (free) accepted his lot as an unhappy but normal fact." On the contrary, nineteenth century servitude was an anachronism, an "exceptional" situation—since man had risen above such inhumanity—and to induce the blacks to resign themselves to chains, it was mandatory that they be "degraded in their own eyes." The French government seemed cognizant of this fact, for laws enacted for the colonies legalized prejudice.44
For prejudice to accomplish its purpose of stilling slave complaints it had to apply to all with any Negroid blood in their veins, to free Negroes and free mulattoes, as well. So it followed as a "logical necessity" that these two groups had to feel "degradation," "a sense of ignominy" and should never "be able to aspire to equality with those of the noble class." Therefore the colonists looked upon legislation that had been enacted for the benefit of the free blacks and mulattoes—notably the law of April 24, 1833 which extended civil and (limited) political rights to all free men in the colonies—as anathema and blocked any attempt at its enforcement. This could be shown, Schoelcher maintained, by the fact that in 1841, eight years after the law had gone into effect, no free black or mulatto could inherit from a white, attend white schools or receive letters of patent. The persistence of discrimination in spite of the law was galling to all free non-whites so that they now felt a bitter hostility towards the white man. In fact, Schoelcher explained, the free Negroes and mulattoes on the one hand, and the whites on the other "hate (d) and detest (ed) each other."45

In spite of this hostility the dominant feeling among all free blacks and mixed bloods toward whites was inferiority. To overcome it, both groups resorted to ridiculous and sometimes harmful extremes. Some mulattoes tried to establish themselves as descendants of the aborigines. In the main, both groups sought relief by identification with the whites. Many mulatto women gladly surrendered to white men whose attentions "flattered them." Indeed such females preferred "to lend themselves to an old and undistinguished white rather than a mulatto." Non-white, free males pursued a largely self-destructive
course in their efforts to identify with whites. They shunned field labor because it was "slaves' work." In this way they acquired a sense of equality with the whites who also scorned agricultural pursuits. Liberty to them, then, was "a sort of noble title." Yet by refusing to participate in field labor, they probably had no employment or income since this was the only occupation generally permitted them by the codes of prejudice. So to their miserable psychological state was added the burden of a kind of self-enforced poverty. Schoelcher doubted the adequacy of such vicarious satisfactions, and branded as futile any efforts to achieve a genuine sense of equality with whites. The latter were an exclusive aristocracy which none save those with white skin might penetrate. While within this elite group there was a certain equality, for all whites had to be admitted and regardless of "whatever they had been they had the nobility of skin" and were "forced to respect one another." 46

The craving for identification with the whites led to a fatal division between the mulattoes and free blacks. The mixed bloods prided themselves on not being totally black, or their hair not being kinky, and looked down on Negroes who did possess such traits. Schoelcher was highly critical of this attitude of the mulattoes as it showed that they, too, were "warped by....prejudice." In fact "they ought to be reproached for not having been more aware of the lessons of misfortune, of not loving their fellow sufferers at all." This division between them was fatal, in Schoelcher's opinion, for if they were to collaborate, and if both would divest themselves of their contempt for the slaves and present a united
front on behalf of all colored peoples, they could secure true liberty for all: "it (was) in such an alliance that their real emancipation lay." The secret of white strength was their unity; "the clue to the weakness of the Negro and mulatto causes was their disunity." 47

Since prejudice was a concomitant of slavery, Schoelcher optimistically prognosticated in 1840 that if servitude were abolished, the blacks educated and allowed to rise to positions of prominence in various professions, prejudice would disappear. The whites, seeing the blacks "equal to us in politics, science, savoir-faire, elegance, dignity," would discard their bias and, "justice would triumph, ignorance and wickedness would be overcome." 48

During the ensuing years, after French emancipation and indeed until the end of his life, Schoelcher held stoutly to this proposition, but his early optimism as to the ease of its realization faded, and was replaced by a pessimism already evident in his discussion of the survival of prejudice in Haiti. Here the chief villain had been Boyer who deliberately exploited and perpetuated the antipathy between Negroes and mulattoes. Most of the time, however, the culprits were the whites who, anxious always for total domination, fanned rather than cooled the flames of racial bias, and blocked Negro advances at every turn. Schoelcher, in 1849, related a first hand experience with the white obsession with supremacy in La Vérité aux Ouvriers et aux Cultivateurs de la Martinique. In this work he recounted the defeat in the electoral campaign for one of Martinique's seats in the National Assembly at the hands of C. C. A. Rissette. 49 Rissette, according to Schoelcher, was disappointed because he had not been appointed to the Abolition Committee by the Provisional Government. He then fell in with colons who planned to use him as a tool
to defeat Schoelcher's Martinique candidacy. This coalition was of course, only "circumstantial" based on Bissette's and "the colons' ambitions and rancors". Bissette wanted revenge against Schoelcher; the colons wanted immigrant or forced labor, which they reasoned they could not procure unless Schoelcher was defeated. The planters were, then, nostalgic for the old order when they were in complete control and could only see the blacks as a "sort of property" that they could do with as they would.50

To assure his defeat the colons and Bissette conducted a vicious campaign with race prejudice its dominant theme. To the whites of Martinique (and France) Schoelcher was portrayed as wanting domination for himself, the blacks and mulattoes, and as advocating communism, meaning wholesale redistribution of land to benefit the freed blacks. The mulattoes were led to believe that he was opposed to their best interests, while to the slaves the colons imparted the news that the mulattoes were their foes and that Schoelcher loathed Christianity, baptisms, favored incest and on the whole considered the blacks an inferior race that could be punished with the whip. All these groups were informed that Schoelcher was using force to try to win the election. In most of their campaign, then, the colons were playing up on the suspicions and hatreds between the three groups.51

Schoelcher's efforts to disprove such charges and to validate his thesis that they were merely part of a white plan for colonial domination were for the most part quite credible. He described himself as utterly ambitionless, otherwise why would he have resigned his post as Under Secretary of the Navy? (He was appointed to the post so he might have an official position in the government and thereby head the Abolition Committee. He resigned as soon as emancipation was proclaimed.) He wondered how the
colon could dare raise the cry of black and mulatto desires to run
Martinique when whites controlled over ninety per cent of all administrative
positions on the island, some of whom had been appointed by a mulatto, who
had also recently fired eleven mulattoes from the government. Moreover,
both mulattoes and blacks had been commended for their restrained orderly
behavior—conduct they would not have demonstrated had they been bent on
domination. He answered Bissette's charges that he was unfriendly toward
the mulattoes by recalling that if he accused that class of superiority
feelings towards the blacks in Des Colonies, he meant them no ill will
because he had shown that their bias was merely a reflection of the
prejudice codes essential to a slave society. 52

He confessed to his atheism, but in a soul-searching analysis for
its causes clearly left the impression that he was not urging all to
adopt this credo, and that he was no enemy of the priests or baptism. 53
And he again summoned his earlier writings to show that he had been mis-
interpreted when he was described by the colon as holding a low opinion
of the Negro race or approving the whip. In "Des Noirs" he had said the
blacks were inferior, but only on account of slavery. And while he had
agreed that the whip might be used in De l'Esclavage des Noirs, he had,
on the other hand, not given his blessing to the weapon but only argued
cooly and logically that it was an integral (but revolting) part of the
institution, which would lose strength without it. 54

To the colon argument that he was a communist, Schoelcher offered
in rebuttal his statements while he was the presiding officer of the
Abolition Committee, pointing out that he had not backed massive redistribu-
tion of property but merely some expropriation of indebted lands. As
to the charge that he advised his backers to use force to secure his
election in Martinique (Schoelcher remained in France), he offered an
uncategorical denial, asserting that he had "a horror of intimidation."
More convincing perhaps was his citation of a newspaper account (Progrès,
November 1, 1849, p. 1) that it was Bissette and his group who were
violent.55

In fact his main thesis—that the whites sought his defeat at the
polls and were not scrupulous about the means was well documented. Very
rarely did Schoelcher specifically mention his sources but they can be
found. He employed letters from eye witnesses. One of the latter re­
corded Bissette's arrival, his efforts against Schoelcher and the attacks
upon the emancipator in creole journals.56 Also on the scene in Martinique,
and indirectly corroborating Schoelcher, was his longtime correspondent
Abbé Dougoujon. The abbé reported persecution at the hands of local
whites for his Negrophilic activities and his removal, finally, as a
colonial priest.57 Following his defeat in June 1849, Schoelcher received
another piece of evidence from an observer in Martinique who claimed that
there was a party on the island bent on reviving slavery, or instituting
forced labor.58

Schoelcher's claims of his guiltlessness in the Martinique election
affair of 1849 and his impartiality towards all races were upheld by his
contemporaries and his most recent biographer.59 These vindications tend
to strengthen an image already formed of Schoelcher as a rigid, austere,
and ambitious man of principle—quite comparable in some respects to
William Lloyd Garrison. Ernest Legouvè confirmed this austerity which at
times must have made Schoelcher seem almost inhuman. His public espousals,
for example, of atheism as described by Legouve seemed much like a fanatic's acceptance of religion, so solemn and serious was Schoelcher's announcement. Yet, this austerity of character was relieved somewhat by reports that Schoelcher, a bachelor, was a "lady killer" who had frequent and fruitful encounters with females—further evidence of the man's contradictory nature.

The austere lady-killer disclosed that the whites—sometimes he accused only a few, other times all whites—driven by their craving for the old order and by scorn for the Negroes, continued to conspire to suppress the race. Their technique in its fundamentals remained the same—the exploitation of racial hatreds. They seemed most occupied after 1849 with arousing or intensifying white hatred toward the Negro in the colonies—"quarantining" and denouncing those few colons in sympathy with the blacks—and in France. In this way they hoped to prevent the mother country from putting into law bills benefitting the Negro race, and they also conjectured that France might be moved to repeal such existing legislation. So the colons as Schoelcher saw them, were really interested in eliminating or blocking legislation which would assimilate the colonies to France. Specifically, they strove to eliminate colonial universal suffrage and to obstruct proposals to extend the French jury system to the colonies.

The tactics devised to arouse white enmity were varied. Most of the time colons blew up out of all proportion a minor incident in order to give the impression that there was an enormous black or mulatto conspiracy afoot. Arson or looting committed by several persons or a crowd, a local rebellion in southern Martinique for independence and an outburst by a single Negro who feared the Count de Chambord would revive slavery if he was made king, were all distorted on various occasions by the colons
so as to resemble huge anti-white plots. Lacking incidents to exaggerate, the colonists manufactured them. Such was the case of the aforementioned attack on the Count de Chambord which was the climax to a train of events cleverly set in motion by scheming whites. The latter according to Schoelcher, wrote and circulated a letter which spoke darkly of mulatto vengeance against all whites—called the governor a lizard—and of course innocently swore the letter had been written by a mulatto. This set the white journals into a panic so that, they spoke of a general black uprising, which in turn alarmed the Negroes, one of whom committed the indiscretion against the Count de Chambord. 67

Schoelcher in all cases flatly denied the existence of any massive conspiracy and proved his point well. In nearly every case, he called forth official pronouncements by the administrators or colonial councils who doubted plots, reported the islands calm, and the Negroes at work. 68 He also claimed that it was absolutely illogical for the blacks to connive against the whites for they knew "perfectly well that an uprising would turn to the benefit of their enemies," as it would lead to a lost of their political rights. 69

When the colonists were unable to dream up imaginary conspiracies to harden the white opinion against the blacks, they resorted to other methods for accomplishing the same purpose. They would argue for example, that, the blacks, on Martinique, at any rate, did not vote in sufficient numbers, and that, hence, universal suffrage should be cancelled. In 1875, at least, this was of some concern to Schoelcher for he strongly advised the blacks to vote so as to avoid giving their enemies a "pretext" for depriving them of the right. 70 At the same time he explained to France the reasons for the meagre balloting, pointing to the "anti-liberal
administration" and the employers who took "every possible means" to dissuade Negroes from going to the polls. Furthermore, even if the whites did not interfere with black voting, the blacks on many occasions were at great distances from voting places, and had had the suffrage for so short a time they did not yet realize it was a duty to be faithfully accomplished.\textsuperscript{71} He also asserted that some of the clergy served the cause of the old guard by preaching against political activity on the grounds that it diverted the blacks from spiritual affairs, thus keeping some Negroes home on election days.\textsuperscript{72}

By 1881, the whites as Schoelcher portrayed them were at their wits' end and had become totally irrational in their efforts to revive by-gone days. They now refused to participate in colonial legislatures and screamed to France that they were under iron rule by the blacks. Schoelcher's cure for this ailment was simple: join the blacks in the colonial general council's sessions. Whites also hurled wild insults at administrators and magistrates who were friendly to the blacks, accusing them of catering to the latter when they refused to acknowledge black plots. Frenchmen (presumably Schoelcher) were vilified as seeking economic gains by wanting to extend colonial representation in the National Assembly.\textsuperscript{73}

Where did the fault lie, ultimately, for these continued manifestations of prejudice? Not with the colons, in the final analysis, as there were extenuating circumstances for their behavior, since "pride of caste . . . of all the aberrations of the human mind" was the "most difficult to eradicate."\textsuperscript{74} Rather--and this was to be expected of Schoelcher--it was with French government, or more accurately the regime of Napoleon III. The Provisional Government had done its best to crush prejudice by
inaugurating educational programs for the blacks and appointing them to office so that the whites would see their capabilities and "lose ... their ... objections" to the race. However, Napoleon III systematically undid all its good work by firing the blacks and reviving white administrative control—the result was "racial hostilities."\(^7\) 

Schoelcher still had some faith that if the program were carried out prejudice would disintegrate. (What concrete proposals he had in mind will be highlighted in the next chapter.) But he never conjured up those euphoric visions, as he had in 1840, of blacks and whites living amicably side by side. It should be apparent to the reader that his theories for dealing with prejudice coincided with the assimilative proposals he advanced in 1843 to check slavery's return. He seldom used the term assimilation after abolition but preferred "fusion" which he first employed in 1849. Whether or not Schoelcher meant miscegenation will never be known as he was silent on the subject.\(^7\) To win errant whites to fusion, Schoelcher issued pleas and warnings. If they did not permit fusion he cautioned that they would be subject to "anarchy," for when the blacks would have "no interest in maintaining order" they would constitute a "caste apart" given to violence.\(^7\) On the other hand, if the whites acquiesced in fusion both races would be better off, since they were "reciprocally necessary to each other" to "assure their joint prosperity."\(^7\) Yet Schoelcher was obviously gloomy about the possibility that the whites would ever concede that the colonies were not "exceptional areas" and that they were inhabited by peoples with no differences between them save those between the "bourgeoisie and working class," as his description of prejudice as the "most difficult of human aberrations" to eliminate suggested.
The fact that the doctrine of fusion, or assimilation, was at this time being discredited in France—chiefly because she was acquiring areas, namely Indo-China in which assimilation seemed impossible because of overwhelming ethnic differences—must have deepened his despair. Racism was also on the rise with the emergence of Social Darwinism which likewise chipped away at the support for assimilation. The other approach to organizing French colonies—association or regimes based on laws different from those of France—was employed in Madagascar in the 1890's and became the prevalent and most acceptable solution to overseas rule until the 1920's. 79

Schoelcher's estimation of the racial situation in the colonies was accurate. Although a bit overdrawn, it rested on a solid foundation of fact. 80 French colonial historians with one exception denied the existence of black conspiracies or did not care to mention them. Le Roy-Beaulieu was the only of these chroniclers to speak of black longings for "revenge" or for "oppressive domination," and he regretted the installation of universal suffrage. 81

Hanotaux and Martineau did not regard emancipation as having any general difficulties, and stated, somewhat nebulously, that "on the whole" the colonial population accepted the assimilative statutes of 1871. 82 Paul Gaffrel considered that prejudice did exist among the whites after emancipation and even later, while contending it was less noticeable on Reunion where fusion had met with the most success. 83 Girault's offerings most closely resembled Schoelcher's. He wrote that "out of pride" the whites abstained from participating in political affairs, and the mulattoes—who took over by virtue of their superior training—ran the governments creditably, so that there was little to fear from them. 84
It would also seem that the persistence of prejudice in other areas where slavery had once existed corroborates Schoelcher's analysis. In the British West Indies, it lingered on but apparently not to the same extent as in the French territories. Mathieson called attention to frequent marriages between Negroes and whites in Jamaica after 1838 as proof of harmonious race relations there. Over one-hundred years later Eric Dingwell minimized race bias, while acknowledging its existence on Jamaica. On the other hand, Dingwell found it stronger in the Barbadoes, and a very powerful factor in Trinidad. The proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute reveal that race prejudice was present between 1877-1905 in Jamaica and Trinidad at least. One participant in its sessions, who was not a colonist, in commending Negro diligence noted that his view was not the customary one in the West Indies. Testimony by a former governor of Trinidad in 1898-9 disclosed that he regarded the blacks as "loyal and good natured" but also superstitious. He finished his remarks, thankful that the blacks had "thicker skulls" than the whites and wooly hair, so that they were less bothered by tropical heat. Another Jamaican visitor recalled that the whites there were often criticizing the blacks for their want of character and incontinence. A very dispassionate witness said in 1906 that race relations in the West Indies were a "pleasing contrast" with those in the U.S. but added that they were nevertheless "highly strung", witness riots in Georgetown, British Guiana.

