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ABSTRACT

This study re-examines the Atlantic movement for African-American Civil Rights from 1833-1919. It explores how a community of British and American activists sustained a crusade first to abolish slavery, and then, after 1863, to promote freedmen's rights in the United States.

The study argues, contrary to previous scholarship, that this Atlantic movement continued after the Civil War in the hands of groups that scholars have hitherto neglected. Re-examination of the ante-bellum Atlantic movement reveals that women and African-Americans in particular were important in sustaining trans-Atlantic activism and that the goals and tactics they utilized in the early nineteenth century dominated the freedmen's rights campaign in the late nineteenth century. While this latter campaign never reached the heights of the ante-bellum crusade, organizations in the later period functioned as abeyance structures until the climate for reform became more supportive to their efforts.

Their use of moral suasion in particular lent continuity to the Atlantic movement. Unable and unwilling to use more radical tactics to further equality, American reformers embraced moral suasion as their primary weapon in challenging
the American racial status quo. This moral suasion relied both on the maternal relationship between the two nations as well as Britain's position as the first abolitionist nation.

Although racism played a role in undermining British support for freedman's relief, it was not the sole, or even most important cause of a decline in aid. Organizational difficulties, jurisdictional disputes, uncertain American leadership, distractions from numerous other competing domestic problems, the gendered nature of philanthropy, and debates within the American reform community over strategy all contributed to a decline in the Anglo-American movement after 1863.

By the twentieth century the scope of the Atlantic movement had altered to encompass the world outside the English speaking Atlantic. The Atlantic abolitionist movement helped build the foundations for emerging Pan-Africanist organizations and other crusades to universalize the problem of the "color line" in the twentieth century. The Anglo-American crusade never really disappeared, therefore, but evolved into a wider crusade against racism by the outbreak of the First World War.
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INTRODUCTION

We won a spectacular victory over injustice, oppression, and evil...How wonderful it is to be able to say to the international community that that spectacular victory would have been totally impossible without your help...your commitment to our cause. On behalf of millions of my compatriots it is a great privilege to say, thank you, thank you, thank you. Our victory in a real sense is your victory.

Desmond Tutu's sentiments at the dismantling of Apartheid in South Africa in the 1990's came 130 years after the demise of slavery in the United States and 160 years after the abolition of black servitude within the British Empire. Though separated by a century or more, these events are obviously and indissolubly linked. They stand along the continuum of colonial and post-colonial struggles for liberation, of the diffusion of the enlightenment ideals of natural and human rights, and of the national struggles against racial oppression and injustice. Yet these events share a greater connection: they are united by their internationalist character. While Archbishop Tutu and others rightly acknowledge the role the international community played in fighting racial injustice in South Africa, scholars have largely ignored the transnational dimension of the
abolitionist and civil rights movements of the nineteenth century. This study moves beyond the national identities ascribed to the antislavery and freedmen's aid movements to reveal that, a century and a half before the liberation of black South Africans, many abolitionists and race reformers of the nineteenth century thought, lived, and acted within an international reform context.

* 

Twentieth century historiography has well-documented the history of abolitionism and the freedman's aid movement. Less well charted is the Atlantic dimension of these efforts. Since the 1920's and Reginald Coupland's valuable, albeit brief, study of the socio-cultural dimension of the Anglo-American relationship, little scholarship has studied the role of the Atlantic community in promoting African-American civil rights. This dissertation seeks to fill that void by examining the Atlantic abolitionist and freedman's crusade from 1833 to 1900.

Similar deficiencies have afflicted both national and international abolitionist scholarship. Until recently, the "great men" theory of history dominated abolitionist scholarship. In largely narrative accounts, white, male, icons--be they William Wilberforce, Joseph Sturge, or Joseph Pease in Britain, or William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Philips,
or the Tappan brothers in America—were the governing personalities of the abolitionist movements. They directed, and gave character to, their respective national crusades: they were the movement. Historians of the Atlantic relationship followed suit, and focused solely on the trans-Atlantic activities of leaders of the respective national campaigns.

Consequently, the scope of Atlantic abolitionist scholarship has been extremely narrow. On the one side, it is circumscribed by time. With the passing of the elite figureheads, scholars presumed that the Atlantic effort subsequently vanished. For scholars concentrating on Britain, this meant that by the 1850's, stripped of national direction, British reformers strayed from the fold. With their interests on the one hand consumed with emergent and more pressing "domestic" issues, and on the other threatened by the rising tide of racist Anglo-Saxonism sweeping over Britain and America, reformers abandoned the cause in droves. Consequently, Atlantic scholars portrayed abolitionism on an international level after the 1850's as, at best, a poor sequel and, at worst, merely a series of inconsequential "aftershocks" to the primary campaign of the early nineteenth century.¹