The extension of prejudice until the present day in the United States is well-known and need not be discussed here. One episode in American race relations, however remarkably paralleled Schoelcher's experiences in the 1849 Martinique election and therefore deserves to be mentioned.
C. Vann Woodward reported it in the *Strange Career of Jim Crow* when he called attention to similar divisive tactics used by the so-called Southern Bourbons (wealthy whites) to retain power.\(^7\)

One can make a case for Schoelcher anticipating the theories of a later analyst of the American racial scene. John Dollard in examining aggression by whites against blacks conjectured that it did not develop because there was objective evidence of Negro intrigues against them but because of the possibility of such plots existed as subjective realities in their minds. The whites, in Dollard's words, were haunted by a "fear of retaliation" for the sexual, economic and prestige "gains" made at the expense of suppression of the Negroes. To relieve anxieties of this sort they found it advisable to lash out from time to time at the Negro by lynchings or similar acts.\(^92\)

Schoelcher, as has been shown also recognized white desire for domination as the central clue to their cry of Negro machinations. He, too, reported senseless acts of injustice against them--ruinous fines, for example, levied on wealthy mulattoes after their trials for "conspiracies." These penalties were really punishment for their "defiance" toward the "dominant factions" a defiance which to the whites consisted merely in being reasonably well-off.\(^93\) Schoelcher did not precisely credit this fear of black intrigues with a psychological reality. Yet he nearly did so, calling them "imaginary fears" or a "detestable phantasmagoria."\(^94\) As an observer of racial relations, then, Schoelcher despite his partisanship, was perceptive and his conclusions do merit favorable comparisons with those of others of a much later date.
CHAPTER IV

SCHOELCHER AS A DEFENDER OF THE FREE
BLACKS, AND PROLETARIANS, AND IMPERIALISM
After his resignation as a member of the Provisional Government, Schoelcher entered the National assembly where he remained until 1851, representing first Martinique and then Guadeloupe. A staunch foe of Napoleon III, Schoelcher was angered and alarmed by his coup d'etat of 1851, joined an abortive insurrection against it, and finally was forced to flee France. Taking up residence first in Belgium and later England Schoelcher's activities until 1870 were confined to diatribes against Napoleon III and a biography of Handel. Following his return from exile in 1870 he re-entered that body until his selection in 1875 as Senator-for-life.

Undoubtedly, it was this new role as an active legislator (he continued, of course, to write profusely in an unofficial capacity) which forced him to broaden his interests, and not confine himself to race and slavery. Indeed, as deputy and senator, Schoelcher fully developed two interests which had long been latent in him. In the first place, he emerged as an imperialist—he had never been an opponent of expansion—of a very ardent sort. In Schoelcher's case, though, the adjective enlightened must be inserted before the noun imperialist, as he sought to protect and enhance the interests of the colonies and their inhabitants. In other words, Schoelcher took the doctrine of the "white man's burden" seriously and nearly always without hypocrisy.

In the second place, he turned his attention to social and economic problems closer to home. Prison conditions, hospitals for the indigent, and high-handed practices by the railroads—problems essentially of a
non-colonial nature—now became the objects of his humanitarianism.

His chief preoccupation, however, continued to be the status and stature of Negroes, free and enslaved, everywhere. For example, despite his pessimism concerning assimilation and fusion, alluded to several times in the last chapter, he never gave up spelling out their specific meanings in his efforts to uplift the former slaves of the French colonies.

In Schoelcher's view the colonial legal apparatus differed widely from that of France and needed to be brought into line with the latter. While a deputy in 1848, he requested that the jury system be instituted in the colonies in criminal cases but was not listened to. Criminal cases there were handled by so-called cours d'assises, comprised of three judges and four assesseurs (assistant judges) who determined guilt or innocence and passed sentence. Most of the court members were well-to-do whites, although the blacks had been made eligible by the abolition decree.

In 1851, following the conviction of twenty-one Negroes in Guadeloupe for conspiracy, Schoelcher denounced the cours d'assises as "imperfect, incomplete and unnatural." Twenty-two years later, in describing another trial of black "plotters" in Martinique he pointed out that several of the participating assesseurs were avowed racists, and again called for the introduction of the jury system.

In the same year he collaborated with three others on his most complete treatise on the subject, Le Jury aux Colonies. This was a deceptive title, for most of the book was a eulogy of black conduct since emancipation. Yet, Schoelcher et al did elaborate at length on the jury system, holding that it would not operate to the detriment of the whites, but would help "combat deadly race prejudice" by bringing
the races into contact with each other. Six years later, on July 27, 1880, a law establishing trial by jury in the colonies in criminal cases was finally promulgated. The steady pressure which Schoelcher brought to bear on the issue seems to have had some influence on his fellow legislators.

Colonial representation in French legislative bodies was another objective of his assimilative and fusionist schemes. Napoleon III had done away with the colonial deputies by decree of 1852. The Third Republic called them back by the law of September 15, 1870, and the colonies, save Guiana and Senegal, each sent one deputy to the National Assembly. In 1875, all colonies, again except for Senegal and Guiana, were allotted one senator. Four years later, though, the latter were each allowed one deputy. In 1881, the number of deputies for Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion was increased to two.

Schoelcher was generally in the thick of the fight on behalf of colonial representation. In an early statement, he opposed the demand of some overseas sugar planters that they be given special delegates outside the Assembly to watch after their interests. The reasoning behind their demand was that the regular deputies did not satisfactorily look after their interests. Schoelcher conceived of this suggestion as a return to the slavery era—when, of course, the masters had such spokesmen in France—and he chided their selfishness in wanting extraordinary privileges when their duly elected representatives were there to speak for all colonials.

The laws of 1875 and 1879, cited earlier, received his close attention, both in his official capacity as legislator, and as a polemicist. In each case, Schoelcher advanced proposals which went beyond what the
actual statutes provided. So, in 1875, before the National Assembly he not only approved senators for Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion, but also would have granted Guiana and Senegal one deputy apiece.\textsuperscript{11} He feared that unless the principle of representation was applied and extended, retrograde whites would resubjugate the blacks. Such colonists hid their true motives, naturally, in their opposition to colonial representation by claiming that it would be a means for black control. They also charged the Negroes with political ignorance, and cunningly argued that the colonies had "special interests" which French-based legislators could not treat properly. Behind these harangues lurked their desire to suppress the ex-slaves, and the first step in this direction would be the elimination of colonial representation. This would be followed by the dismantling of local, popularly-elected governments in the colonies. In addition, to unmasking these white plans, Schoelcher stoutly supported the case for colonial representation by pointing to the Negroes' contributions of men and material to the French cause during the Franco-Prussian War—this in rebuttal to the charges of ignorance and incompetence leveled at them.\textsuperscript{11}

Furthermore, he not only backed the 1879 statute providing representatives for Guiana and Senegal in the National Assembly, but also would have given them senators. Schoelcher's fear that unless the blacks were so represented they would be exploited by the whites again seemed to dictate such magnanimity, for he estimated that in so endowing these areas, France would be better able to keep an eye on the blacks' "social condition". Yet, he also suggested that by establishing such ties between herself and Senegal and Guiana, France could also encourage black "work habits". He was apparently still somewhat apprehensive on concerning reputed black laziness.\textsuperscript{12}
The legislative and legal rights of the blacks, then, along with universal suffrage—already discussed—\textsuperscript{13} were the prime ingredients of Schoelcher's assimilative and fusionist recipes. They were, however, not the only ones. The employment of Negroes in administrative positions he had earlier held of high importance.\textsuperscript{14} After 1848, he seldom busied himself in this area aside from registering occasional complaints against the white monopoly of such posts and requesting that the blacks be removed only for just cause.\textsuperscript{15}

On several occasions he spoke out on the desirability of bringing the colonial educational system more in line with that of France. Thus, he sponsored the extension of the Falloux law of 1850 to the colonies. He must have done so with misgivings, for while giving lip service to the principle of liberty of instruction the law was really designed to promote Catholic influence on education. Simultaneously, he advised his colleagues in the National Assembly to provide the colonies with their fair share of university scholarships, contending that to do so would "allow the poor to participate in the benefits of our fine colleges."\textsuperscript{16} It was apparent from such phrasing, that to Schoelcher it was not the colonies but the blacks who were not getting a square deal in this respect. This, he made quite clear in 1873 when he stated in \textit{La Grande Conspiration} that colonial students of "non-European" origin were receiving only 22\% of such grants while outnumbering their European competitors ten to one.\textsuperscript{17}

At times he detected what he regarded as discrimination in colonial schools. In one case cited (that of a Catholic seminary, the Séminaire - College de Fort de France in Martinique), he found that many blacks were denied admission on the grounds that they were illegitimate by birth. Schoelcher would not accept such a basis for scholastic eligibility and
thought it unfair to penalize children for the "sins of their fathers."\textsuperscript{18}

Even while exiled in England (and doing very little in connection with
the race issue) Schoelcher bemoaned the general lack of educational
facilities for blacks. In part, at least, he held Napoleon III responsible,
since the latter had taken a "false route" in his determination to get
the blacks to work, and by paying small heed to their schooling.\textsuperscript{19}

Other assimilative and fusionist schemes advanced by Schoelcher
involved the incorporation of the blacks in the French military establish­
ment and their respectable treatment as soldiers. Shortly after his first
election to the National Assembly, he held forth on the necessity of
giving black army recruits in Senegal first-class uniforms and equipment
in order that they might not feel inferior to the spit-and-polish of their
comrades-in-arms.\textsuperscript{20} In 1850, he spoke of admitting Negroes to the colonial
National Guards as a means of bringing the races closer together.\textsuperscript{21} Near
the end of his active legislative career, he advised extending the Military
Service Law of 1884 to the colonies, which would have made a tour of duty
in the army compulsory for colonial blacks. White foes of this project
he described as "endeavoring to render impossible every rapprochement
among the two classes."\textsuperscript{22} Yet, another assimilative notion of Schoelcher's
was the extension of the statute of 1884, legalizing labor unions, to
France's overseas territories. Seemingly, still concerned lest the blacks
be exploited, he introduced a bill to this effect into the Senate where
it was approved on February 24, 1884.\textsuperscript{23}

An additional adjunct of colonial integration was liberty of the
press. In an extended address before the National Assembly in 1871, he
described a free press as essential to the destruction of prejudice.
Schoelcher here was apparently advocating repeal of two colonial statutes--
one of 1822 and another of 1850—which restricted the activities and writings of journals. 24

Sometimes, assimilation and fusion, particularly the latter, involved mere requests by Schoelcher of the whites that they mingle socially with Negroes. Such pleas were generally accompanied by caustic remarks about white females who would not socialize in this manner—a situation which was due to their training in racist, parochial schools. Schoelcher complimented thirty-one white families who sent their offspring to an integrated lycée opened in 1883 in Guadeloupe. Such whites he styled the "liberals of Guadeloupe", and their courageous action had "started the work of regeneration" on the island. 25 Because of Schoelcher's general pessimism regarding revolutions (cited in the preceding chapter), such comments were few in number.

Although fusion and assimilation were most closely associated with Schoelcher's efforts on behalf of the Negroes, he also strove to implement them, more or less, for the welfare of other subject races and peoples—more in the case of the inhabitants of Cochin-China, less in the case of the natives of French Indian territories. In 1879, he advocated a seat for Cochin-China in the National Assembly, suggesting that this was in the interest of the native population. He went on to announce total assimilation as his ultimate goal for this new colony. He took a mixed view, however, toward the assimilation of France's Indian settlements. While lauding a law of 1884 which gave all males there the right to vote, he was relieved that the voting system was weighted in favor of the French residents and those Indians living under French law—only a tiny minority of the population. He exhibited a horror of Hindu civilization which he considered barbaric, and for this reason was unwilling to risk total
assimilation. Yet, his distaste for Hinduism was understandable, for it was rooted in his dislike for the caste system and pity for its lowest-ranking members, the pariahs. It would, therefore, be difficult to see in Schoelcher's stand on Indian assimilation any elements of hypocrisy—only fear of certain alien mores and their adherents.

 Appropriately, Schoelcher had an occasional kind word for the most persecuted of peoples, the Jews. Speaking before an anti-clerical gathering in May 1881, he chastised Christians generally for their anti-semitism and depicted the Jews as a capable "race," witness the achievements of composers of Hebrew origin like Mendelssohn and Giacomo Meyerbeer and of Jewish financiers like the Rothschilds.

 Still, the French colonial blacks were his principal concern, and he often went outside the scope of assimilation and fusion in their defense. His approach must at times have seemed quite personal since he intervened directly in matters of limited or local significance. In this way, he urged the National Assembly in July 1850 to allocate 50,000 francs to the victims, nearly all Negro, of a fire in Point-Pitre, Guadeloupe in May of the same year. A short time later, he appealed in behalf of two black butchers of the same colony who had gone to Puerto Rico to purchase beef in Puerto Rico, but were barred from the island because they were free Negroes whose mere presence jeopardized slavery there. Schoelcher thought that France should contact her emissaries in Madrid to move Spanish officials to cease such discrimination.

 Other of his parliamentary interventions dealt with more general matters. He sought to shape the colonial banking system so that it would be more beneficial to the Negroes. He reasoned, in 1851, that overseas banks should issue bills of smaller denominations than those of five-
hundred, one-hundred and twenty-five, as provided by a law of that same year. This could only have been to encourage Negro dealings with banks, to make them believe, in other words, that these were institutions for them, as well as for wealthy whites. 29 And, seemingly recollecting his 1851 speech on the subject of colonial press liberties, Schoelcher twenty-eight years later lamented the lack of "republican" newspaper in the Antilles, which could refute the charges of black conspiracies. 30 He contributed to the elimination of this deficiency by helping to found a journal in 1883, Le Moniteur des Colonies. 31

Probably the most perplexing colonial (and racial) problem of the post-slavery era with which Schoelcher grappled was colonial labor. A noteworthy decline in sugar production took place after 1848, which resulted at least partially from abolition and the consequent tendency of the blacks to stay away from the cane fields, the most detestable symbol to them of the old order. 32 The colons tried a number of means of restoring the sagging fortunes of sugar—special taxes on producers of non-sugar products and emigrant labor being the mainstays. They were assisted in their efforts by Napoleon III who established a forced labor system after 1855, a regime to be discussed at length very shortly.

True to form, Schoelcher opposed any kind of coercive measure to get the blacks back in the cane fields. He lashed out at the tax of twenty francs on each hectare devoted to the cultivation of non-sugar products, which became law in 1849. He theorized that this measure would ruin some of the small Negro farmers who were just striking out on their own, but not growing sugar. While recognizing the necessity of winning the blacks back to sugar, Schoelcher derided this negative approach and proposed as a positive alternative that bounties be offered to those cultivating cane. 33
Forced and immigrant labor received his closest attention. In fact he put together four separate books on these subjects alone between the years 1877 and 1885.

Napoleon III, instituted forced labor on Guadeloupe in September, 1855 by the Arrêté Gueydon; he did the same for Martinique in December 1857 with the Arrêté Husson. These decrees ought to be surveyed together as they were almost identical. In theory all inhabitants of both islands were under the decrees, but in practice they affected only the Negroes. The latter were required to gainfully employ themselves, and had to carry livrets attesting the fact. Their movements were greatly curtailed, and they were required to carry passports to move from one locale to another. The purpose of the decrees was to promote sugar production and to ensure the collection of a stiff head tax imposed by the emperor. This tax, or a portion of it was forcibly deducted from the blacks' wages. If one job did not give them sufficient wherewithal to meet the obligation they would have to take on additional employment.

Schoelcher ridiculed both measures on the grounds that they were self-defeating and impractical. It was costing France more to maintain in ateliers or disciplinary workshops those who could not pay the tax than the latter brought into the treasury. And, in fact, many blacks willingly went to the ateliers, as life there was no worse than on the outside under the decrees.

Furthermore, white employers scorned the Arrêtés Husson and Gueydon, which required them to hire only laborers with passports. Since these were not issued to workers who were in arrears in their tax payments--and there were many who were so delinquent--there was a theoretical labor shortage. The planters overcame this deficiency by hiring any
able-bodied citizen with or without passport. All these difficulties could be cleared up, Schoelcher estimated if the decrees were abolished, coercion abandoned, and the blacks well paid.  

His objections to both decrees on moral grounds were more strenuous. In his opinion, they constituted a return to the ancien régime, for they amounted to nothing more than serfdom. Moreover, Schoelcher added, it was not society's job to specify how individuals passed their time so long as they broke no laws and weren't found "lying in the streets", completely indigent. If a man could manage on a daily wage of ten or fifteen centimes and meet all his obligations, that was quite all right with Schoelcher. (This recalls Schoelcher's remarks in 1848 that if the blacks wanted to get by on hunting and fishing, he had no objections—and, too his lyrical outburst on behalf of primitivism in Colonies Étrangères).

Still, the "fundamental vice" of the decrees lay in the fact that they were enforced only against the blacks, which tended to set them apart from the other classes. Though the laws were detestable, Schoelcher counseled the blacks to be obedient, while at the same time they should petition for their repeal. Both arrêtés, by the way, were revoked by the Third Republic in 1873.

Immigrant laborers since they suffered under a regime of forced labor comparable to that imposed by Napoleon III received similar sympathy from Schoelcher. In 1851, Réunion was permitted to make arrangements with India for the shipment of coolies to the island. In 1852, Martinique and Guadeloupe were accorded the same privilege with China, and some nine years later with India. Mayotte and Nossi-Bé, two French outposts in
Africa were allowed, in June, 1881, to recruit labor in Mozambique, a Portuguese colony. The British had a comparable pact with Portugal, allowing their residents in Natal to contract with the blacks of Mozambique. (Showing that he was quite cosmopolitan in his diatribes against such goings-on, Schoelcher denounced this Anglo-Portugese agreement.) In all cases such recruited laborers signed contracts agreeing to work for a stipulated period—five years in the case of France—and then could return to their native lands. The British cancelled the treaties between the French colonies and India between 1882-3 because of complaints of abuses suffered by the emigrants. Martinique apparently ceased importing such laborers at an earlier date, however.

Schoelcher found fault with the immigrant labor system because those who came to the Antilles and Réunion under this arrangement experienced abuse and regimentation comparable to the miseries of the creoles under the Arrêtés Guevdon and Husson: limitations on their movements, livrets, and unwarranted punishments. In addition, Schoelcher doubted that they would be able to return to India or China when their engagements were terminated because of harassment by colonial authorities. And, while fulfilling their engagements, they were a threat to the prosperity of the Negroes because they worked for lower wages.

The resemblances between immigrant labor and slavery and the slave trade, though, caused Schoelcher the most alarm. In fact to him, they were all really one and the same thing. Logically, then, his assaults upon immigrant labor took generally the same form as his anti-slavery polemics. Thus, immigrant labor was inherently bad, something which could not be humanely regulated, and in its current form, had to be immediately
Illustrating its intrinsic demerits, Schoelcher pointed out that the coolies (from the Far East) were lured into the system by crafty contractors who promised orally a happy and prosperous life in the colonies. Of course, the written agreements that the coolies signed contained the real truth—that they were taking on five years of brutal work—but they couldn't read, and so paid attention only to the honeyed words of the contractors.⁴³

The African workers who remembered slavery, could only have come against their will, and were, therefore, forcibly seized by certain unscrupulous adventurers. The latter, the recruiters who went to the Orient, and the planters who sent both groups, regarded their charges only as "things bought and sold". Both the coolies and blacks died by droves in transit to the place of their engagements, and experienced a high death rate after they arrived at their destinations, mainly because they were ill-housed and ill-fed.⁴⁴ Since they were poorly paid and had no material incentives, their quality of work in the sugar fields was low.⁴⁵ Nor could their grievances be heard, since the officials (syndics) assigned to protect them could not immediately halt any abuses for they were only intermediaries. For the engage, justice would have been a long and tedious process. He first had to go to a syndic who would record his complaint and then carry it to administrative officials who would order a hearing at some distant date. Schoelcher even doubted that there would be hearings in some cases, as the syndics could be bribed by the planters to keep quiet. Small wonder, that Schoelcher called the protective measures for the engages "nearly illusory".⁴⁶

All things considered, moreover, the Negro death rate, the costs of supporting sick or recalcitrant engages in hospitals or ateliers—the
system had to be rated monetarily as a failure. As Schoelcher ceaselessly pointed out the sums spent on the immigrants could have been paid to native workers who would work when their wages were good. Not unalterably opposed to immigration to the colonies, Schoelcher indicated that he could countenance it if it were conducted in a manner "compatible with the Republic," which assuredly meant that coercion and contract labor were not to be its concomitants. These diatribes from beginning to end were strikingly like the old Schoelcher polemics against slavery. He began in 1877 with the statement that immigrant labor was inherently evil and needed to be abolished, and concluded in *Nouvelle Règlementation de l'Immigration à la Guadeloupe* (1885) with the assertion that it was unprofitable.

Slavery in the United States which he had always treated scathingly came under attack again during his speech before the National Assembly of November 28, 1850. Here he called for an end to laws in the Southern states which virtually excluded the free Negroes from the region. Curiously enough, he spoke of a "higher law"—the rights of man—which such statutes conflicted with.

In 1872 he censured bondage in Zanzibar, a British possession. The English he felt should take steps to abolish this institution still prevalent among the natives, which in turn would discourage the activities of recruiters of emigrant laborers who were busy in the island. Contrasting with his harsh words for English indiscretions in Zanzibar were his personal compliments to Gladstone for ending slavery in Egypt in 1882. The prime ministers' failure to do the same in the Sudan, though, he found reprehensible. The Sudan upraiding was delivered during a speech
celebrating slavery's end in the Brazilian province of Ceará in 1884. While obviously satisfied with this example of Latin American progress, he denounced Brazil's gradualist approach to the problem.  

Even in France there were remnants of slavery which had lingered on and had to be done away with. Before the National Assembly in 1851, he protested against a bill which would have extended by ten years the period of grace granted to French slaveholders to divest themselves of their human property owned in foreign lands. (According to a ruling by the Abolition Committee in 1848 they were given three years to do so). In his discussion, Schoelcher raised the usual moral and practical arguments against the proposal. It was "unprogressive" and "un-French" to keep slaves; moreover it was costly because as slavery retreated around the world, the value of chattels declined. 

The backers of the bill stressed their conviction that the United States would surely abolish slavery within ten years. Since most of the slaves who still belonged to Frenchmen were resident in the United States, they felt that it would be appropriate and convenient to free them at the same time that America manumitted her blacks. Schoelcher disputed this opinion and guessed that American slavery would continue indefinitely. He cited the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 as an indication that the institution was still thriving in the United States. So, while not opposed to some extension of the grace period, he regarded ten years as too long. 

By far the most interesting and significant of Schoelcher's later polemics on slavery was L'Esclavage au Sénégal (Paris 1880), a summary of his senatorial speeches on a peculiar series of developments arising in the African territory in the 1860's.
Napoleon III, by three circulars dated November 14, 1852, November 15, 1862 and March 6, 1863, instructed French authorities in Senegal, especially at Saint-Louis and Gorée, to hold fugitive slaves from the surrounding area for approximately a week so that their native masters might reclaim them. These instructions continued to be followed after Napoleon fell from power.

For the most part, Schoelcher's reaction to such a policy was typical. He thought that it should be immediately abandoned because it virtually sanctioned slavery on French territory. He didn't care if his proposal could hurt the pocketbooks of some French who traded with Senegalese slaveowners and who feared the exception they might take to any restrictions on their slaves. Schoelcher was even willing to risk war for the sake of this principle—a war which he considered most unlikely and one which would be easily won by France. No type of slavery, not even the benign form in French Senegal, could be tolerated. He went further and attacked other French policies in Senegal—the impressment of natives into the army, and their forced recruitment as laborers. He concluded by reprimanding those who soft-pedaled the issue for pecuniary motives.

Yet there was one remarkable statement by Schoelcher on this situation which seems completely out of character. He found it quite acceptable for France to employ Senegalese slaves outside her own territorial limits on a railroad then under construction to the Niger River! His justification for this concession to servitude lay in the fact that France could have no say as to the form of labor used in non-French regions. From such a remark it is easy to believe Schoelcher's comment
at this time that he was an abolitionist but had no "fanaticism" on the subject. Sounding like a diehard imperialist, Schoelcher went on to extol the virtues of this railroad which would make of thirty to forty million Africans eventual consumers of French goods. 55

How could Schoelcher make such fine distinction between good and evil? How could he allow Frenchman to employ slave labor off French soil and simultaneously be so adamant about bondage in French possessions? The answer would seem to lie in the rabid expansionism, referred to above, which he expoused late in life.

At times, especially after 1870, Schoelcher gave utterance to the most blatantly imperialistic sentiments. His exultation over the Niger railroad was only a sample. He styled Senegal a "very precious establishment" in 1879. 56 A year later he congratulated de Lesseps for his work on the Suez Canal and looked forward to the completion of his Panama venture, for such a canal would greatly augment French military and maritime strength. 57

He fought vigorously against those who opposed colonies on the grounds that they were a drain on French finances. Schoelcher actually produced statistics to show that they were a boon to the nation's commerce, and that the duties paid on colonial products imported into France more than made up for outlays from the treasury for colonial expenses. 58

Couple this expansionism with the fiery patriotism which Schoelcher demonstrated with respect to Franco-German relations after 1871—he urged constant and total effort to secure vengeance for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, including slanting education so as to inculeate in youths
the demand for revenge—and it becomes more understandable why Schoelcher, blinded by his devotion to the tricouleur could forget his dedication to the blacks.

Yet this was but one side to Schoelcher's imperialistic philosophy and one which revealed itself fully only in this single instance. There was another side, one more altruistic—albeit naive at times—which in the long run prevailed. Though Schoelcher never clearly delineated his imperialist views, he did expose in two brief articles the core of their benign (and dominant) facets.

Writing in 1883, he explained that he approved of "European" (not simply French) occupation of Africa, as it would civilize the inhabitants of the Dark Continent. Europe, in this way, would be able to "atone for the crimes" that it had committed there earlier. The crimes referred to could only have been those connected with slavery and the trade. In Le Rappel, two years later, rehashing the significance of the phrase "perish the colonies rather than principles" he made it clear that he prized overseas possessions but only so long as honesty and probity there were strictly observed. He would have no part of French expansion at the expense of non-colonial nations, as a rancorous attack on Napoleon III's Mexican adventure revealed.

Random statements elsewhere were in the same vein. Despite his willingness to acquiesce in the use of slaves on the Niger River railroad, he contended that in French moves in Africa "moral interests ought always be placed above material (ones)". Delighted though he was when Cochin-China was secured, he warned that the lust for profits among colonizers of the area must be restrained to prevent exploitation of the natives.
There were other manifestations of this "positive" side to Schoelcher's imperialism. Assimilation was not only a means of protecting the Negro rights but also of putting the colonies on a footing equal or nearly equal to that of France. On July 31, 1851, he asserted that the colonies were in effect departments of France and should be treated as such; in this case, they should pay the same duties on imported spirits as France. In 1874, he proposed that the naturalization laws extant in France apply also in the colonies so that foreign residents there could become French citizens if they desired. The measure of Schoelcher's devotion to assimilation on all fronts may best be realized by the fact that he chose to support the colonial extension of such an antiquated and corrupt law as one requiring payment to central authorities of a tax on a government office when the latter had been purchased.

Colonial economic well-being he invariably strove to promote. He fumed at the National Assembly's delay in awarding the colonos the indemnity promised by the Abolition Committee. This money, after all, was vital if the colonies were to get back on their financial feet. On numerous occasions he tried to keep a favored position for colonial sugar; that is, that the duties paid by French planters on this staple be considerably lower than those on foreign sugar. His reason for so doing was always the same: sugar was the sole source of colonial prosperity and had to be protected. He could hardly be accused of being a lobbyist for the white colonos in his efforts on behalf of sugar. In fact, he was once labelled by them as the "worst enemy of the colonies." However much he may have tried to boost colonial sugar, he was also aware of the dangers of this type of monoculture and stressed the necessity
of crop diversification in all of France's possessions, including coffee, vanilla, tobacco and tropical woods. Monoculture he described as a "fundamental error" which could only be partially reduced by lower duties on sugar. One last bit of evidence showing Schoelcher's concern for colonial prosperity: he conceived that a steamship line running directly between France and the Antilles would aid the islands, since it would reduce the heavy mail expenses incurred by the colons who were generally forced to use British vessels for this purpose.

The status and stature of colonial officialdom was another of Schoelcher's concerns. For example, he believed that overseas deputies should have extra compensation to cover travel expenses to France, and that their elections should take place at an earlier date than those of their fellow legislators in France to insure that they would arrive in time for the convening of the National Assembly. Furthermore, each colonial deputy ought to be accompanied by a suppléant or substitute who could replace him should he be incapacitated. This was essential in Schoelcher's eyes, as the mechanics of electing and transporting another deputy would require excessive delays. At later dates, he argued for and secured a 10% pay increase for all colonial officials, and tried once unsuccessfully to block a salary cut of 5,000 francs for the governor of Senegal. Finally, it must be remembered that Schoelcher's insistence on colonial representation in France derived not only from his desire to protect the blacks but also out of his conviction that general colonial interests would be better cared for.

In some respects, Schoelcher's most striking efforts on behalf of the colonies lay in his hostility to a project to make them all, especially Guiana and New Caledonia, penal centers for habitual criminals. Specifically, he lashed out at a law of 1885 to that effect. This enactment
stipulated that some récidivistes (habitual criminals) would be literally exiled to any colony where they could live at liberty. Most, however, were to be sent to either Guiana or New Caledonia where they would be imprisoned.  

Schoelcher was infuriated. He claimed that France was simply throwing an "intolerable burden" on the shoulders of the colonies. If the problem of 60,000 récidivistes could not be solved by the mother country, how could the colonies be expected to untangle it? Furthermore, if these ruffians caused trouble in France with a population of 30,000,000 they would have a far more damaging influence on the sparsely-inhabited colonies. In Guiana, their effect would be fatal, for they would convert the area into "so much rubbish". Also, the law ran contrary to assimilation. Schoelcher, of course, considered Guiana and New Caledonia as departments. Since such administrative divisions in France were not victimized in this fashion, sending the récidivistes (principally) to these locales was rank discrimination. The General Council of Guiana had, indeed, already announced its opposition to the statute.  

Nor would this variation of exile serve what Schoelcher saw as its prime purpose: the rehabilitation of the deported criminals. (Note here his opinion of criminals as maladjusted individuals who only needed to be reconditioned in an appropriate environment to function as decent citizens--his Enlightenment heritage was showing again.) No, confinement in the tropics was only brutal, pointless punishment, because, whites could not endure the climate for long periods, witness the fact that France wisely limited the tour of duty for soldiers in Guiana to two years, and for civilian officials to three or four.
There were other "practical" drawbacks to the measure. It was too costly and would act to prevent further emigration to Guiana, which sorely needed new blood with but 17,000 inhabitants. Schoelcher was willing to allow a penal colony but only in the isolated Loyalty Islands (part of the New Hebrides group), and he doubted that it could work well there, since these tiny islands could properly handle only five-hundred récidivistes.76

The sum total of Schoelcher's statements and actions with respect to the colonies, coupled with his record on behalf of Negroes, add up to a conception of the man as an imperialist of conscience, as one who took the white man's burden seriously. His stand on the employment of slaves on non-French territory was an impulsive deviation from this position. But it was a serious as well as impulsive deviation and dramatically shows how imperialism could, at least on occasions, fog the vision of men of probity like Schoelcher. Contradictory it was too, but as has been pointed out, ambivalence was characteristic of him.

It would have been unthinkable that Schoelcher's crusades could have been confined to the colonies and Negroes. In fact he had demonstrated fleeting sympathy for France's urban poor in Abolition de l'Esclavage and other pre-1848 works. After emancipation with the Negro problem at least partially solved, he had more time for domestic affairs, and compiled an admirable record in this area both as a legislator and as a polemicist.

Schoelcher interested himself in a number of causes which have come to be associated with the general reform tendencies of the nineteenth century—the abolition of capital punishment, prison conditions, temperance, female rights. In this respect, he had a good deal in common with American abolitionists who likewise occupied themselves with such projects.
The death penalty was often a target for his verbal and written onslaughts. In fact, he even prepared a pamphlet on the topic: Abolition de la Peine de Mort (Paris, 1851) which was later summarized in the second volume of Polémique Coloniale. In the same year he introduced a bill abolishing capital punishment in the National Assembly, a bill which seemingly was never discussed. He repeated this action in 1872 with the same lack of success. Not discouraged, he delivered a lengthy address before the Senate in June, 1876, detailing his reasons for wanting its suppression.

His objections were, as might be expected practical and moral and certainly not original. To begin with, capital punishment, he stated, did not attain its objective, the prevention of further crime. Law-breakers who knew death sentences awaited them were, on the contrary, egged on by fear of their future to commit further offenses to escape the hangmen—and all criminals were somehow persuaded they could somehow evade him.

Schoelcher found numerous "proofs" of this thesis. Capital punishment had been abolished in France for offenses against property, but thefts had not increased as a result. In Switzerland it had been completely done away with, and in parts of that country, notably Zurich and Neufchatel, crime had diminished somewhat. Statistical evidence of sorts concerning the futility of the death penalty might also be gleaned, Schoelcher claimed, from the fact that France stipulated that executions take place at odd hours and in secluded places. Didn't this prove, he thought, that the death penalty failed to deter people from crime and only inspired them with horror? The near-pariah status of executioners in France further illustrated this horror—and an unconscious public desire to do away with capital punishment.
Yet—and this was more important—even if capital punishment did realize its aim, Schoelcher announced that he could not permit it. If it did work, he deduced, torture would, of necessity, be revived since it operated on the same principle—fear. Furthermore, capital punishment's implementation required that human beings be infallible and never err in their judgements—which, of course, was impossible. Man should not, then, have the power of life and death over his fellows, unless, Schoelcher ironically concluded, he could resurrect those whom he might have unfairly executed.

Many of Schoelcher's views on capital punishment hinged on his notion that criminals were made not born, and capable of rehabilitation. He saw their misbehaviour due to faulty or insufficient education. Instruction enabled men to control their "grosser instincts" and it was implicit in his reasoning that lawbreakers could, if properly trained, be broken of their bad habits. Prisons and prison conditions were, therefore, another object for Schoelcherian commentary.

His lengthiest and most fully-developed discourse on prisons was delivered before the National Assembly on January 5, 1849. More, he said, was needed than jails and dungeons to deal with crime. Education, in fact, was far more vital, since failure to receive it was instrumental in turning men into thieves and murderers. He proposed that an effort be made to counteract ignorance and crime by offering free elementary education to all prison inmates who had not received it. In addition, he advised the creation of a commission to study and evaluate the principles of the French penal system.