Atlantic scholarship is also restricted in its scope. Like early histories of the abolition crusades within Great Britain or the United States, most Atlantic studies have
focused on mobilization on a national scale: mobilization conducted by the organizations led by the "great white icons". Recently, scholars examining the campaigns in Britain and America, have attempted to redress this imbalance. Historians have emphasized regional organization and the day to day operation of abolitionism locally, arguing that it was at this level that the most important and long-lasting work of abolition occurred.¹

Atlantic abolitionist scholarship lacks not only depth, however, but also breadth. Characterizing abolition as a cause dominated by national, white, male leaders, blindsided scholars to the important role of women and African-Americans in abolition. Recent scholarship has redefined abolitionism as a much more feminized movement than Coupland and his contemporaries allowed. Likewise, the role of African-Americans in fostering abolition has lately received serious scholarly attention for the first time. These studies, however, remain embryonic and most make only passing reference to the international activities of each group.⁶

This dissertation argues that a fundamental reevaluation of the abolitionist and freedman's aid movement is required to rehabilitate the history of Atlantic activism. It argues that it is precisely because historians have marginalized the role of women and African-Americans that the Atlantic crusade remains hidden from history. While not ignoring the role of the "traditional" Atlantic leaders, this study argues that
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one can only truly understand Atlantic abolition by comprehending the essential contribution of hitherto unstudied groups and individuals to national antislavery. Furthermore, one can only fully comprehend the contribution of these marginalized groups by placing their activities within the international context in which they operated. Thus it is only by synthesizing all these hitherto discrete strands within the antislavery movement that it is possible to reveal the Atlantic movement in its entirety.

By examining the role of women and African-Americans, this study also challenges the conventional interpretation that the Atlantic abolitionist movement—and thus the British and American national crusades—was all but a dead letter by the advent of the Civil War. Looking beyond the "traditional" and accepted ranks of abolitionism, this study argues that the Atlantic friendship, forged on the basis of racial activism, survived not only through the Civil War and Reconstruction, but well into the Gilded Age and the next century. While the fight undoubtedly ended for some white activists in 1863, for African-Americans the battle was obviously not won with emancipation. Thus, while Anglo-Saxonism did indeed, at one level, foster shared prejudice and chauvinism between Britons and Americans, a counter-culture of racial understanding and humanitarianism also survived as a legacy of the abolitionist movement into the twentieth century.
There is, however, no doubt that the activities of the Atlantic abolitionist movement were muted from the 1860's. But such a decline was not solely or even mainly due to the so-called veil of racism that historians claim descended over Britain in the late nineteenth century. Cultural misunderstandings between American abolitionists and their British hosts, jurisdictional squabbles within both the domestic British and American antislavery movements, personality clashes, unscrupulous and dubious advocacy, misrepresentation, and financial chicanery all beset the Atlantic movement and hampered its effectiveness.

Moreover, early historical accounts to the contrary, the Atlantic movement had always moved to the beat of American drums. American abolitionists, not British reformers, were most likely to initiate fund-raising in Great Britain and for good, sound, political reasons. Humanitarian efforts by British abolitionists on behalf of American slaves and freedmen were fertile fodder for those who wished to smear the abolitionist movement with the taint of treason. As with international humanitarian endeavors ever since, altruism was often interpreted—and much of the time willfully so—as meddling with the domestic politics and independence of a nation. Not yet a century from winning that independence, Americans at best resented such international interference and at worst rattled sharpened sabres at the impertinent British. Northern fears regarding British interference in
the sectional crisis merely heightened American national paranoia. The climate of suspicion in the nation threw the American abolitionist movement into a quandary of indecision and helped to heighten the factionalization of the crusade. Divided—as always—by their quarrels over strategy, and further beset by domestic problems, the Atlantic movement floundered in the 1850's and 1860's without clear direction.

Despite the decline in the scale of activism, those who had labored at the heart of the Atlantic abolitionist community continued to support the campaign for African-American rights up to the turn of the century. In the process they provided the movement with much needed continuity. Non-conformist churches, always the mainstay of the Atlantic abolitionist movement, continued to be the backbone of the freedmen's movement. Though bitterly disappointed not to be granted the franchise as a result of all their efforts on behalf of slaves, women remained a vital force within the Atlantic movement. And, of course, African-Americans, continued to be most effective advocates for the cause. Moreover, though many antebellum reformers became "distracted" by other pressing concerns, the very international nature of many of their crusades—women's suffrage being the foremost example—actually provided conduits for maintaining race at the forefront of the Atlantic community's concerns. Collectively these myriad reform groups and freedman's crusaders marshalled the
Atlantic movement during the period of freedman's aid in the 1870's and into the late nineteenth century. In so doing they demonstrated that the foundations of that ante-bellum Atlantic community were still solid.

A new examination of this Atlantic community after emancipation also contributes to a better understanding of an old but ongoing controversy: the effectiveness of humanitarian versus economic forces in the fight against slavery and racism. The contributions of organized abolition to the downfall of both British and American slavery has provoked much historiographical controversy. The Whig school--whose foremost exponents were Reginald Coupland and Thomas Clarkson--argued that the abolitionist movement was the inevitable by-product of "progress". Abolitionism was to Clarkson the product of three developments: enlightenment ideas concerning the natural rights of all men, the evangelical revivals of the eighteenth century, and the leadership of gifted, charismatic and committed figureheads--the "Saints". Utterly humanitarian at its core, the Whig argument continued, the abolitionist movement mobilized the moral opinion of Britain and channeled it first into political lobbying--culminating in the destruction of slavery by governmental mandate in 1833--and then, by example, forced other nations down the same path.¹⁰

To their largely Marxist detractors, Whig hypotheses were nothing more than the mere ramblings of sentimental
historians. Eric Williams was at the vanguard of such critics. Coupland's arguments, he claimed, were myopic. Williams concluded, however, that, although to ignore the humanitarian element in abolitionism would be a grievous historical error, "the importance of the humanitarian element in the abolitionist movement" had been "grossly exaggerated by men who have sacrificed scholarship...and...placed faith before reason and evidence."\(^{11}\) Williams instead argued that the abolition of slavery was largely born of economic interest and the political weight that those economic interests carried in Parliament.

Writing in 1944, Williams fundamentally changed the context of the debate regarding abolitionist success. Most importantly, he turned academic attention away from the moral aspect of slavery. Williams' conclusion that industrial economics was the exclusive cause of slavery's destruction made the study of humanitarian movements redundant. Thus the exploration of the activities of the "Saints" after emancipation was insignificant. The "Williams paradigm" remains the strawman of antislavery historiography today. British scholars since the 1980's have scrambled to dismiss Williams' economic determinism partly through a pseudo-resurrection of the old humanitarian school.

This dissertation argues that a resolution of the debate between those who reduce abolitionism to a knee-jerk reaction of self-interest and those who view antislavery as the
product of inevitable and unsullied humanitarianism, requires a broader examination of the abolitionist movement. One cannot limit the discussion to the elite British leaders of the cause— or the "Saints" as the Whigs piously characterized them. Nor can one limit the argument to a dispassionate examination of abstract economic forces, as Williams did. For both Whig and Marxist interpretations paid no attention to the activities of women and African-Americans in their analyses. Yet, this dissertation argues that these two groups were central to the survival of an atlantic antislavery community. Only by reintroducing these two groups can we approach a full and clear picture of atlantic abolitionism.

Moreover, by demonstrating that the atlantic movement remained viable after 1850, this dissertation changes the historical backdrop against which abolitionist sentiment should be considered. Abolitionist "sentiment" continued after the actual emancipation of slaves on both sides of the Atlantic. In particular, Americans continued to appeal to the "moral superiority" of Britons and to enlist their aid to improve the lives of freedpersons. This mobilization of British moral authority was the mainstay of the movement during the Gilded Age just as it had been during the ante-bellum era.

Essentially what defined the continuity on the Atlantic reform community was its abiding allegiance to, and
utilization of, "progressive" sentiments and tactics. The aim of most reformers remained the publicizing of the injustices perpetrated against African-Americans, just as other muckraking journalists publicized city and business corruption, illicit and dangerous factory practices, and abuse of business influence. To effect change, however, African-Americans and their American supporters even more than most progressive reformers, believed that they needed to appeal to outside pressure. To transform the prevailing system of race relations reformers thus, once again, internationalized their efforts and, through the outrage of British reformers, attempted to create a metaphorical "moral cordon" of negative publicity around the South which would alter the racial status quo.  

American reformers had mixed success in this endeavor if gauged by the degree of immediate and tangible change in the American racial climate. Nevertheless, American reformers were successful in raising significant financial, physical and moral support from Britons. Without this assistance, American efforts to aid the freedperson, particularly in the areas of immediate relief and education, would have been much more restricted.

Moreover, though this support produced virulent condemnation of Britons, especially from American Southerners, this very publicity sparked wider awareness about the inequities of life in the old Confederacy. Most
importantly, the publicity roused Northern sensibilities. In the eyes of many American reformers the initial step on the road to systematic reform was to reach those Americans who had tried to abrogate their responsibility for the freedperson by abandoning the South to reconstruct itself. Many activists, for example, directly attributed a falling off in the incidence of racial violence after 1900 to a growth of racial awareness in the North fostered by British condemnation.

This continuation of British support also prompted many reformers to universalize the problem of racial prejudice. At the end of the nineteenth century the Atlantic movement helped to nurture nascent Pan-African sentiment and organization.¹³ That the first Pan-African conference in 1900 convened in London was both testament to a new era in racial activism and acknowledgement of the role still to be played by the Atlantic community in this new age. London was the "obvious" venue. With its tradition of abolition, aid to the freedman, and a large community of African and African-American exiles, London provided the sentiment, infrastructure, and the credentials for the new movement. Both within and outside this movement African-American reformers found reason to continue to invoke the reform leadership of Britain up to World War One.