Thereafter, Schoelcher's blasts generally dealt with specifics. Regular inspections of prisons by governmental officials was the subject
of one peroration; inadequate visiting hours for prisoners' relatives was covered in another. The practice of the bastonnade, or the beating and flogging of convicts he found most reprehensible. Abolished in France during the ancien régime, the bastonnade was still in use in New Caledonia and Guiana in the nineteenth century. This anachronism Schoelcher strove to eliminate as, in his opinion, it put criminals beyond the pale of humanity, relegating them to the category of beasts. Moreover, most men were so nauseated by it, that only sadists or other demented individuals could administer floggings—with, of course, tragic results. On January 29, 1878 Schoelcher introduced a measure in the Senate outlawing the bastonnade. It was defeated some two weeks later.

Schoelcher, it will be recalled, had in part been drawn to the anti-slavery cause because of the rusticity of the tropical life of the Negro. In his lengthy summation of the virtues of the "noble savage" he had denounced alcoholic beverages. He later urged heavy taxes on rum to reduce colonial consumption. After abolition this rather bland interest in the temperance cause persisted. He backed a reduction in the army budget of 1851 for wine and brandy, and as a member of a commission set up by the National Assembly in 1871 to prepare a law on public drunkenness, Schoelcher curtly answered a disputant who regarded the bill as absurd with words to the effect that it was a crime to be inebriated on the streets.

Undoubtedly, many of his countrymen must have lifted their eyebrows at such a statement unless they were already acquainted with Schoelcher's occasional austerities. His support of female rights probably provoked a comparable reaction. Disapproving in 1851 a scheme to deny women the right of petition, Schoelcher contended that they were more than "mothers, wives and daughters"; they were "members of society" as well, witness their
participation in charitable and educational activities. In 1881, he expressed approval of their presence at an anti-clerical gathering, ridiculing the notion that females belonged only in the kitchen or salon. He also felt that by embracing humanitarian causes, women would force men to be more upright in their own undertakings.

Oaths were another nineteenth century convention which Schoelcher denounced. In a Senatorial harangue, he pointed to the absurdity of a person like himself—an atheist—taking an oath to God. He suggested also that an oath would hardly restrain an evil-intentioned individual from breaking his vow. He imagined that the poor suffered most from such a requirement, for surely there were many of this less fortunate group who had refused to take some mandatory oath and suffered imprisonment or a fine. For all these reasons, Schoelcher conceived that a man's conscience, without an official avowal, was enough to ensure an honest performance of his duties.

Schoelcher interested himself in less abstract matters than oaths. He sought remedies for the vicissitudes traditionally experienced by children, the aged, the indigent and enlisted military personnel. In 1874, he warmly endorsed a bill curbing the use of children in circus acts. Circuses he condemned as "depraved" by themselves because the stunts there executed inspired the spectators to attempt them. For the potential juvenile delinquents of his day Schoelcher recommended industrial schools. The inmates of such institutions would be children who had been forcibly taken from those parents who had "fallen into the way of vice." Schoelcher admonished the opponents of his industrial school project that such an arrangement would prevent youth from growing up into hardened criminals.
At the same time, he advanced prescriptions for the weaning of children. He denigrated the custom of wet nurses, claiming that it was preferable for mothers to nourish their own infants, and he issued the rather moralistic judgement that Rome's decadence began when her women abandoned duties of this sort.93

Schoelcher's feet were more firmly on the ground in his programs for the aged and indigent. The poor of all ages should receive free medical care if they required it. He reasoned that their misery was "not an accident" but rather derived from society's inequities. Society, therefore, had an obligation to those whom it had victimized. Since he singled out the elderly in particular for such assistance, it should cause no surprise that he considered prisoners over sixty as deserving of preferential treatment and would have them placed in detentional homes rather than jails.94 Schoelcher did not ignore the situation of enlisted service personnel, and the latter, then as now, must have been or would be, delighted by his rancor at their slow promotions and his sponsorship, in 1850 of a plan to have officers elected from the ranks.95

Schoelcher's humanitarianism as manifested in these several and varied ways would have gained him the good will of American reformers like Garrison, William Jay and Susan B. Anthony. But did he come to grips with the industrial Revolution? This is a vital question that must be answered if Schoelcher's stature as a reformer is to be accurately determined. Richard Hofstadter established this as a key criterion by which to judge abolitionists, most of whom he found deficient in this respect.96

Schoelcher was not oblivious of the shortcomings of the Industrial Revolution, though his dealings with them were rather oblique. His sympathy for the proletarians generally expressed itself in demands that
they be given better and more reasonably-priced accommodations on railroads and on sailing vessels. As early as 1850, he counselled the necessity of making third-class fares proportionately lower than those for the other classes. Finally, in July of the same year, he requested third-class facilities complete with beds for passenger ships.

Such favors as those which Schoelcher would have bestowed on the working class may have appeared inconsequential by themselves. In his rationale for them, however, he displayed perception into the nature and solution of industrial ills. Characteristically, of course, he brought up his old refrain on behalf of his proposals—that if put into effect they would have practical value by increasing the clientele for the railroads and passenger ships, or at least would not hurt them. Of greater weight with Schoelcher, though, was the fact that the trains were "made for the public", so all citizens deserved "some sort of equality before them."

At one point Schoelcher went so far as to demand that France regulate the fares on one Mediterranean steamship line—the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique which ran vessels between Marseilles and Algeria and had received several millions of francs in the form of a government subsidy in 1851. Schoelcher maintained that since France supported the company she ought to have some say concerning passenger rates. After all, the company's officials were after only one thing—profits—and this could lead them to overcharge their customers, which was "an immoral thing." There was an added incentive for government regulation: if the Compagnie Générale received many favors of this sort it could become a "veritable monopoly", capable of sucking the public dry.
These were credible reasons for favoring such measures and they mark Schoelcher as a man with insight into the intricacies and injustices of the Industrial Revolution. Coupled with his reverential remarks earlier about Saint-Simon and Fourier, they support Schoelcher's frequent allusions to himself as a socialist. By this term Schoelcher did not mean he wanted government ownership of the "instruments of production" as Marx did. At any rate, he tried to get the French government out of the porcelain industry on the grounds that state-owned factories had outlived their usefulness—which was to provide skilled and trained laborers—and, because, such state enterprises were a threat to private competition in the field.100 (Since he had divested himself of his father's holdings in porcelain, he cannot be accused of selfish motives in this situation.) Whatever socialism Schoelcher espoused was probably of the Fourier variety where individuals owned property collectively. There is a certain vagueness about Schoelcher's position of the political spectrum. Where does one put a Fourierist? This question is quite relevant to Schoelcher's opinions on race and slavery and so must be answered.

Schoelcher would seem best to fit into the category "radical" as delineated by Crane Brinton. In describing various nineteenth century attacks from left to right on democracy, Brinton identified one group which he said is "usually" called "radical", such as the Chartists of England. The "radicals" did not experience total disenchantment with democracy by any means. In fact, in Brinton's words, while seeing democracy's ills, they believed that the "cure" lay in "more democracy of the old sort—bills of rights, written constitutions, universal suffrage . . . compulsory secular education and so on". In addition,
they seemed to favor a "broadly egalitarian society" in which no one would be "very rich" or "very poor", but one in which there would be a "healthy variety". To achieve this sort of society, they eventually felt that "social legislation" for the welfare of the less fortunate classes would be essential. In short the radicals seemed to serve as a kind of bridge between nineteenth century liberalism and socialism with a "foot in each camp."

In France thinkers and politicians of this kind in and out of legislative halls comprised a definite group and were known variously as Jacobins, Montagnards and Radical Republicans. Schoelcher must have felt thoroughly at home with them. The old slogans of nineteenth century liberalism—freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly, for instance—still, had meaning for him. He shared their anti-clericalism, a hostility towards organized Catholicism, particularly associated with French radicalism. And he also ventured to back certain kinds of social measures to prevent excessive disparities between rich and poor and ensure a "healthy variety," stopping short of Marxian socialism. It would be appropriate to add here that Schoelcher's experiences with slavery, since they taught him that one could not trust in the philanthropy of slaveholders to do away with the institution, must have conditioned his support for social legislation in other areas.

Symbolic proof of Schoelcher's "radical" leanings can be seen in his selection as one of the delegates sent by the provisional government at Versailles in 1871 to get the Communards in Paris to come to terms. As he was one of those with a "foot in each camp" his appointment seemed most appropriate. His mission, of course, failed, but the episode did draw from Schoelcher some very revealing statements and proposals.
He censured the violence perpetrated by the Communards as so many "monstrosities and execrable crimes" but was silent concerning their leftist economics, and he urged caution and humanity in deporting them. Deportation could ruin the Communards and their families, permanently. Of greater interest for its connection with Schoelcher's thought was the course of action he recommended to the Versailles government for later dealings with the Commune. (Schoelcher never gave up—even after his mission failed). He advised them to send National Guard forces loyal to Versailles in a parade down the Champs Elysees, flying the tricolor. Guard commanders would then extend an invitation to their Paris counterparts in support of the Commune to join them. Presumably, these Paris Guardsmen would not fail to acknowledge this patriotic appeal, and the Commune leaders would do likewise. All Frenchmen would again be brothers and the Versailles regime could take up residence in Paris.¹⁰⁵

This was not the first time that Schoelcher had demonstrated naïveté when confronted with the relationships between the workers and the bourgeoisie. While he was attacking Napoleon III during his exile in England he saw the differences between these two groups as basically artificial, as having been "excited and maintained with deadly talent" by "monarchist liars" (Napoleon and his followers.) If the two groups realized this they would quickly ally, and the Republic would be restored, since no "force" could "prevail against their union.°¹⁰⁶ Even before exile, Schoelcher had indicated this peculiar naïveté and republican zeal by his courageous but quixotic role in a last-minute uprising against Napoleon III's coup d'état of December 2, 1851. The following day, Schoelcher, Victor Hugo and a number of other critics of Napoleon put together a small-scale conspiracy against the Emperor in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine quarter of Paris.
They hoped to turn it into a massive protest by winning followers there. Napoleon's informers though, got word of the plot, and soldiers were speedily sent to disperse the agitators. Schoelcher boldly marched up to the commanding officer, confident that by invoking a higher law than military duty— that of the sanctity of the Republic— he could win him to their cause. Only a zealot blured by his own devotion to his ideals could have hoped that such an appeal would have worked. 107

Schoelcher himself— had he been the officer in question or a Communar in 1871— would have felt no hesitation about rallying to the Republic. And it would have been just as easy, for him had he been a worker during Napoleon III's regime to join with the middle class in overthrowing the emperor. To expect others, though, to do so was farfetched. That he did expect such behaviour from them would seem to stem from the reverence which he felt for republicanism. Scattered remarks during his lifetime lead one to conclude that it was really a religion for him. In 1850, while praising the revolutionaries of 1848, he stated, "that to attack a monarchy (was) . . . not . . . evil," to attack a republic was. 108 His polemics against Napoleon during an exile depicted the latter as an anti-Christ. 109 Rebuking a royalist deputy in 1874 for a speech against the Third Republic, Schoelcher "demanded satisfaction" (threatened a duel) because he considered himself "personally insulted." 110 Such veneration must have made it difficult for Schoelcher to perceive the misgivings that others might feel about their own loyalties to republicanism, and prompted his rather ingenuous solutions to the Commune and Napoleon III.

His naive and intransigent republicanism is quite relevant for Schoelcher's antagonism towards slavery, for it confirms the latter's
sources. It reveals the religious fervor with which the philosophes believed in their "heavenly city" on this earth, or in other words, their faith in the creation of a perfect and just society.\textsuperscript{111} It also echoes the Social Romantics—or at least some of them, who made a theology of Saint-Simon's classless society "organized along rational lines."\textsuperscript{112} Very likely, too it lent that innocently optimistic flavor to his imperialism. In other words, imperialism to Schoelcher was a means of spreading the gospel of republicanism (and French culture in general) among the backward peoples of the world. In fact, even had he lived to see the uglier results of imperialism, it is doubtful that he would have opposed it, and rather would have only continued to fight its worst abuses.
CHAPTER V
SCHOELCHER'S POSITION
IN THE ANTI-SLAVERY SPECTRUM
Any comparison between Schoelcher and other abolitionists ought to begin with his predecessors and contemporaries in France. His three most famous French predecessors, Abbés Raynal and Grégoire, and Brissot had much in common with him, but they also differed from him in certain vital ways.

All three owed much to the Enlightenment as a source of their anti-slavery ideas. Raynal, though trained by the Jesuits and for a time a member of that order, left it voluntarily and began to frequent the salons of the patronesses of the Age of Reason. There he must have befriended Montesquieu and Diderot, the latter being one of his collaborators on Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Européens dans Les Deux Indes, Raynal’s main work. In this tract, he acknowledged his debt to the Enlightenment by denouncing existing religions as superstitious, and all forms of political absolutism. More significant for present purposes was his condemnation of slavery. He never, however, embraced immediate emancipation as he regarded the blacks as ill-prepared for liberty, and instead preferred that steps be taken to sweeten their lot. Furthermore, while envisioning that the work of emancipation would be done by “future generations,” he thought it advisable that these emancipators-to-come free their slaves only when they had “very precise” guarantees of their morality and work habits.

Brisson de Warville, the founder of the first French abolitionist society, the Société des Amis des Noirs, during the Revolution of ’89, also had a strong orientation toward the Enlightenment. For example, in
one of his official speeches, he described the law of May 15, 1790 endowing the free mulattoes and blacks with civil and political rights as something "Locke and Montesquieu would be honored by," while the writings of both and of Rousseau "paved the way" for the statute. Brissot's leading parliamentary concern was these same rights which took up most of his interventions in the legislative debates of 1792-3. The bondsmen received scant attention from him in an official capacity, save where he exonerated them from blame in the civil wars of Santo Domingo.

Outside parliamentary chambers Brissot had more to say about slavery. The bulk of his comments can be found in New Travels in the United States of America (Bowling Green, Ohio 1919), a study undertaken of slavery in America in 1788 in order to ascertain the most efficacious means of ridding France of the institution. Brissot guessed that the end of slavery was in sight in America, was in "the nature of things." This meant that—given the near extirpation of bondage from the northern states, the growth of anti-slavery societies, and the contemplated abolition of the foreign slave trade (which would lead to a scarcity of Negroes, a consequent improvement in their condition and a realization that free labor was cheaper and more efficient), that, given all these propositions, "reason" would triumph among American slaveholders and they would liberate their chattels. However, Brissot did recognize the need for other steps to accompany this inevitable process—namely educating the blacks, and endowing them with a few rights, particularly in the courts.

Brisson saw the destruction of slavery in the French colonies as also being inevitable, but again he advised that France must take certain precautionary measures to assist it. Specifically, she should start cultivating the maple sugar tree. If she did, maple sugar would "fill
the markets" of Europe and make cane sugar unprofitable. This would wreck the trade first and later slavery itself. While this was going on, the Negroes would be receiving instruction, and civil rights in a piecemeal fashion. Once slavery was demolished by maple sugar, they would be released from bondage. However, they would still have prejudice to contend with, and Brissot took the view that it could never be eradicated. So, he saw the final solution resting in a massive emigration back to Africa by the blacks, where, happily, they could train and uplift their barbaric brethren and in so doing, incidentally stimulate a demand for European goods.

Schoelcher would have felt at ease with both Brissot and Raynal because they were moved to adopt anti-slavery ideas by the Enlightenment. Of course, by eventually opting for immediatism he would have disagreed with these two gradualists on the modus operandi of liquidating slavery. Yet any dispute between them on this point would have brought out clearly that they all analyzed the institution with care, and saw it as a social problem requiring considerable time and effort. It was not simply a question of sinful behavior on the part of the masters that was involved, as with American anti-slavery figures—as will be seen shortly.

Grégoire was an unorthodox Catholic bishop whose religious humanitarianism and exposure to the Enlightenment thought of Montesquieu and Raynal conditioned his anti-slavery stand. He deserves more attention than he has received to date because of his dispassionate and perceptive treatments of slavery—and for the purpose of this dissertation because (as pointed out in chapter one) Schoelcher borrowed a great deal from him.

What were some of his dispassionate and perceptive contributions to anti-slavery lore? Grégoire was the first to call science to the service
of the blacks, suggesting that their smaller cranial capacities did not signify mental inferiority. Grégoire agreed with slavery's defenders that there were "doubtless planters who (could not) be accused of cruelty..." But he also noted the corrosive effects that slavery had on most masters, who by holding absolute power over their charges were bound to abuse them sometimes. White women and children were similarly blemished by the "peculiar institution". What is most remarkable about Grégoire from the twentieth century scholar's standpoint was his judgement that Portuguese and Spanish slavery were milder than elsewhere, due mainly to the Catholic Church "continually" interposing itself between slaves and proprietors in the colonies held by each nation.

Frank Tannenbaum and Gilberto Freyre, modern investigators, reached the same basic conclusion concerning the leniency of Spanish and Portuguese slavery, but neither paid homage to Grégoire's initial probings into the field. Tannenbaum in Slave and Citizen (New York, 1948) cited the Catholic clergy for its benevolent role, but found also that the Hispano-Portuguese governments protected the blacks. Freyre in The Masters and the Slaves (New York, 1946) tended to emphasize factors other than Catholicism in softening Portuguese slavery in Brazil, and gave primacy to the shortage of women in the colony. This situation led to "zones of fraternization" between the races, reducing white severity towards Negroes. Still, clerics aided in this process, for their kind of Catholicism was "more easy going and more relaxed," condoned consanguineous marriages, and "generally encouraged racial mixing." Granted the superiority in research of these later writers, Grégoire deserves commendation for his early "diggings" into this area.

Grégoire's relationship with Schoelcher's ideas has already been discussed. One parallel between the two however, has not yet been covered.
Both continued to manifest a deep interest in the fate of the blacks after emancipation. Grégoire constantly gave advice to the Negroes of newly-independent Haiti as they struggled to gain a respectable reputation. He chastened their rulers for their absolutism indirectly, by his refusal to correspond with Henri Christophe, and directly in his letters with one of Christophe's successors, Boyer. He also urged Boyer to further education by building more schools and libraries.\(^{17}\) In *Les Considérations sur le Mariage* (Paris, 1822), he cautioned Haiti's blacks to uphold the sanctity of marriage, avoid illicit sexual arrangements, and considered that Haiti should enact a statute barring divorce. A year later he pressed for freedom of religion on the island. Then in 1827, he prodded them to be ever vigilant in the performance of their "religious and moral duties," and once more denounced the domineering regime of Boyer.\(^{18}\) Finally, according to his biographer, Grégoire, on his death bed in 1831, asked that more religious tracts be sent to Haiti.\(^{19}\)

From the preceding paragraph, it can be deduced that Grégoire like Schoelcher saw that the Negroes needed help and friendly advice if they were to prosper as free men, for servitude had ill-equipped them to cope with liberty. Like Schoelcher again, though, he would not deprive them of their freedom because of this deficiency. At least he expressed his disapproval of efforts by Louis XVIII to retrieve the former colony.\(^{20}\)

As with Raynal and Brissot, and unlike Schoelcher, the Abbé never came out for immediate emancipation. Initially, in fact, Grégoire forecast that a sudden and unprepared for general manumission would be a disaster. He recommended, instead, ameliorative measures, rights for free blacks and mulattoes, and a step-by-step elimination of the trade. Like Brissot and Raynal, he saw the demise of slavery as bound to come as the last link
in an "irresistible chain of events." According to one observer, Grégoire's opposition to immediate abolition persisted even after it had taken place in 1794.22

He never changed this stand. After slavery was revived by Napoleon and through the Restoration, he denounced the trade, and requested more stringent penalties for those who violated the French statute of 1815 against it.23 Or he asked that Rome order its missionaries to preach against it.24 Periodically he fumed over the mistreatment of slaves in Réunion.25 But he said nothing about emancipation of any kind.

Nearly all of Schoelcher's contemporaries until the eve of abolition were just as reserved. (It would be impossible to detail the careers of all of nineteenth century France's emancipationists, so only significant and representative figures will be examined here. (Some of the lesser known personalities are discussed in Pierre Baude's L'Affranchissement des Esclaves aux Antilles Françaises, pp. 118-126.) Their hostility to slavery, though, usually had the same roots as his.

Lafayette's devotion to the principles of the Enlightenment and the Revolution are, of course, well known and must have loomed large in molding his sympathy for slaves. Melvin Kennedy also ventured to explain that his experiences in the American Revolution "developed his ideas on slavery and the slave trade."26 Kennedy's volume which consists mainly of Lafayette's correspondence with various figures like Washington and Clarkson also shows him to have been a consistent enemy of immediatism. Writing to Washington in February 1793 he proposed a "scheme to promote the gradual emancipation of slaves in America." To Clarkson, five years later he depicted French emancipation in 1794 as resulting in "anarchy." In another letter to his English friend in September 1823, he eulogized him for his gradualism and attacked again as precipitous the French measure of 1794.27
And, practicing what he preached, Lafayette during the Revolution of '89 experimented with his ideas on his sugar plantation in French Guiana, undertaking first to educate and moralize the slaves there, and then to free them. He invariably claimed he achieved good results from the experiment, and in his opinion he had less trouble with his blacks in 1794 when the emancipation decree arrived from France because of what he had done.\textsuperscript{28}

Tocqueville's deserved reputation as an objective political scientist (and historian) make it slightly difficult to locate the well-springs of his anti-slavery thought, for he seldom resorted to emotional rhetoric which could serve as a give-away. Despite this, one scholar found that Tocqueville had a "passionate concern for individual liberty" which stemmed from the Enlightenment, and though he lost much of his optimism concerning the ideals of the Age of Reason, he continued to be attached to them.\textsuperscript{29} Tocqueville's correspondence with Gobineau disclosed another factor behind his antipathy for slavery. Decrying Gobineau's racism, Tocqueville regarded it as contrary to Christianity, and Tocqueville looked upon himself as a sincere Christian.\textsuperscript{30} Religion, in Tocqueville's case, was probably very significant in directing him to an anti-slavery position, a fact which to some extent separates Tocqueville from Schoelcher. Furthermore, and unlike Schoelcher once more, there is proof that Tocqueville was impervious to Romantic influences, as they did not suit his political realism.\textsuperscript{31}

This same political realism pervaded his articles on slavery and the Caribbean colonies. He evinced a strong interest in the latter and felt they had great potential value. Observing an increase in trade and
population along the Mississippi, he prognosticated that this river was becoming the "leading commercial outlet in the world." The possibilities of a canal through Panama and the economic development of Latin America also caught his attention. What did all these things mean to Tocqueville? It signified that the Caribbean would soon become the "Mediterranean of the New World," and that the stock of most French possessions thereabouts would rise. On the other hand, most Frenchmen seemed unaware or indifferent to this situation, for they did see the dangerous straits of their colonies, since British emancipation had thrown the French bondsmen there into a turmoil. War with England Tocqueville continued was a likelihood at this time. The British, he reasoned would invade the French Antilles and would quickly conquer them, assisted by rebellious slaves there. So, France would be deprived of her opportunity to share in the profits soon to come from the "Mediterranean of the New World." The presumed moral: France should free her blacks who would then dutifully and gladly defend their homelands, the British would be beaten, and France would receive her slice of the growing Caribbean pie after all.

Expediency, however, did not always control Tocqueville's abolitionism. He also implied that servitude was unchristian, brutal and not in keeping with France's tradition as one of the "leading instruments" in the drive towards human equality. So, for practical and idealistic reasons, France should end bondage. But, said Tocqueville, she should do the job only in a prudent and deliberate fashion. He regretted total British emancipation in 1838; in his opinion, the apprenticeship system, to all intents and purposes, should have been kept, and the blacks forbidden to hold property (probably in order to keep sugar production up.)
He was even mildly critical of a plan prepared by the Broglie Commission (composed of Peers and Deputies) in 1843. Tocqueville thought the ten year period of intensive secular and religious tutelage which the Commission contemplated before freeing the blacks was insufficient— but he supported their findings generally. France, he went on, must carefully supervise the scheme. The colons like any aristocracy would not part with their privileges willingly, and France would have to interpose herself between them and the blacks to guarantee success for the Broglie plan.  

This interventionism would have to go on after freedom was secured— but not necessarily with the welfare of the blacks as its chief design. Far from it. Negroes must not, he emphasized, be allowed to own land (presumably, again, as they would not grow sugar on their plots.) The prosperity of cane, in fact, seemed to be his chief concern in the aftermath of abolition. France must undertake to maintain its price artificially; the colons must be awarded an indemnity of 12,000 francs per slave. The blacks might have been consoled by this last recommendation, and one other— that indebted land be turned over to creditors— because Tocqueville looked on them as essential if the ex-slaves were to receive a decent wage.  

Some of Tocqueville's slavery writings had a Schoelcherian ring. Both men saw emancipation as a long and complicated business which only began when the slaves were liberated. And both were of the opinion that France had to get on the emancipationist track if she were to retain her colonies. But in Tocqueville's case the latter argument was pre- eminent; in other words his humanitarianism took a back seat to expediency. Moreover, Tocqueville eschewed immediate abolition. Undoubtedly Tocqueville's skepticism concerning the visionary republicanism that lay behind Schoelcher's immediatism explain his reluctance to take such a step. By 1847, however,
Tocqueville had changed his mind and was won to the Schoelcher point of view.

Tocqueville's travelling companion during his tour of the United States, Gustave de Beaumont, was a very different person, and had one thing at least in common with Schoelcher—an attachment for the Negro with a distinct Romantic flavor. Beaumont recorded his impressions of race and slavery in his "novel" Marie. The Romantic framework of Marie is obvious: it tells the story of a tragic love affair between a young Frenchman (Ludovic) and an American girl, Marie, laid in a number of settings including wooded areas near Baltimore and the Canadian wilds, but Marie's exoticism is manifest in other ways—by, for example, its image of the American Indian as a noble savage.

Marie—and its appendices—have their shortcomings as literature. Yet they are thoughtful and valuable analyses of slavery and race prejudice, with emphasis on the latter: Marie, after all, had some Negro blood in her veins. The humiliations and discrimination which she and her brother and free Negroes and mulattoes throughout the United States had to endure comprise the core of the work. These injustices are familiar, and need not be related here. Their causes and the possibility of their extinction, though, should be treated. Their immediate cause, Beaumont stated, was the ignorant condition of American public opinion which had been poisoned by contact with slavery—their ultimate cause. Public opinion in America, he went on, (borrowing a leaf from his comrade, Tocqueville) was "irresistible; its least desires (were) . . . commands, and the "black race" had to submit to its "sovredigny of hatred and scorn."^38

Beaumont reasoned, like Grégoire and Brissot, that slavery in America was destined to fade away. He declared that "each year" the "ideas
of universal liberty" were winning "another degree of latitude" and that hostility toward slavery was even growing in the South. Furthermore, some alert Southerners were starting "to think that slavery (was) harmful to industry" when they compared their section's relative poverty with the prosperity of the North. By rejecting all emancipation plans, gradual or instantaneous, Beaumont indicated that it was best to let slavery die of these natural causes, predicting that in its death throes, it might lead to civil war. Even when the institution was no more, he did not foresee much improvement in the Negroes' status. Custom (prejudice) was "more powerful than law; the Negro slave has been considered an inferior or degraded being; the degradation of the slave will cling to the freedman." Only two "occupations" would be open to him: he could be a beggar or a menial laborer.

Beaumont went awry, clearly, in some of his judgements, particularly in Southern attitudes toward slavery. Still, his commentary on the persistence of prejudice is of much merit, and raises him above the level of a mere Romantic hack. He also showed insight into the problem of intraracial bias, pointing out that mulatto girls spurned the flatteries of males their color because the latter could not "raise" them out of their "class." Conceivably, Schoelcher might have drawn some of his notions on this subject from a reading of Marie.

Alphonse de Lamartine's abolitionist sentiments likewise had a Romantic bent, as his tragedy based on the life of Toussaint Louverture showed so well. David Evans categorized him with Hugo and others as being a Social Romantic who received inspiration from Saint-Simon. Lamartine was a complex anti-slavery figure who apparently began as an
immediatist and ended up as a gradualist, yet there are ambiguous features in his early remarks which make it difficult to discover just where he stood.

On April 23, 1835, before the Chamber of Deputies, France's poet-politician appeared to favor total abolition then and there, saying that a delay would harm the "morals of the blacks," the nation's treasury, and would make later remedies ineffectual. (Gaston-Martin took Lamartine at his word and considered him an immediatist.) In this same address, however, Lamartine warned of the advisability of being cautious in statements about slavery, for the interests of the colons and the "susceptibilities" of the blacks must not be ignored. Maybe, Lamartine by such words meant work had to be commenced immediately on the implementation of a gradual program.

A year later in another speech, the same discrepancy was discernible. Once again he harangued for immediate emancipation, premising his demand on the pointlessness of trying to educate the Negroes for freedom while they were still in chains—slavery, after all, taught only "servitude" to the slave and tyranny to the masters. Yet Lamartine again admonished his fellow deputies on the necessity for careful deliberation on the matter, lest the interests of masters and slaves be harmed by hasty actions. Conceivably, his words on prudence and caution concerning the masters meant only that France must not forget to give them an indemnity, for he laid stress on such compensation in both this and his earlier speech. At any rate, Lamartine's position as of 1836 was still somewhat nebulous.

By 1840, his outlook was less ill-defined and less liberal. At a banquet on February 10, 1840, he sympathized with the masters and saw
them as victims of slavery—an institution which France had "inflicted on them" (as Schoelcher was to argue later that same year in Abolition de l'Esclavage.) Lamartine continued and defined himself as an abolitionist but not of the revolutionary sort, adding that he wanted emancipation, but only under conditions of "justice and work," or, in other words, only if there were guarantees that the blacks would continue to man the cane fields and that the masters would be indemnified. He added that he hated a "disorderly society."^51

By 1842, Lamartine had completely clarified his views. He announced himself as a gradualist and prescribed two "indispensable" conditions for general manumission: the indemnity, as usual and a "graduated initiation" of the Negroes into liberty. Still, the reader is perplexed by Lamartine. He can find his way out of his bewilderment by assuming either that all along Lamartine was a gradualist who simply wanted France to get busy at the task of eventually setting her slaves free; or that he might have been distressed by the results of English emancipation and repudiated his earlier immediatism.52

The Duc de Broglie dominated French anti-slavery circles until the late 1840's and so his career deserves some examination. Unfortunately there is nothing in his published works or speeches which suggests the roots of his antagonism towards slavery.53 A reconstruction of his life sheds enough light on this matter so that a tentative hypothesis can be hazarded. Broglie, who lived from 1785 until 1850, was the son of the Prince de Broglie (1757-1794) who like Lafayette was enchanted with the Age of Reason. The prince belonged to the Society of Friends of the Constitution and fought well in the field against the First Coalition in the name of the Revolution. During the Reign of Terror, like most of the
nobility, he became suspect, was arrested and guillotined. But he did not disown the Enlightenment or the Revolution and insisted on the eve of his execution that his son further the cause of both. The younger Broglie fled from France at this time with his mother but returned the same year, after the Thermidorean Reaction. He held a few minor administrative posts under Napoleon but did not attain political prominence until the Restoration when he became a peer and later held the portfolios of Education and Foreign Affairs. In favor of the Revolution of 1830, he became Louis Philippe's chief cabinet minister in 1835.

Broglie was a Doctrinaire in the parlance of the day, or one of those politicians who accepted the Revolution of '89 and believed that its principles were fully incorporated in the Charter of 1814. The Doctrinaires were in sympathy with the '89 upheaval and the Enlightenment to an extent, and supported government according to "justice, truth and reason," but they were not republicans. Distrusting the common man, they regarded the monarchial system as best at presiding over society, as most reliable in the interests of "justice, truth, and reason."

There is an additional episode in Broglie's life which might have bearing here. He married the daughter of Madame de Stael, the Romantic authoress whose Mirza was influential in giving the Negro respectability.

Considering this data, the following thesis concerning Broglie's anti-slavery bent may be suggested. As a boy, he had the ideals of the Enlightenment and the Revolution drilled into him by his father, and this indoctrination seems to have had a lasting effect. His enthusiasm for both must have been dampened by the Reign of Terror but not completely dispelled, and instead of concentrating on the dangerous area of internal reform, he channeled it into the less perilous colonial scene. He was
probably attracted, too, to this area by the salon conversations and
writings of his mother-in-law.

From such a reserved figure, talk of immediate abolition would have
been unexpected. And, in fact, until 1847, Broglie harbored no such rad­
cal sentiments. Founder and president of the Société pour l'Abolition
de l'Esclavage, he set the tone for the organization as one of the guiding
spirits behind its official gradualist statement of aims of the year of
its establishment 1834, the Prospectus de la Société Française pour l'Abó-
lition de l'Esclavage. Here, were contained a number of gradualist
ideas, particularly those proposing to free all children born henceforth
of slave parents and to grant chattels time off from required tasks to
work their own land and save money with which to purchase their freedom.

Schoelcher, incidentally, was a member of the society, probably
joining it in the late 1830's, but apparently played no part in its pro­
ceedings until after 1842. By 1847, as will be seen shortly, he was a
very conspicuous member. In spite of the absence of other records of the society, one may
say with confidence that Broglie and most of the other members—Hippolyte
Passy, Odilon Barrot, Destutt de Tracy, Charles de Remusat and Tocqueville
did not change their minds concerning the gradualist course of action
before 1843. This is born out by the fact they usually sponsored leg­
islative bills incorporating the slow approach. Passy introduced one
such measure into the Chamber of Peers on February 9, 1838, Tocqueville
and Tracy, another in July 1839. At least three members of the society—
Barrot, Broglie and Tracy—were part of the Broglie Committee (headed by
the Duc) set up in 1840 and composed of peers and deputies. Its function
was to determine the most "rational" means of ending slavery, and three years later it came up with the two gradualist propositions. Only one participant, Destutt de Tracy, balked at both plans and came out for immediatism. Tracy's father, by the way, was a philosophe who compiled a commentary on Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* which was translated into English by Thomas Jefferson. Significantly, Tocqueville called Tracy a weak-willed person whose ideas were a carbon copy of his father's.  

By 1845, the tempo of immediatism was picking up with the emergence of Guillaume de Félice, the dean of the Protestant theological seminary at Montauban who demanded that France liquidate slavery posthaste. Whether Félice did his own research or leaned on Schoelcher is not clear but he used the same logic as the latter, underlining the hopelessness of half-way statutes (like those of 1843) in the face of a pro-slavery magistracy and clergy in the colonies.

By 1847, Broglie, Lamartine, Tocqueville—in fact presumably all of the society—had burned their bridges behind them and chosen immediatism, as the circulation of a series of petitions put together by the society in that year attests. Containing over 11,000 signatures, the petitions cited the failure of the 1845 laws and the partiality of colonial officials to slaveholders. Thus, they had a distinctly Schoelcherian caste. Others, not members of the society, were also now pushing for immediate abolition, including Ledru-Rollin, who, used Schoelcher's works as documentation for his demand. Schoelcher ought, then, to be recognized as one of the prime movers in the evolution of the new point of view, for he had steadily denounced gradualism since 1840, and was by 1847, at least being listened to.