A true understanding of the Atlantic community thus bridges the gap between the abolitionism of the nineteenth
century and the civil rights and pan-African approach to racial reform in the twentieth century. The divergence of the atlantic community after the Civil War into various crusades meant that the freedman's movement did not dominate atlantic humanitarian relationships as it had done up to the late 1870's. At the same time, however, this divergence ensured that the shared commitment to African-American civil rights did not entirely disappear. Indeed, the diverse atlantic community of the late nineteenth century ensured that race injected a wide variety of discourses, thus ensuring, as W.E.B. Dubois prophesied, that in the twentieth century the question, would be the race question.
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CHAPTER 1

EXPOSING THE MONSTER OF DARKNESS TO LIGHT:

THE ATLANTIC ABOLITION MOVEMENT, 1833-1860.¹

Let the general mind of England become thoroughly possessed of the facts of American slavery...and the hand of destiny will have written the words of doom upon the walls of our Babylon--When public sentiment is such in the British Islands, that no slaveholder can be received at court, in the public capacity, when the force of enlightened public opinion is brought to bear not only on slavery but on pro-slavery; then the circle of fire which has already been kindled around the scorpion will grow hotter and hotter, and close nearer and nearer, until it will be compelled to bury its sting in its own brain, and rid the world, by a blessed suicide, of its most monstrous existence.²

On 29 August 1833 the British parliament passed the bill abolishing slavery throughout her colonies. This was the culmination of a long and arduous campaign that had initially taken off in the 1770's. As one era of the antislavery crusade closed, however, another began. The eradication of slavery within the West Indies had already excited American consciences as news of the intense parliamentary debate on the issue hit the front pages of American newspapers. After the abolition of West Indian slavery in 1833, Americans confidently predicted that British emancipation would "prove an earthquake on this continent."³ By the end of the decade
a resurgent American abolitionist movement took the field to validate such predictions. Anti-slavery advocates in Britain also turned their attention to the eradication of slavery in the Americas. Prior to 1833 the British antislavery movement had been largely ignorant and inactive regarding bondage in America. In the United States, slavery was a more integral part of the economy and African-Americans presented a social and numerical challenge of the kind that Britons did not have to face. American slavery was thus a very different problem. However, prompted by American anti-slavery activists and armed with a belief in their own moral superiority as the world's foremost "slave-free" power, British anti-slavery activists soon turned their energies elsewhere.

Slavery was one of the dominant themes of the nineteenth century. And, politically, more often than not, it served as a touchpoint for international tension. As a political issue slavery obstructed cordial Anglo-American relations. Tensions between Britain and the United States reached a climax when the expansionist policies of the two nations clashed. In the United States between 1800 and 1870 the slavery issue aggravated the debate over expansion and inevitably this played into expansionist disputes. But while slavery itself proved to be a divisive issue, the campaign for its abolition illustrates one of the strongest examples of Anglo-American cooperation.
For thirty years American and British abolitionists worked, although not always totally harmoniously, towards the abolition of slavery in the United States. From the 1830's until the outbreak of the Civil War the American abolitionist movement successfully garnered British support for American abolition. Aside from financial sustenance, however, Britons nurtured the American anti-slavery movement through example and through their apparent openness on racial issues. American abolitionists appealed to Britain as the vanguard of the anti-slavery impulse to realize fully the scope of her mission and bring her moral suasion to bear on her "offspring", the United States government. For American abolitionists then, Britain became the model for America to aspire to, she was the yardstick of full national maturity and civilization.

This chapter traces the development of the antebellum Atlantic abolitionist movement from the 1830's until the Civil War. It illustrates the divisions that beset the movement and underlines the importance of these divisions for the continuation of a post-war Atlantic civil rights movement. For while the Atlantic abolitionist movement generally failed to look beyond immediate emancipation, elements within the community were already stretching their commitment to the promotion of widespread racial equality, a commitment that many would be called upon to honor after the American Civil War.
The transatlantic antislavery community was not new in the nineteenth century. During the early eighteenth century institutional and personal ties linking the two antislavery movements had been close. In the 1780's there had developed an essentially single trans-Atlantic antislavery movement devoted to the gradual elimination of slavery. This waned in the early nineteenth century, however, as the movement failed to convince planters on both sides of the Atlantic to emancipate their slaves. This failure led to an abandonment of gradualist principles and, for a while, both national anti-slavery movements grappled with the problem of finding new strategies. At the same time, and perhaps consequentially, the Atlantic movement went into abeyance. Although trans-Atlantic agitation on the slavery issue never entirely ceased, before the 1830's American anti-slavery emissaries were infrequent visitors to British shores. Consequently, outside of a very narrow circle of die-hards, the wider British public largely remained ignorant of both American slavery and the efforts to eradicate it. Britain meanwhile, refocused its energies on expunging the blight of slavery from the Empire.