It would be useful at this stage to halt and look at a question which automatically arises when emancipationist movements are discussed: how
important were they in the final extinction of slavery? When this question is posed, another invariably presents itself: were not economic forces (sometimes hidden) really more destructive than these movements? There is a definitive volume which answers both questions admirably as they pertain to English slavery—Eric Williams’ *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, 1944). French slavery badly needs a comparable study, particularly as Williams throws a challenge to French scholars in his claim that his basic thesis—that capitalism destroyed slavery in the British colonies and not the abolitionists—is applicable also in the case of France.

The challenge will be taken up here, but very incompletely because it was not the intention of this writer to prepare a monograph on the economic factors behind French abolition. On the basis of what little research he has done, he finds himself mostly disagreeing with Williams.

The downfall of slavery in the English colonies, according to Williams, lay in the rise of laissez-faire capitalism in Britain in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a capitalism which could no longer abide the restrictive and protectionist mercantilism which was the prop on which colonial prosperity rested. As Williams put it: "When British capitalism depended on the West Indies, they ignored slavery or defended it. When British capitalism found the West Indian monopoly a nuisance they destroyed West Indian slavery as the first step in the destruction of the West Indian monopoly.”

Until the end of the eighteenth century the British West Indies were the "hub of the British Empire, of immense importance to the grandeur and prosperity of England." And it was the "Negro slaves who made these
sugar colonies the most precious colonies ever recorded in the whole annals of imperialism." Clearly, British capitalism was reliant on slavery, so it could overlook or excuse the institution and be contented by the fact that colonial products, especially sugar, were given a monopoly of the home market.66

Ominous signs for the colonial planters began to appear by 1783. The application of machinery to the coal, iron and textile industries led to increased production in all of them. Desirous of stepping up exports their representatives became spokesmen for laissez-faire and were "gathering strength for the assault on the system of monopoly." About this time also, came the American War for Independence which was a disastrous milestone for the British Caribbean colonies. In the first place, during the conflict the North American colonies bought their sugar from the French islands, mainly Santo Domingo, boosting their fortunes, while hurting those of Jamaica, the Barbadoes and the other British Caribbean colonies; in the second place, the East India Tea Company "turned its attention to the cultivation" of sugar in India; thirdly, Britain abandoned mercantilism to the extent that she set up free trade with the United States in 1783, and the fact that British trade increased by fifty per cent between herself and her former colonies during the years 1784-1790 was potent evidence of the worthwhileness of this step. All these occurrences of 1783 or thereabouts "impressed the capitalist class which was beginning to regard the Empire from the standpoint of profit and loss and contributed to undermining the mercantilist philosophy."67

This situation as far as the colonies were concerned did not get better but rather worse after 1783. The cotton and iron industries grew rapidly after that date. The former became increasingly less dependent
on West Indian cotton as it expanded, until this area contributed only a trivial percentage of the total amount imported, while it sent not one ounce of ore to England ironmasters. Similar growth took place in the woolen business.⁷⁰ The exports of all three increased at a staggering rate but not to the colonies. In the meantime, sugar from other parts of the empire began to enter Britain—"the first salient in the monopolistic front had been driven" when Mauritius was allowed to send sugar to the mother country "on the same footing as British West Indian sugar." By the 1830's further rivals had appeared when Brazil and Cuba began growing cane in profuse quantities and at cheaper costs. This set of affairs "was aggravated" by the fact that sugar production in the West Indies was in excess of home consumption.⁶⁸

It was the last-named situation which was the immediate cause of English slavery's demise. Overproduction under such circumstances to British entrepreneurs was "intolerable," (when cheaper sugar was available elsewhere). Williams added, therefore; "overproduction in 1833 demanded emancipation." Later the new capitalist classes also did away with mercantilism, in two stages in 1836 and 1846; in the first year, East Indian sugar was admitted on equal terms; in the second, duties on all sugars were equalized.⁶⁹

So it was capitalism, which worked really invisibly, that was crucial in British slavery's decline. Williams did give credit to England's abolitionists for bringing slavery's brutalities before the public eye: "The humanitarians in attacking the system in its weakest and most indefensible spot spoke a language that the masses could understand." Nevertheless, he insisted that their importance was "seriously misunderstood and grossly exaggerated" by sentimental historians who "placed faith before reason and evidence."⁷⁰
Williams believed his thesis had validity for French slavery as well, for he claimed that what was characteristic of British capitalism was "typical also of capitalism in France" since these two countries "ushered in the modern world of industrial development." Williams found another parallel between British and French colonial slavery. The French cane sugar industry was also adversely affected by the emergence of competitors—beet sugar, above all—so much so that in Williams' opinion: "Beet . . . freed the slaves on the cane sugar plantations of the French colonies." It would therefore seem logical to derive from this that Williams wanted his readers to conclude that the French abolitionists were only a subordinate factor in abolition like their British comrades.

There is no doubt that the rise of the beet sugar industry was very destructive as far as French slavery is concerned, as efforts by cane growers and their allies in France to ruin their rival show. Beet planters, who had been free of taxation since Napoleon had founded the industry, found themselves compelled to pay a duty of fifteen francs per hundred kilograms in 1837, a figure which was doubled two years later. Also in 1839 the colonial planters attempted to get rid of their rival permanently by having the French government buy up beet refineries for 40,000,000 francs. This failed, but was repeated in 1843, and again defeated, though the colonists could have drawn solace from the fact that the two sugars were put on an equal tax basis that year. Beet production increased though, throughout the nineteenth century, especially as production methods were improved and cheapened. Thus, between 1828 and 1836 beet sugar production jumped from 4,000,000 to 35,000,000 kilograms and to 50,000,000 in 1838. It declined markedly though in the next two years and by 1840 was only 23,000,000 kilograms. (One-hundred and sixty-six refineries closed that
But it moved upward again to 30,000,000 in 1843 and to 64,000,000 in 1847.

The two largest beet-growing areas, the departments of Nord and Pas de Calais consistently sent anti-slavery petitions to the chambers in the 1840's. Yet they were worded in a curiously restrained manner and spoke of the necessity for "suitable guarantees" for the colons. One would have expected a virulent attack on them rather than mild pleas on their behalf. As early as 1835, Eure-et-Loir was also sending up anti-slavery petitions to Paris. The verbal proceedings of the General Council of this department contained a reference to such a petition for 1835, and considerable discussion on a like petition for 1836. In the debates over the latter, humanitarian considerations entered the picture, but of greater importance was the council's anger at a Paris proposal to tax beet sugar in 1836. Beets had been planted in Eure-et-Loir for the first time in 1835 and promised to relieve a departmental agrarian depression, so their rancor was comprehensible. As the General Council saw matters, France in considering such a tax was letting herself be dominated by "three tiny and far-off colonies."

Two key pieces in the Williams version of English slavery's decline were costly over-production of sugar in the colonies, and the existence of alternative, cheaper sources of the commodity. He discovered evidence of the former in the fact that the colonies were encouraged by bounties and subsidies to sell sugar outside of England. Hard-headed British capitalists noting this, and the availability of the alternative sources, struck slavery down.

If subsidies and bounties were the criterion for overproduction, then France's colonies were also growing excessive amounts of sugar since they,
too, were receiving handouts from the metropolitan government to unload the staple outside France. Moreover, the same alternative sources of sugar—Cuba and Brazil—were available to France. Beet, though, was more important in this respect, for by the 1840's it was less dear, too, and had the added advantage of being home-grown.

The crux of the matter is this: Were there in France as in England powerful economic blocs who sensed this situation and moved that slavery be done away with—who then scowled at the colonial monopoly of the home sugar market—France had set duties on foreign sugar which were prohibitive—and clamored for the admission of the item from elsewhere? That such blocs existed cannot be denied, but they did not express themselves very vociferously. After the Revolution of 1848, as the question of emancipation was being debated, the loudest voice amongst French business interests was that heard in defense of slavery.

In fact, France's leading industrial cities and ports were very strong in their opposition to abolition. How different from the case of England where on the eve of abolition, as Williams recorded, urban centers were strongholds of emancipationist sentiment so that Wilberforce and others "concentrated their attack there!" Cities like Liverpool, Glasgow and Manchester which had hitherto been dependent upon colonial prosperity and had supported slavery, had now undergone economic changes so that their relationship with the colonies was completely altered. In Liverpool, for example, the sugar trade had ceased to be the cornerstone of prosperity and American cotton had taken its place. As cotton became king in Liverpool so did free trade doctrines—one of slavery's greatest nemeses.

But in France, the cities behaved differently. While the Abolition Committee was meeting, in March and April 1848, delegations (usually from
the chambers of commerce) from fourteen French cities and towns paraded before it to complain in various ways about the intentions of the Schoelcher committee. Among the most prestigious and powerful delegations were those from Marseilles, Bordeaux, Nantes, and Le Havre. To the Marseilles and Le Havre representatives abolition meant Negro desertion of the cane fields, a reduced sugar crop, fewer cargoes for their merchant ships and a victory for beet sugar. Bordeaux's spokesmen were briefer, and angrily predicted complete ruin for the colonies. The delegation from Nantes showed up most frequently--at least five times--raising similar objections and resorting to a schizophrenic racism, claiming on one occasion that free Negroes wouldn't work, and on another that only blacks were able to endure tropical heat. Obviously, Nantes wanted the retention, pure and simple, of slavery.

These four cities had close links with the colonies which went back centuries. Since the seventeenth century and until early in the nineteenth, they had engaged in the triangular trade between France, Africa and the Caribbean. On the first leg, they took trinkets to Africa which were exchanged for slaves. The latter were in turn transported to the Antilles where they were unloaded, and replaced by sugar which was carried to France to be refined. After 1815, two legs of the triangle were knocked out, when the slave trade was discontinued, but the third was left, since sugar was still carried by vessels from Bordeaux, Marseilles, Le Havre and Nantes and still refined in these cities.

In fact, and this is crucial, sugar remained vital to the prosperity of all four. Cane processing as of 1848 was the "chief industry" in Nantes, was a big cog in Bordeaux's economic apparatus, and probably second in importance only to soap making in Marseilles. Uncertainty exists about Le Havre in this respect, but one historian saw no dramatic fluctuation
in her economic life between 1815-1848, so it is likely sugar was still a powerful factor there.

There is more to this story. Little evidence exists of any serious free-trade movement in France at this time which might have been harmful to cane sugar and slavery—especially since duties on foreign sugar remained high and quite advantageous to the colonies between 1815 and 1848.

Bordeaux made some timid gestures in that direction shortly before the Revolution of 1848 because of a recession in the wine industry. There was a reason for this which businessmen in the city well understood.

Britain and various Latin American countries had until the late 1840's bought a large amount of Bordeaux wine but had recently reduced consumption by taxing it "severely." This step was taken in reprisal for the high duties France imposed on their sugar. To repair the situation, Bordeaux asked that France lower such duties by 5%. Yet at the same time, the city also was anxious over a comparable depression in sugar refining which it traced to dwindling imports from the French colonies. To rectify this situation, Bordeaux's men of affairs proposed that levies on colonial sugar be cut by 20%. 82

Before the Abolition Committee Bordeaux repeated these suggestions, and this time, was seconded by Le Havre and Nantes. Again, though, concern centered principally on colonial sugar, and it would have been the prime beneficiary in any scaling down of duties. 83

From this discussion, it is obvious that beet sugar though very deleterious to cane, did not free the slaves in the French colonies. Beet was not yet either sufficiently strong by itself to do the job or able to find allies to help. Laissez-faire capitalism, therefore, had not yet taken over France as it had England. So it would be accurate to ascribe to
the French anti-slavery movement, but above all to Schoelcher, a larger part in French emancipation than that due the English abolitionists in their bailiwick. First hand observers verified this fact—Louis Blanc and Ernst Legouvé, especially. Both intimated that slavery would have lingered on in the French possessions because of the machinations of the colons and their partners in Bordeaux and other cities, had not Schoelcher returned conveniently from a trip to Senegal to change Francois Arago's mind. Arago, Minister of the Navy, was largely ignorant of colonial affairs, had listened to the pleadings of the colons and tentatively decided to postpone abolition until after the Constitutional Convention met in the summer of 1848. Blanc and Legouvé implied that a postponement would have really meant an indefinite prolongation of slavery. Schoelcher saw to it that the delay did not take place.

As one begins a comparison between Schoelcher and abolitionists from Britain and the United States, one feels overwhelmed because there were so many from both countries. It is possible for one to do detailed work on leading figures like Garrison, Weld and Wendell Phillips in the case of America, or Clarkson, Wilberforce and Buxton for England, and still feel that the surface has scarcely been scratched. Further probings (and extensive ones) into lesser figures do not relieve this sense of inadequacy, for there always remains in the writer's mind the suspicion that someone has been left out (to his own disadvantage, and to that of historical writing on anti-slavery in general.) In short, the conclusions drawn here with respect to Schoelcher and British and American polemicists are tentative.

It seems suitable to begin by looking at the origins of the anti-slavery thought of American and British abolitionists. A number of scholars
who have delved into the field of abolitionist literature in the two
countries have shown that Romantic influence at work. Yet Romanticism
seems to have affected directly only peripheral figures in both movements,
playing only an indirect role in alerting the consciences of the important,
hard-core agitators. Schoelcher, of course, was clearly, in part
at least, placed on the abolitionist path by "the noble Negro." He moved
in circles where the Negro was talked about and eulogized, before he
became a foe of slavery. His reference to Abbe Prevost's Romantic
novelette, Manon Lescaut, is also noteworthy, as are those occasional
lyrical outbursts on behalf of tropical primitivism. Comparable literary
encounters and rhapsodic utterances among the leading American and English
anti-slavery leaders are hard to find.

Benjamin Lundy's "autobiography" yielded no sign of a Romantic
influence at work on this early nineteenth century American abolitionist.
Garrison's biographers have nowhere noted in his life any contacts with
Romanticism. He seemed too pious a youth, or more probably too bogged
down with work to have had time to cultivate a taste for such literature.
His sons, though, did recall that he "had a boyish desire" to assist the
Greeks in their war for independence against Turkey—a desire redolent
of Romanticism since sympathy for the Greeks and admiration for their
classical culture was one facet of this literary movement. Wendell
Phillips', Theodore Weld's and James Birney's biographers did not uncover
such leanings among their subjects. Birney did show an affection for
the American Indians but his antagonism toward slavery antedated it.

Wilberforce's sons had nothing to say about their father's non-
religious, literary propensities. Clarkson, it appears, may have been
affected by the noble Negro of Romanticism according to Wylie Sypher,
who stated that Anthony Benezet, an American Quaker abolitionist who was one of the earliest propounders of Negro exoticism, "had traceable influence on Clarkson." Clarkson was a friend of Coleridge and Wordsworth, who for a while were very adamant against slavery; they seem, however, to have been influenced by Clarkson rather than vice versa. Two other important English abolitionists were untouched by Romanticism—Thomas F. Buxton and Granville Sharp—as demonstrated either by their own memoirs or the chroniclers of their lives.

Nor did most of the abolitionists in question reveal direct Romantic influences in their polemics against slavery. There are no traces of the "noble Negro" notion in the writings of Garrison, Lundy, William Jay or Weld, among American agitators. Conceivably, Wendell Phillips was so affected—if his own words are a reliable index. Phillips showed a familiarity with certain Romantic writers like Byron, Hugo, and above all, with Madame de Stael. Lydia M. Child's *An Appeal* contained a fleeting reference to Alexandre Dumas, but she seemed primarily interested in calling attention to him as a Negro of achievement. William E. Channing showed concrete evidence of some familiarity with the noble Negro concept in this idealization of the black race:

> Of all races of men, the African is the mildest and most susceptible of attachment. He loves where the Europeans would hate. He watches the life of the master, whom the North American Indian, in like circumstances would stab to the heart. The African is affectionate. Is this a reason for holding him in chains?

Sentimental oversimplification of Negro character such as this were typical of Romanticism.

Ralph Waldo Emerson of all American anti-slavery figures, though, bore the Romantic impress the most. In his *Journals*, Emerson wrote that
while musing he often was "carried off" to "distant Climes" and "distant periods." At times during his daydreams, visions of Africa appeared in Emerson's mind. At first these African visions were bucolic—with the stark beauty of the landscape, the distant and not unpleasant roars of leopards and lions and handsome blacks swimming in a cool river as their main elements. But they always had sinister endings when marauding slave traders appeared on the scene to spirit off the swimmers.

Some American opponents of slavery, then, showed the Romantic influence, but not many, and none of the principal actors or actresses in the abolitionist drama—save possibly Phillips. Phillips' background differed from that of his fellow anti-slaveryites like Garrison, Weld and Birney, and this explains his contacts with Romanticism, if indeed, there were any. As part of Boston's elite, he had an education which was broader than that of the others, and he had leisure time, either or both of which might have brought to Phillips touch with Madame de Stael or Hugo. The same was true of Channing and Emerson who doubtlessly had a Romantic touch to their abolitionism, but were not central figures in the movement.

There is little or nothing in the writings of Wilberforce, Clarkson, Buxton, or Granville Sharp (an early English foe of slavery who died in 1813) to warrant the conclusion that they were steered into the anti-slavery cause by the "noble Negro" idea. Clarkson did show a tendency to gloss over their faults as a backward race and emphasize their good qualities—a pale reflection of Romanticism which he might have imbibed from Benezet. James Stephen was the single important member of the English abolitionist conclave who showed clearcut signs of a Romantic impulse in his Buonaparte in the West Indies (London, 1805) a glorification of Toussaint.
Schoelcher, then, was different from most emancipationists elsewhere in that the Romantic strain of his abolitionism was stronger. Of course, the "noble Negro" concept was more prevalent in French literature than other countries—witness the active role in the anti-slavery crusade of Lamartine, Hugo and Beaumont—so this contrast is quite understandable. A word of caution: Schoelcher's works were not festooned with eulogies of the tropics and their admirable black inhabitants; he was too busy making vituperative attacks on slavery.

If Romanticism per se left its mark but slightly on leading American abolitionists, they did espouse a variant of Social Romanticism, that blend of Romanticism and the Enlightenment which was a potent force in the evolution of Schoelcher's thought. Garrison's chief biographer Benjamin Thomas saw the American anti-slavery movement as dedicated to achieving a millennium here and now. Behind this perfectionist drive lay a religious urge "to carry out God’s promises of a final triumph of righteousness over sin." Nevertheless, there was also a social and egalitarian thrust to this millenialism in the wish to implement fully the Declaration of Independence. The Bible and the Declaration "fused into a mystical corpus of higher law."98

Signs of these millenial aspiration are sprinkled liberally throughout American anti-slavery writings. James Birney spoke of abolitionists as propagators of God's "light," involved in chasing "the darkness that for two hundred years brooded over men's minds." They were in the act of "banishing sin not only from our country but the whole world."99 Mrs. Child fought slavery because it contradicted liberty, and liberty was "the birthright of every human being. God himself made it the first law of creation." William Jay thought of himself and his colleagues as
conducting a "crusade which had God's approbation" and which was wrecking feudalism's last "vestiges." Theodore Parker, the renowned Boston Unitarian minister, asked before the New England Anti-Slavery Society convention on May 31, 1848: "What is the idea of the abolitionists?"

He answered his own question with: "Only this: That all men are created free, endowed with inalienable rights; and in respect of all rights that all men are equal. That is the idea of Christianity, of human nature." Wendell Phillips was lyrical in detailing his own life's mission to create a "church broad enough and brave enough to admit both sexes, all creeds and all tongues in triumphal procession of this great daughter of the West of the Atlantic." Weld never waxed as poetic but according to his biographer, he was a millenialist.

Among the British abolitionists millenial aspirations were present—but they lacked any egalitarian foundations. Wilberforce, as part of the Evangelical movement in early nineteenth century England, was convinced that the world was in a state of "alienation from God . . . lost in a state of depravity and guilt." His life's purpose was to modify this:

It ought to be the grand object of every moral writer . . . to produce in us that true and just sense of the malignity of sin . . . and of the real magnitude of our danger which would be likely to dispose us to exert ourselves to obtain deliverance from the condemnation and emancipation from the power of sin.

Sin to Wilberforce consisted principally of slave-holding, play-going, and card-playing. He wanted to create a society from which these elements had been erased, but not a democratic one. In fact, Ford Brown recorded that he "steadfastly" opposed "all measures for the social, political and economic betterment of the lower orders", and approved "all measures for the suppression of democratic activities." Wilberforce
saw his role in a rather narrow context: as a gentleman of leisure and money, he had the responsibility to instruct others, the poor above all, that such possessions were illusory, that spirituality and freedom from sin were far more worthy goals. No democratic slogans came from his lips. "French philosophy" (the Enlightenment) he viewed as toxic, and in the United States (in the early nineteenth century) it had "shot its roots so generally as to poison the whole body of the soil."^\textsuperscript{106}

Buxton's convictions were nearly identical with those of Wilberforce. He wanted to "become a real soldier of Christ" and "do his will and walk in his ways." He was, however, outraged by democratic protests such as at Peterloo in 1819, and thought of the demonstrators there as "Radicals" striving after the "subversion of religion."^\textsuperscript{107}

Thomas Clarkson's position was somewhat different. He too was a religious millenialist. During a joyous outburst over England's outlawing of the slave trade in 1807, he prognosticated "that many of the evils which are still among us may be greatly alleviated if not entirely done away with"—if the Christian spirit which did away with slavery persisted.\textsuperscript{108} Yet there may have been an egalitarian flavor to his millenialism, for while compiling his objections to slavery, he reflected that liberty was a "natural" right because all men were originally free. Slavery was, therefore, a violation of a natural right.\textsuperscript{109}

Clarkson afforded a glimpse of his utopia in his biography of William Penn. He considered Penn's Pennsylvania regime as ideal because he governed in accordance with Christianity and endeavored to stamp out profanity and the use of "spiritous liquors." More estimable in Clarkson's eyes, though, was his tolerant attitude toward Indians, Negroes and non-Quakers. He also eulogized Penn for seeking to rehabilitate criminals and
and not simply to punish them. In other words secular and religious motives were mixed together in Clarkson’s millennialism. There is no record, however, of Clarkson joining a democratic movement like the Chartists, or spelling out a specific program for a more democratic English society.

French Social Romanticism had but one important resemblance to British millennialism: it also aimed at the regeneration of man. It was closer to American millennialism because both had egalitarian implications. A good portion of the explanation for this similarity lies in the fact both evolved from comparable backgrounds. Gilbert Barnes has shown that American millennialism was generated by the social and economic ferment of the 1830’s, from the "triumph of Jacksonian democracy, the extension of knowledge and the enlargement of economic opportunity." The age needed a new and more dynamic Christian creed, one in keeping with the changed environment. Calvinism with its austere pre-destination was suitable no longer, but Christian millennialism was. Salvation had been the end of Calvinism, while under millennialism it was only the "beginning of religious experience." Now "benevolent activity" or labor on behalf of God and in the name of democracy became man’s central purpose.

France in the 1830’s was also experiencing a social and economic upheaval, too, as the Industrial Revolution took hold, and the lowly proletarians emerged as a class. Here, too, there was a feeling that ideas and institutions needed to be in harmony with the times. Social Romanticism which directed its efforts at the moral and spiritual emancipation of mankind filled that need.

Schoelcher, who matured intellectually in the Social Romantic milieu, had something in common with American agitators in their dedication to egalitarian ideals. These ideals in both cases were in large measure
a result of the Enlightenment. French Social Romanticism, complete with Saint-Simonianism and Fourierism, had devotees in the United States, for Brook Farm, the collective living experiment in Massachusetts, was designed according to Fourier's principles. But, the major participants at Brook Farm were only peripheral figures in American anti-slavery circles. Garrison derided Brook Farm either out of ignorance of its rationale or because he distrusted Robert Owen who conducted a collectivist experiment at New Harmony, Indiana. He labeled Owen's notion that environment was most instrumental in shaping man as "absurd" and "dangerous."

If the British anti-slavery movement was devoid of a democratic orientation, and frightened, really, by republicanism, it must be remembered that it was not contemporaneous with its French and American counterparts. Rather it went back to the 1780's where it was rooted solely in a revulsion against the immorality and vice of the times.

It would be a serious error to attempt to draw the lines any closer between the American emancipationists and Schoelcher. There was an enormous difference between them on the relationship between Christianity and abolitionism. The American (like the British) anti-slaveryites always emphasized the sinfulness of slavery above all else. William Jay probably summed up the feelings of English and American abolitionists when he described his "first great principle" as the "sinfulness of slavery." Schoelcher pronounced the institution irreligious and contrary to the true spirit of Christianity, but this argument in his case was trivial when compared with slavery's incongruity with republicanism.

Schoelcher's French background provides the clue to this dissimilarity. Inbued with the ideals of the Enlightenment and 1789 he was steeped in anti-clericalism which was the seed from which his religious doubts grew,
and this process was strengthened by the loathing shown by French Catholicism for republicanism until the era of the ralliement in the 1890's when the church began to cooperate with the Third Republic. This is not to say that French Catholicism did not nurture anti-slavery sentiment, as Tocqueville's abolitionism was partially conditioned by it. Nor were all Social Romantics religious skeptics. For Lamartine, at least, Christianity and reform were synonymous. 117

If there were differences in the sources of Schoelcher's abolitionism and those of American and British emancipationists, their arguments against bondage were quite alike. American and British agitators raised the issue of the economic advantages of free labor—Hinton R. Helper, Jay and Mrs. Child from the United States for example, and William Pitt from England; Jay, Mrs. Child and Garrison conjured up the spectre of black insurrections unless the race was freed; Buxton did likewise for England; 118 Mrs. Child and Garrison condemned black enslavement on the grounds the Negroes were a race with intelligence and ability, while Clarkson in praising African civilization employed essentially the same argument; 119 the brutalities experienced by the slaves were a subject of nearly every British and American anti-slavery trace but they were especially covered by Theodore Weld's Slavery As It Is.

Numerous American abolitionists, like Schoelcher, indicted their government for its guilt in establishing and perpetuating slavery;—Garrison, in pronouncing the U.S. Constitution a compact with the devil, was most vehement in this respect. Really, the main difference in anti-slavery content between Schoelcher's works and those of British and American polemicists lay in the near absence of religious polemicizing in the former.
Despite the fact that the well-springs of Schoelcher's abolitionism more closely resembled those of the American movement than the British, his treatment of servitude was more like that of Wilberforce et al in that it was characterized by a degree of realism and detachment. By contrast, abolitionists in the United States saw slavery only as an unmitigated sin and a violation of man's natural rights. As such slavery was not to be removed by political action but by appeals to the consciences of the slave owners, and when it had been eradicated it would leave no unpleasant after-effects. In other words, Garrison and the others could not see slavery for what it was—an institution which should have been attacked along institutional lines (by action through governments, churches, etc.). They also could not comprehend that since slavery was an institution (and a deeply rooted one) its removal was bound to leave complications requiring foresight and careful planning. In short, American abolitionists were too abstract in their dealings with slavery.

This interpretation of the American anti-slavery movement has been elaborated by Stanley Elkins. Elkins related the abstract tendencies of American abolitionism to its attachment to transcendentalism. Transcendentalism greatly oversimplified the problem of slavery by conceiving of the Negroes as abstractions who needed only to be freed to function normally and prosperously, and not as flesh and blood beings who might need supervision and guidance. Moreover, transcendentalism was hostile towards all institutions since commitments to them limited freedom, and, therefore, American abolitionists refused to work through institutions which might have assisted them. Actually, as Elkins saw it there were few institutions through which they might have worked anyway, because American society in the 1830's was being deinstitutionalized—religion, the legal profession,
business and politics were all being broken into segments, each at variance with one another.  

Investigations conducted during the course of this dissertation confirm many of Elkins' findings. Seldom could American polemists look on slavery with detachment; it was an unmitigated evil, regardless of time and location. Most of the time they could not recognize that in different environments and at different times it could be more or less brutal. There were some exceptions. Mrs. Child in *An Appeal* rightly pictured ancient servitude as less harsh than in the nineteenth century variety, and American slavery (probably accurately) as more inhumane than that of the Portugese, French or English colonies. Rarely did they see that careful planning and foresight were mandatory if abolition was to succeed. William E. Channing, in his first sally into anti-slavery literature, laid down a number of practical suggestions to prepare the slaves for freedom. Channing was alone in this respect, though, since the others never bothered with reconstruction plans. Mrs. Child would have left the matter up to the legislators; Emerson regarded emancipation as simply a matter of arousing the consciences of the masters who would then do their duty; Jay was angered by criticism leveled at him for his lack of a program and retorted that he and his friends were "under no obligation of duty or policy to propose any specific plan."  

Occasionally, emancipationists in the United States showed a willingness to abandon their standoffish attitude towards institutions and tried to use them against slavery. William Jay, for example, suggested that Congress should outlaw the internal slave trade throughout the nation, and slavery in the district of Columbia. James Birney finally came to doubt the efficacy of abstract abolitionism; in the late 1830's he backed
candidates for Congress who were against the extension of slavery to the territories, the annexation of Texas, and slavery in Washington, D. C. In 1840 and 1844 Birney moved into politics himself by running for the presidency on the Liberty Party ticket (with an anti-slavery platform).

Birney's overwhelming defeats disclose the disrepute of the anti-slavery cause in the United States circa 1840, a disrepute which was to last about another ten years. Conceivably, this lack of prestige and the consequent inability to secure a hearing in official circles in conjunction with the Elkins thesis on transcendentalism and deinstitutionalization also shaped the abstractionism of American anti-slavery polemics. That the anti-slavery cause in America until 1850 was held in such low esteem is in striking comparison with England where statesmen of power and wealth like Wilberforce, Buxton and Burke supported it, and France where equally influential legislators like Tocqueville and Broglie devoted their time and energy to the cause. Louis Filler has pointed out that abolitionism in America would never have gained respectability had it not been tied in with other reform like temperance and female rights. Neither the English abolitionists nor Schoelcher had any need to hunt for respectability—though Schoelcher later championed these other causes.

Quite probably the fact that English and French anti-slavery leaders were able to gain official support prompted them to be very down-to-earth when they got down to the business of rooting the institution out. So, while stressing abstract and moralistic denunciations in their writings, Wilberforce and the others played upon the sentiments of Parliament to attain limited and viable objectives: first, the elimination of the trade, then the amelioration of slavery and its gradual liquidation. Only when
colonial opposition to the latter became intense did they adopt immediatism. Schoelcher's anti-slavery position was similar. He, too, initially wanted his government to enact laws to improve the slaves' condition and later give them liberty. His later conversion to immediatism did not have abstractionist connotations since it was based on the realistic judgement that gradualism would not work as it misfired on Jamaica. In the final analysis, Schoelcher was a reasonably happy blend of practicality and idealism. This was brought out best by his stand on an indemnity for the ex-masters, when he condemned it in principle but favored granting it in practice so as to deter a colonial financial collapse. Garrison typified the predominantly unyielding moral abstractionism of American anti-slavery circles by refusing to consider any kind of compensation for the whites.  

Two reservations have been made concerning the Elkins thesis. Transcendentalism and deinstitutionalization were not the only determinants of the abstractionism in American abolitionism—popular opposition to the movement was also at work, at least in prolonging it, and abstractionism was not so universal as Elkins maintained.

The charge of abstractionism still stands, against American emancipationists, and it appears to have the most bearing on their position after emancipation when they lost most of their interest in the Negro cause. If their involvement in the crusade diminished at that time, it must have derived principally from their thinking on the Negro himself who in their minds needed only to be let loose from his chains to live happily and prosperously ever after. Garrison, for example, contented himself in the Reconstruction years, with issuing platitudes about educating the blacks, and passively backing the Fourteenth Amendment. Thomas deemed Garrison's simple prescriptions for post emancipation problems "narrow and astigmatic."
Theodore Weld dedicated himself even less than Garrison to the Negroes after their freedom was secured, and aside from some relief projects he participated in, "seemed content with . . . formal victory", with just emancipation.\footnote{130} James Birney was understandably silent as he died in 1857.

The record of the English abolitionists in this area was no better. Eric Williams hypothesized that if English emancipation was truly to succeed, it had to be accompanied by a parcelling out of land to the ex-slaves. Wilberforce, Clarkson, Buxton and the others would have none of this, and mainly confined themselves to cliches concerning religious instruction. Some even countenanced slavery in the United States for expediency's sake, since the cotton produced by it was needed by England's textile mills. Others showed no hostility to the importation of sugar from Brazil where slavery also was extant. Worst of all, a few even tolerated servitude's continuation in Britain's East Indian possessions where they had investments.\footnote{131} In extenuation of this lack of interest in the fate of the blacks after abolition it must be said that Clarkson was senile and that Wilberforce had died in 1833. Moreover, both had manifested concern for free blacks elsewhere, especially in Haiti, by means of a lengthy correspondence with Christophe. In their letters to Christophe they offered freely of their opinions as to how best to promote the new nation's well-being. Some of Wilberforce's ideas were constructive. He counseled Haiti to diversify her economy and become less dependent on sugar. He was not adverse even to a redistribution of land so that the poor might benefit, but this, he cautioned, should only be done with the consent of the owners. Concern about religious and secular education, however, constituted the dominant theme of Wilberforce's correspondence with Christophe.\footnote{132}
Of all the American and British anti-slavery personalities, only one, Wendell Phillips worked actively and diligently for the freedmen. Phillips disagreed with Garrison that with emancipation their principal labors were over. On the contrary, in Phillips' opinion they had just begun. Suiting his actions to his words, he vigorously backed Negro suffrage and officeholding rights, and stringent laws against the Ku Klux Klan. 133

Schoelcher's participation in post-emancipation affairs was like Phillips', extensive and active. He not only spoke out for Negro suffrage, but fought for it in his official capacity as a member of the Provisional Government. He did not limit himself to homilies about education; he also made concrete proposals as to curriculum. He thought, for example, instruction should stress the virtues of agrarian labor so that it might help dispel Negro aversion for this activity. (He did not, though, like Booker T. Washington de-emphasize academic courses.) 134 Most significantly he displayed a keen appreciation of the intricate economic complications that emancipation brought in its wake. He anticipated and prepared remedies for these problems even before emancipation. Some of his recommendations were wise, notably that the sugar industry be broken down into its component parts; others like the high protective tariff for colonial sugar seemed short-sighted and narrow.