While the British anti-slavery movement reorganized itself sufficiently to win the emancipation of slaves within the British Empire by 1833, in the early years of the nineteenth century the American wing of the movement
floundered. American abolitionist societies in the first two and a half decades of the nineteenth century remained limited in number and localist in action and agenda. Most white abolitionists adopted a conservative approach to the ending of slavery and affiliated themselves with the American Colonization Society [hereafter ACS]. Fearful that a large black population in the South would trigger massive rebellion, and convinced that whites and blacks could not coexist in a free population, abolitionists proposed a program of colonization on the coast of West Africa. Although the organization was hardly successful in its goals, relocating barely 1,500 former slaves by the 1830's, it did succeed in rejuvenating some British interest in American slavery. Encouraged by earlier British support for the efforts of African-American Paul Cuffee and the establishment of a colony for free blacks in Sierra Leone in the late 1820's, the American Colonization Society sent emissaries to Britain to raise funds for colonization. These emissaries helped to publicize awareness of the American problem.

The ACS's forays to England in particular piqued the interest and awareness of trans-atlantic travelers and British ex-patriots, men who already thus had some knowledge of the political and social worlds of both Britain and America. Most famous of these was Captain Charles Stuart, a man whom William Lloyd Garrison regarded as the "most valuable friend" that American abolitionists had in Britain.
in the 1830's. Born in Jamaica to a British army officer, raised in Canada, Stuart spent his early career as an instructor in a British cadet school in India. Upon his forced retirement, a result of his opposition to the treatment of officers involved in a mutiny in 1808, Stuart settled in Canada. Although it is unclear as to when Stuart underwent his "conversion" to the cause of abolition in Canada he immediately became active in supporting fugitive slaves who had fled the United States. He then moved to New York State, and became a school principal at Utica. It was here that he met the youthful Theodore Dwight Weld. In 1829 he visited England where he allegedly became exposed to abolitionism for the first time. By the spring of 1829 the abolitionist community in Britain was moving away from gradualism towards immediatism. Petitions bombarded Parliament calling for an end to slavery with "all immediacy". Stuart became a convert and while working for the Negro's Friend Society in Ireland he began the process of sending the message across the Atlantic. Stuart focused upon his young friend and protégé, Theodore Weld, who he successfully converted to abolitionism. It was Weld, together with Lewis Tappan, George Bourne, Joshua Leavitt, Simon Jocelyn, and William Goodell who in 1831, inspired by the promising events in Britain, met and drew up plans for an American Antislavery Society based on the British model. The organization would not bear fruit until 1833 when the
definitive British Emancipation Proclamation came into effect. In the interim, Stuart became the liaison between British and American interests.

Stuart's conversion of Weld marked the effective revival of connections between the two antislavery movements on either side of the Atlantic. Not only did Stuart become the conduit for American information on the British campaign, but, as his biographer Anthony Barker indicates, Stuart's growing connections with other American abolitionists meant that American abolitionist concerns began to impinge themselves upon the British public for the first time.  

First as a member of British abolitionist groups and then from 1834 onwards as an agent of the American Antislavery Society, Stuart remained a mouthpiece for American antislavery issues in Britain. Most importantly, in the early 1830's Stuart became the major source for British knowledge on the feud in the United States between colonizationists and the new radical wing of the antislavery movement which by 1830 was configuring itself around William Lloyd Garrison and his Boston adherents. Influenced by the Reverend George Bourne of Virginia and his association with free blacks, Garrison committed himself to a program of immediate emancipation without compensation to the slaveholder and without colonization of freedmen which he considered a scheme of "folly, imbecility and violence." Inspired by the British Emancipation Proclamation of 1833,
Garrison persuaded other American abolitionists, Philadelphia Quakers, New England Garrisonians, and New York reformers, to ally in the American Anti-Slavery Society, (AASS). To facilitate immediate abolition the AASS relied on "moral and political action." The effort would be focused on groups traditionally hostile to slavery; evangelicals. Anti-slavery, in its campaign to convert churches, was thus essentially a religious impulse.

Besides winning converts, the AASS also engaged the Colonization Society in a head on battle. It was this battle that Garrison himself carried to England in May 1833. In 1832 he wrote to Lord Brougham, Lord Chancellor and prominent in the early British abolitionist campaign, announcing his intention of destroying the sympathy that the Colonization society had garnered in Britain. In this Stuart, again, was instrumental. It was Stuart who kept Garrison in touch with the sympathy that the ACS was garnering in Britain and it was Stuart who, by publicizing Garrison's cause, facilitated Garrison's sojourn to Britain in 1833 and ensured that he would not arrive in obscurity.

Garrison's immediate target of attack in Britain was Elliott Cresson of Philadelphia, an emissary of the ACS sent to England in 1831 to raise financial support for the colonization effort in Liberia. Some of the leading British antislavery advocates of the day, including Thomas Clarkson, had endorsed Cresson and contributed considerably
to his cause. Under the leadership of Charles Stuart and Nathaniel Paul the ACS was already under siege in Britain by 1832. Thus, by the time of Garrison's visit to Britain in 1833 the stage had been set internationally for the battle between colonizationists and abolitionists.