None of the American anti-slaveryites deigned to touch the problem of economic dislocation in the South—not even Phillips. It would not be too venturesome to say that as a group they welcomed the financial decline of the South after the Civil War as a sign of God's vengeance. This conveniently raises another point of contrast between Schoelcher and the American emancipationist. His opinion of the colons was never so
vindictive as to favor their disfranchisement and their exclusion from political life as, for example, did Phillips. Of course, France did not have to fight a war to rid herself of slavery, and the Civil War engendered much of the bitterness toward the South, of which white disfranchisement was part. It would be useless to speculate whether Schoelcher would have revised his leniency under comparable circumstances; the important point was his charity toward the colons, charity which dated back to his early polemics when he did not depict them as inherently bad or tainted by sin but only corrupted by slavery. Long after emancipation he saw them as "indispensable to the continued development of colonial society" and deserving of representation in France.\(^\text{135}\) He was always able to regard them not as an implacable mass of incorrigibles but as individuals some of whom disliked slavery but were afraid to speak out against it. This view also persisted after abolition, and Schoelcher was quick to praise whites who shed past habits and were honorable in their conduct toward the freedmen.\(^\text{136}\) Schoelcher in this way seemed to be pointing the way to Eric McKitrick, a contemporary American historian, who has suggested that some of the bitterness might have been taken out of American Reconstruction had effective use been made of ex-Confederates like Wade Hampton who were quite ready to accept the Negro as a free citizen and who might have moved Southern public opinion in this direction.\(^\text{137}\)

Schoelcher and Phillips were alike in their willingness to expand their humanitarian horizons to include the injustices of the industrial era. Schoelcher's prime concern in this sphere was establishment of facilities for the poor—a rather curious obsession, which, however rested on the sound theory that railroads and steamship lines were public concerns and could be legally supervised and controlled to prevent exploitation
on their part. Schoelcher's absorption with such industrial problems reached their peak in 1850-51. Phillips activities centered around agitation for a reorganization of society vaguely along utopian socialist lines. At this stage the similarities between Schoelcher and Phillips became pronounced for the former spoke frequently and sympathetically of Fourier's and Saint-Simon's schemes at least until about 1850. After that date, Schoelcher's concern for industrial ills began to alter until he occupied himself mainly with relief for the indigent and aged, so that by the 1870's, they were a study in contrasts as their mutual reactions to the Paris Commune revealed. Phillips wholeheartedly approved the uprising, while Schoelcher deplored it, though he defended the Communards against wholesale deportations.

One further similarity between Schoelcher and Phillips: both defended racial groups other than Negroes. Schoelcher honored the Jews and asked for assimilation of the Indo-Chinese. Phillips demanded that Chinese coolies arriving in the United States in the 1870's be accorded respect. Garrison also sympathized with Oriental immigrants to America and wrote against efforts to exclude them in 1879. One should quickly mention here that Schoelcher espoused the cause of female rights and temperance as did his American counterparts. The British humanitarians though promoting abstinence had little or nothing to do with feminism.

In the final analysis, Schoelcher was more like American abolitionists, especially Wendell Phillips, than those of Britain. Yet the differences between Schoelcher and these other anti-slavery groups and individuals were more striking. In the first place there was no religious thrust to Schoelcher's abolitionism; in fact he even blamed Christian fatalism partially for slavery's survival. This assessment of Christianity was
Schoelcher's one original contribution to anti-slavery thought. American emancipationists had been jabbing at organized religion for years on account of its complicity in slavery but never went so far as this. Still, Schoelcher was never consistent in his interpretations of Christianity, for he acknowledged that its brotherhood-of-man ideal clashed with slavery.

Secondly, Schoelcher involved himself far more with post-emancipation problems than did most other abolitionists. Probably most significant in this respect were his untiring efforts—eventually colored by pessimism—for the assimilation and fusion of the white and black races by bringing the colonies under French law—a proposal finally and fully implemented, incidentally, in 1946 when France's Caribbean territories were made departments of the mother country. His labors in this area were characterized by dispassionateness, and charity, which clearly distinguished him from Phillips who was vituperatively vengeful, and the other Americans like Garrison who were indifferent. The English emancipationists evinced a rather bland interest in reconstruction problems—witness Clarkson's and Wilberforce's correspondence with Christophe—but old age, death, and expediency kept it to a minimum.

Finally, Schoelcher showed a capacity for growth in reform sympathies. The bulk of abolitionists elsewhere did not push beyond the confines of anti-slavery, female rights and temperance. Schoelcher moved on into a critique of the Industrial Revolution, and if his ideas for curing industrial ailments seemed oblique and timid in comparison with those of Wendell Phillips, they were far more efficacious than Garrison's who in his one confrontation with the horrors of early industrial America posed free trade as a panacea. 144
From these three differences it may be assumed that Schoelcher was a superior breed of abolitionist—that he was more dedicated, more realistic, and more charitable than either those of Britain and America. This favorable image of Schoelcher is marred, however, by one enormous flaw: Schoelcher's toleration of slave labor on non-French soil in Senegal in the 1880's. This astonishing turnabout stains an otherwise perfect abolitionist record. In extenuation of Schoelcher, a number of things may be said. In the first place, he was an old man—nearly eighty when he made the remark. In the second place, and more importantly, this stand was conditioned by imperialism, and a rather bland imperialism, at that, which at this time in France (the 1870's and 1880's) played down the economic enticements which Jules Ferry was to stress so heavily a decade later. French expansionism of this earlier period was largely dictated by a desire to revive national morale after the humiliations of the Franco-Prussian War, and the hope of civilizing backward peoples. Its foremost spokesman was Paul Leroy-Beaulieu who esteemed colonies for their economic value, but who also saw France as a disseminator of European manners and mores.

Schoelcher was clearly part of this earlier imperialist movement. While attracted to the financial lures of colonies, he relegated them to a secondary position. As pointed out in chapter four, imperialism to him was, above all, a means of spreading western civilization to Africa, a way of paying back a debt which Europe had acquired by enslaving the Dark Continent's inhabitants. Probably, then, if Schoelcher was willing to allow France to use slaves in building the Senegal railroad, it was merely a temporary device which actually, in his mind, speeded up colonization and was to be quickly discarded once the French were established.
and went about the business of teaching Africans French ways.

A decade later French imperialism was economic and racist in its general orientation. It still retained enough of its humanitarianism and morale building features, though, to be attractive to the French left, as Jean Jaurès, the noted socialist leader supported it and continued to do so until 1905 when he recognized it as a breeding ground for war.

There is another reason for not placing Schoelcher too far above other abolitionists. This lies in the limited role which any of them, Schoelcher included, could play in the total process of emancipation. By "total process" is signified the destruction of slavery and the eradication of prejudice. The persistence of prejudice in the French and British colonies, and the American south after abolition despite the wise and charitable efforts of people like Schoelcher to destroy it, highlights the long and tortuous path that the total process must follow. Tannenbaum, in Slave and Citizen, hazarded the view that prejudice would disappear only when the blacks had acquired "moral equality" in the eyes of the whites. "Moral equality" was especially hard to achieve in the case of British, French, and American Negroes because the kind of servitude under which they had lived gave them little opportunity to show their native ability, or "moral equality", as a race. In the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, however, since slavery had always been hedged about by restrictions giving the blacks the opportunity to secure their liberty, they were able to show their "moral equality", so that prejudice was mostly extinct when freedom came. Therefore, though one should not belittle the efforts of Schoelcher and the American Negro sympathizer, George W. Cable, who tried to exorcise the phenomenon, one should recognize that they could point to little progress in their endeavors during their lifetimes.
Relatively speaking, Schooler was a cut or so above other abolitionists. It must be clearly understood that he was no great innovator as far as anti-slavery polemicizing was concerned. He did not offer any new and ingenious arguments against the institution. Whoever consults Schooler will find the same rhetoric that Benezet, Clarkson, and Gregoire used long before he did.

Schooler's originality lay elsewhere, in his astute dissections of race prejudice. No other abolitionist reported its mechanics and subleties as did Schooler, but rather simply expressed their dissatisfaction with prejudice. They did not, as he did, record how after emancipation the whites accused the former bondsmen of seeking domination when it was they, accustomed by slavery to rule, who were conspiring along these lines. One hundred years later John Dollard reported the same phenomenon in Mississippi and defined it in psychological terms as a projection, a mild mental disorder, by which individuals, to alleviate a sense of guilt, fasten on others the sinister and selfish designs they harbor in themselves. Schooler labeled such conduct as insanity. Lacking the tools and terms of twentieth century social psychologists he could not offer Dollard's sophisticated explanation but he did sketch in its basic outlines. Schooler also analyzed the divide-and-conquer policies of the whites (during the 1849 elections on Martinique, covered in chapter three) when they played upon and then capitalized on Negro-mulatto tensions to retain power; in much the same fashion C. Vann Woodward in The Strange Career of Jim Crow, showed how the southern Bourbons exploited the "poor whites'" fear of black rule. Finally, no other anti-slavery writer saw the relationship between racial bias and totalitarianism as did Schooler in Colonies Étrangères et Haiti in which he
examined Boyer's Haitian regime and found the latter encouraging dissension between blacks and mulattoes to perpetuate his dictatorship. In this way, Schoelcher becomes a worthy predecessor of Hannah Arendt who covered the same relationship between the Hitler movement and anti-Semitism. Political scientists, sociologists, psychologists, and historians, then, could turn to Schoelcher with considerable profit.
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4. See chapter I., p. 22.

5. Jean Barbot (n.d.) who wrote *A Description of the Coasts of North and South Guiana and of Ethiopia Inferior, Vulgarly Angola* (London, 1732); James Bruce (1730-1794) a celebrated English explorer whose best-known work was *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772 and 1773* (London, 1805); Hugh Clapperton (1788-1827) compiled *Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa in the Years 1822, 1823, and 1824* based on his reminiscences and those of Dixon Denham and Walter Oudney; Friedrich Hornemann (1772-1800) who recorded his opinions of Africans in *The Journal of Frederick Horneman's Travels* (London, 1802); Macgregor Laird (1808-1861) who took a trip up the Niger during 1832-4, and as a result wrote *Narrative of an Expedition into the Interior of Africa* (London, 1837); Mungo Park (1771-1806) who recalled his trip in *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (London, 1800); and Cowper Rose (n.d.) whose *Four Years in Southern Africa* was published in London in 1829.


10. Ibid., p. 80.


13. Ibid., p. 93.


18. Henri Grégoire (1750-1831), Bishop of Bloc was an oddity: a French Catholic prelate but a zealous supporter of the Revolution of 1789. Absorbed by both man’s spiritual and temporal condition, he fought for the rights of Jews and Negroes in France.

19. Schoelcher, *Abolition*, p. 81. *The Encyclopedia Illustrada* (Barcelona, n.d.), XXXII, 1109, said of Manzano that he was a good poet and dramatist but was more admirable for having freed himself after forty years of slavery.


21. *Ibid.*, pp. 121-3. Schoelcher also asserted that the blacks used poison to keep the masters on their estates. The colonos were often prone to live in France and leave the plantations under the care of their gensmurs who, as has been shown, were more brutal. (*Ibid.*, p. 123.)


24. In February, 1843 Guadeloupe suffered an earthquake which was disastrous for her economy that year, causing a decline in sugar production of nearly 9,000,000 kilograms. (See "Bulletins de Commerce de Guadeloupe", 1842 and 1843 in the Archives du Ministère des Colonies).


30. Henri Christophe (1767-1820) was a Negro general who aided the French against the Spanish and English invaders of Haiti during the Revolution. Later he turned against France and the Le Clerc expedition of 1802. Appointed president of the Haitian republic in 1807, he had himself crowned king in 1812. His despotism led to an insurrection, and his suicide in 1820.


33. Ibid., pp. 305, 403.

34. Haiti, Cuba and Puerto Rico were also on his itinerary in 1840.


36. Ibid., pp. 176, 194.

37. Boyer (1776-1850) was a mulatto who played a prominent role in the campaign against Le Clerc. He was president of Haiti from 1820 until 1843 when he was driven from power.

38. Schoelcher, Colonies Étrangères, I, 238.


40. La Revue Indépendante, May 10, 1843, p. 96; Schoelcher, Colonies Étrangères, II, 236.

41. Schoelcher, Colonies Étrangères, II, 224, 236, 237.

42. Ibid., pp. 328-9. There was pressure from the former colons of Haiti for the reoccupation of the island. Louis XVIII briefly contemplated such a project, but gave it up for it would have disturbed England. Instead, France signed a treaty in 1825 giving her favorable trade arrangements with Haiti while recognizing the latter's independence.

43. Schoelcher, Des Colonies, pp. 168-70.

44. Ibid., A correct estimation of the situation. See Baude, L'Affranchissement des Esclaves, pp. 440-7, where he listed several laws forbidding mixed marriages, etc.


46. Ibid., pp. 168, 190, 191, 193.

47. Ibid., pp. 201-2.


49. Cyrille-Charles-Auguste Bissette (1795-1858), a mulatto who in 1822-23 was part of a celebrated case in which he and several other mulattoes were condemned to life sentences at hard labor for circulating literature on behalf of mixed-bloos' rights in Martinique. The sentences were rescinded by a French court, and Bissette went to Paris where he wrote for several journals, notably the Courier Française, and Revue des Colonies which he founded. Though he supported abolition, Bissette was more concerned with mulatto interests.

50. Schoelcher, La Vérité, pp. 97-100, 238.

53. Ibid., pp. 27-8.
54. Ibid., pp. 294, 298.
55. Ibid., pp. 175, 184-5, 217-8, 317.
56. Castelli to Schoelcher, April 24, 1849 (Lettres Inédites a Victor Schoelcher, pp. 167-8.)
57. Dougoujon to Schoelcher, January 9 and March 24, 1849, (Lettres Inédites, pp. 96-7.)
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61. Sainville, Victor Schoelcher, p. 15.
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68. See Le Procès, pp. 20-1, La Grande Conspiration, p. 100, and Événements, p. 63.
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83. Ibid., April 5, 1849, p. 1244; May 20, 1851, pp. 1433-4.
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48. Lamartine, Oeuvres, XXXII, 152.
49. Ibid., p. 158.
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Charles de Rémusat (1797 - 1875), writer and politician was first elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1830. He later served as Minister of Interior (1840) and held the foreign affairs portfolio from 1871 - 3. A philosopher as well as a politician, Rémusat wrote De la Philosophie Allemande (Paris, 1846).
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76. Helot, *Le Sucre de Betterave*, pp. 41-5.
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91. Syphcr, Guinea's Captive Kings, p. 92. Anthony Benezet (1713-1784) was a French-born Quaker schoolteacher in Philadelphia and one of the earliest anti-slavery polemists.
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94. Among the works surveyed or read in their entirety were: William L. Garrison, Selections from the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison (Boston, 1852); Theodore Weld, American Slavery as It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses (New York, 1839); James A. Thome and J. Horace Kimball, Emancipation in the West Indies (New York, 1838—a work which Weld actually wrote using the reports of the latter two individuals; Wendell Phillips, Speeches, Lectures, and Letters (Boston, 1863); William E. Channing The Works of William E. Channing (Boston, 1843); William Jay, Miscellaneous Writings on Slavery (Boston, 1853); Gerrit Smith, Letter of Gerrit Smith to Rev. James Swyle of the State of Mississippi (in the Anti-Slavery Examiner (New York, 1837)); James G. Birney, Birney's Vindication of Abolitionists (in A Collection of Valuable Documents (Boston, 1836)); Lydia M. Child, An Appeal in Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans (New York, 1836); Benjamin Lundy The Life... of Benjamin Lundy (contains a number of articles from Lundy's anti-slavery journal, The Genius of Universal Emancipation) Ralph Waldo Emerson, The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson (Boston 1903-32) and Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson (Cambridge, Mass., 1961);

Two secondary works on slavery contain a large number of summaries and collections of anti-slavery writings and they were both consulted: Dwight Dumond, *Anti-Slavery: The Crusade for Freedom in America* (Ann Arbor, 1961) and Louis Ruchames *The Abolitionists* (New York, 1963). The latter was especially useful as it contained in the original, letters and statements by major and minor American emancipationists.
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114. Merrill, Against Wind and Tide, pp. 216-7; Garrison’s William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879, III, 95. Owen, however, wrote an anti-slavery tract The Wrongs of Slavery, the Right of Emancipation and the Future of the African Race in the United States (Philadelphia, 1864) in which he voiced religious grievances against the institution. It was in his words, "a baneful system, abhorrent to Christian civilization." (p. 23.)


117. Evans, Social Romanticism, p. 81.


122. Channing, Complete Works, II, 106-122. Elkins gave credit to Channing for his concreteness; he did not see any such virtue in Mrs. Child. (Elkins, Slavery, pp. 171, 191).

123. Child, An Appeal, pp. 141-2; Birney, Birney’s Vindication, p. 15; Miscellaneous Writings, p. 197.


125. B. Thomas, Theodore Weld, p. 81.


135. Schoelcher, *De la République*, p. 4.
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142. Lord Henry Brougham (1778-1868) was one British abolitionist with broader interests, and favored extending education, poor relief, and the suffrage (See John Campbell, *Lives of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham* (London, 1869), pp. 405-6, 471.)

143. Some of the French philosophes notably Condorcet also failed to have religious roots for their abolitionism. (See J. Salwyn Schapiro, *Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism* (New York, 1934), pp. 149-50.)

144. Merrill, *Against Wind and Tide*, p. 322.


150. George W. Cable (1844 - 1925) was a Louisiana white best known for his social novels and short stories about the American south—Old Creole Days (New York, 1879) and The Grandissimes (New York, 1880), the latter being an indictment of slavery. Cable also wrote non-fiction like The Negro Question (New York, 1888) in which he argued for black political rights.

151. This notion, however, Schoelcher may have derived from Alexander von Humboldt (1769 - 1859) the German scientist and traveler who theorized that Spain managed to retain power in Cuba by pitting the races against one another. See his Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of America during the Years 1799 - 1804, (London, 1852-3), III, 275. Numerous citations by Schoelcher of Humboldt in Colonies Étrangères et, it is clear, point to this conclusion.
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