Implicit in Garrison's crusade were a number of assumptions regarding the nature of the anti-slavery campaign and the standing of Britain in the continuing struggle. Garrison believed that the different national anti-slavery enterprises were integral to a single venture as was symbolized in the masthead of his publication, the Liberator: "OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD, OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE MANKIND." Although Garrison's primary mission in England was financial, his appeal for British aid helped to point some British abolitionists to the wider implications of the struggle in which they had so lately engaged and reinforced the ideas of Britons who were already thinking along similar lines. Garrison's visit helped to stimulate the growth of new antislavery societies in Britain, most of the old organizations having disappeared or at least gone into abeyance after 1833. The most prominent of these organizations were: the British and Foreign Society for the Universal Abolition of Negro Slavery and the Slave Trade (1834); the Central Negro Emancipation Committee (1837-9) (replaced by the British and Foreign Antislavery Society in 1839 - hereafter BFASS); the Society for the Extinction of
the Slave Trade and the Civilization of Africa (1839-43); and the Aborigines Protection Society (1839-1909) (APS). The BFASS would emerge as the dominant organization of the antislavery movement in Britain after 1840. It, along with many other smaller provincial societies that Garrison spawned, avowedly committed themselves to a mission that went beyond financial support, ultimately pledging themselves to "the Abolition of Slavery Throughout the World."²⁰

Arguably, Garrison merely lit the spark to an already smoldering fire. But it was a crucial spark.²¹ Although Britons had pledged themselves to the abolition of the slave trade, they had thus far met with little success. Ardent abolitionists found it difficult to reignite the fire that had burnt the cancer of slavery out of the British Empire in the hearts of the British public. Abolition had become a marginal issue to many Britons. In the face of the increasing problems associated with urbanization and industrialization "charity at home" became the rallying cry for the reform minded. Only a small minority remained sympathetic to the cause of abolition. Intellectually these few had identified slavery with immorality, a universal sin that transcended national boundaries and needed to be purged. But they remained frustrated by their apparent powerlessness. The political tactics that they had used to eradicate slavery in Britain were clearly unsuitable for the American situation. Political impotence therefore restricted British
sympathizers to spectatorism, their mission arrested by their success. It took American initiative to tap and redirect these British sympathies into constructive action.

American abolitionists reawakened the British abolitionist spirit by appealing to Britons on a number of levels. First, Americans merely reconfirmed what Britons already believed: that Britain's abolition of slavery had elevated her to the position of moral leader of the world. After the abolition of slavery, some British abolitionists firmly believed that other nations would soon follow their example:

The French, the Dutch, the Spaniard, the Brazilian and the American...look on us as conquerors; they have read their destiny ran the banner headlines of the BFASS Reporter. And why should this be otherwise, they rationalized? The abolitionist movement in Britain was, to all appearances at least, the most successful example of anti-slavery agitation in the nineteenth century. Consequently, American abolitionists and financially strapped activists accorded their British compatriots high status and encouraged them in their self congratulation. After 1833 then, British abolitionists looked towards Europe and, in particular, towards the United States as the arenas of their next moral crusade, confident that their moral prowess had been proven and would now be welcomed worldwide.
The people of England stand on a proud eminence...They have purged themselves from the imputation of a crime, than which no greater can be perpetrated against human nature or the great moral Legislator of the universe. They can now consistently bring the moral influence with which they are invested, to bear on those nations which may still persist in perpetrating a similar crime.23

Mere political boundaries should not be allowed to stand in the way of such a dynamic, British activists felt. "Moral force cannot be bounded by geographical lines, rivers or oceans," wrote one enthusiast.24 In the same vein British abolitionists defended their work by claiming "brotherhood with all mankind" as "citizens of the world." "True charity" George Thompson, a leading British activist argued, "begins at home. But it is a very false charity that stops there."25

In this manner anti-slavery was merely a reflection of the ethic of the age...internationalism. Throughout the nineteenth century internationalism touched all areas of the reform community from the peace movement to the movement for the penny post.26,280

Abolition was one of the first social crusades to operate on a world-wide scale. Correspondingly, abolitionists concerned themselves with slavery in Africa, South America, and the Near East.27 But the focus of their concentration was always the United States.

American abolitionists' appeals to Britons resonated with the calls of other reform impulses that cumulatively had
created an "Atlantic reform community" in the nineteenth century. Despite the nineteenth century's reputation for Anglo-American antagonism, by the 1830's a true "Atlantic Community" existed; a community united by a shared set of ethical and benevolent considerations, and strengthened by improvements in transatlantic communications. Streams of reformers, clergy, and philanthropists crossed the Atlantic in both directions. Institutional connections further supplemented these personal links.

Such co-operation should not surprise us. The two nations had a shared history, language, culture and belief system. Both nations also shared an intellectual heritage. Both antislavery movements derived their inspiration from the same sources—Enlightenment liberalism stemming from the natural rights philosophies of the eighteenth centuries and evangelical religion based on the teachings of the New Testament. And in the mid-nineteenth century European and American thought shared ideas of liberty and equality, the brotherhood of man, which dominated political and philosophical beliefs of the day. These beliefs overrode nationalism and international rivalry and were at the heart of the abolitionist community.

Moreover, American abolitionists also tapped into the more negative implications of this relationship. British evangelicals tormented themselves for their own personal accountability for the sins of Americans. For, not only did
ties of religion relate them to Americans, but the influence
that English government and law had in molding American
individuals and institutions, namely slavery, created a
crisis of accountability in British abolitionist circles.
This was a black spot on the antislavery record of Britons
and one that needed to be expunged. This was a sin that
American abolitionists constantly reminded their British
cousins of when British support was found wanting.

American reformers exploited all of these affinities.
But they did so for more than consciously self-serving
reasons. A complex mosaic of sometimes unconscious competing
loyalties bound Britain and the United States together; the
rebel nation versus the tyrant; the mother nation versus the
child. American abolitionists seized upon these loyalties
and reified Britain as the moral parent responsible for her
offspring, in a convoluted way the very essence of republican
motherhood. Americans thus squarely placed the burden upon
these Britons to sustain their efforts elsewhere. American
abolitionists truly believed that Britain had the power to
abolish slavery within the western hemisphere and, moreover,
that she had a duty to use this power. "How great, how awful
is her responsibility, if she does not exert this moral power
without delay" asserted William Lloyd Garrison in an appeal
for British aid in the late 1830's.29 American
abolitionists then, attributed moral leadership to Britain
for her abolition of slavery and many British abolitionists,
imbued with the confidence of the Victorian era and the angst of parental responsibility, were not about to disillusion their American compatriots.

Nineteenth century notions of progress also gave British leadership added credence. As David Brion Davis has pointed out, the nineteenth and twentieth century worlds equated slavery with human regression and anti-slavery with progress.30 Many viewed slavery as part of the route that nations must tread on their inevitable road towards civilization; the more civilized nations were those who had trodden this route and had already abolished slavery. Thus, for many, America was merely on a more adolescent part of the same continuum as Britain. Abolition was therefore a natural progression.

However, at the same time some Americans were justifying Britain's leadership in this arena as dutiful and natural, others were condemning it as yet another conspiracy plot hatched by "foreign" nations to foment rebellion within the United States. British abolitionists and their American counterparts who solicited British aid were constantly aware that humanitarianism could easily come into conflict with the exercise of sovereignty by foreign powers. Opposition to British interference is understandable. Britain and America had, after all, been something of traditional antagonists and in the 1840's came close to war on several occasions. It was somewhat inevitable, therefore, that elements within both the
north and the south, within both pro-slavery and anti-slavery camps, became convinced that British abolitionists were a threat to the national life of the United States. On the occasion of the World's Anti-slavery conference that assembled in London in 1840, one American slave holder wrote:

These philanthropic Americans have told our most deadly foe that we have three millions of enemies, burning for revolt in our very midst. 31

American anti-slavery activists invited such "foes" into the very midst of American public life several times throughout the mid-nineteenth century. George Thompson's visits especially stimulated much outspoken American particularism. In 1850, for example, William Lloyd Garrison persuaded George Thompson, of the more radical London group, to share the wisdom of his many years of agitation with anti-slavery organizations in the United States. His visit not only provoked opposition from southern slave holders, but a direct reprimand from the President and the hostility of more enlightened opinion in both the north and south:

The appearance of a Foreigner in the field in an occasion of peculiar excitement gives the advocates of slavery the opportunity to chase the issue...Crying out against foreign interference and covering up the question with great clamor—so that the truth is not lighted and progress for the time halts. The name of "Agitator" adds to the odium of "Foreigner" in the matter of "interference --and the American John Bull gives up to his normal propensity to antagonism as well as to his jealousy."
Pro-slavery forces also consistently criticized Frederick Douglass for promoting British support for slave rebellions within the United States and for bringing the institutions of American society into international disrepute. American abolitionists constantly faced accusations of disloyalty and a lack of patriotism by involving Britons in what proslavery forces saw as an essentially domestic issue. While the irascible Garrison shocked people by his public denunciations of his homeland and Wendell Phillips inveigled against the south as "one great brothel", abolitionists usually forbore from total condemnation. However, accusations of disloyalty dogged the Atlantic abolitionist crusade throughout its existence. What is not clear, however, is to what extent these fears were justified.

The construction of an imminent foreign threat had the potential to be a politically viable tool for proslavery forces, but such fears remained largely rhetorical devices. This had much to do with the techniques through which British abolitionists had achieved victory in the West Indies. The success of the anti-slavery movement in Britain before 1833 had come politically, through parliament, and largely through the efforts of the Whig party. The Whig government carried through the Emancipation Act and most members of the Anti-Slavery Society were Whigs. Abolitionist M.P.s such as William Wilberforce and Thomas Fowell Buxton had lobbied their fellow parliamentarians consistently throughout the
early nineteenth century as ostensible leaders of the cause. This leadership had brought the movement both prestige and acceptability and steered it away from dangerous extremism. It had also given a prominent national air to the organization and had lent it advantages in organization and in the mobilization of public sentiment in favor of the abolition of slavery. As such, the movement had attracted upper and middle class sponsorship and had disassociated itself from the "moral contamination" of the working-class. After this, anti-slavery associations mobilized support that crossed party boundaries and ultimately resulted in the passage of the Emancipation Act in 1833.

Such techniques were clearly unsuitable for the abolition of slavery outside of the British Empire, however. Although American abolitionists urged their British supporters to lobby the British government into action against the slaveholding states, American abolitionists appreciated the impossibility of the British government taking direct action against the United States, and leaders of the British wing of the movement clearly did not favor this policy. Instead, American abolitionists encouraged the British government to speak out and use its international influence whenever feasible. British abolitionists did intervene politically, however, on three fronts before the 1850's. Firstly they lobbied to keep Texas independent. An annexation of Texas they felt would mean the seizure of Cuba
and all of Mexico and hence an extension of slavery into all of these areas. The abolitionists argued that Britain should only recognize Texas if slavery was abolished here. If Texas agreed, then she could claim cash loans from Britain in return. Secondly, British abolitionists exerted pressure upon southern governments to repeal laws authorizing the imprisonment of foreign black seamen while their ships were in dock. This they were successful in achieving in South Carolina (1851), Louisiana (1852), and Georgia (1854). Thirdly, they refused to ratify article ten of the Anglo-American treaty of 1842 which required Britain to return fugitive African-American slaves. All of these actions engendered extreme nativist hostility to the abolitionist movement and, especially during the diplomatically tense times of the 1840's, Americans viewed this as another example of British plotting.

William Lloyd Garrison's conviction that the antislavery crusade on both sides of the Atlantic was a unified crusade undoubtedly contributed to pro-slavery and nativist notions that abolitionism was part of some "grand, unified, conspiracy." Not all British abolitionists viewed their activities in this manner, however, and the transatlantic movement, on very fundamental levels, was undoubtedly not simply a facsimile of the British model. Clearly the Atlantic abolitionist movement could not utilize the same tactics and modes of organization that British abolitionists
had employed. Although American abolitionists undertook fact-finding tours of Britain to learn from the experiences of British anti-slavery societies, the model did not fit American realities. In a decentralized federal system where state law protected slavery, there was no way of attacking the system directly. Moreover, the physical scope and sectional nature of the United States prohibited the type of national anti-slavery societies that had operated in Britain before 1833. The American abolitionist scene was regional and fragmented. Further, factions of the anti-slavery movement in the United States were at odds with the internal organizational practices of British societies, most obviously so in Garrison's case. Garrison linked his crusade to a direct attack upon the political and social system as a whole. He coupled his crusade with those of anti-sabbatarianism, pacifism and most importantly, women's rights. Organizations of mixed gender were therefore common among American Garrisonians. In this, he was at odds with the traditional British practice of keeping men and women's anti-slavery organizations separate.

Lewis Tappen considered British support to be the "sheet anchor", the mainstay, of the American cause. Considering the aforementioned impediments to transatlantic cooperation it is difficult to conceive of the impact that British activists had on their American counterparts, however. Certainly the financial contributions of Britain were not
enormous: Tappen did not base his assessment upon financial contributions. Pro-slavery forces, however, argued that British gold bankrolled the American abolitionist campaign. Although certain individuals did indeed raise substantial sums for the support of the movement in the United States, overall, the contributions were not large. Lecturing tours were the major source of donations collected by American abolitionists in Britain, and these tours were intermittent at best. Before the Civil War Harriet Beecher Stowe's tour raised some $200,000 but this was by the far the most successful tour in this respect. In fact the American Antislavery Society sometimes refused funds from Britain to escape charges of disloyalty. Those who relied upon British funds most were individual African American speakers and the factionalized wing of the American abolitionist movement; Garrison and his followers. Throughout the period Garrisonians relied upon the proceeds of bazaars and other fund-raising efforts undertaken by British supporters. Without such support it is debatable whether Garrison could have sustained his efforts in the United States.

Arguably, Britain's most important contribution was in a more intangible realm. Britain's abolition of slavery in 1833 foisted upon her the role of the world's leading anti-slavery nation and all of the appurtenances that accompanied such a role. This was the rationale not only of the British themselves but of American abolitionists too. For American
abolitionists the antislavery movement was an essentially religious campaign. "Our crusade" remarked Wendell Phillips, "is eminently a religious one, dependent for success entirely on the religious sentiment of the people." Religious fundamentalism underpinned the American movement and abolitionism was a direct by-product of the Second Great Awakening. To American abolitionists slavery was a sin. Many leading abolitionists, such as Theodore Dwight Weld, had undergone conversion experiences in the 1820's and had committed themselves to a life of Christian activism before they became dedicated to freeing the enslaved. These activists faced an uphill task in trying to convey to the American people the inherent sinfulness and immorality of the slave system. As slavery was such an entrenched evil and the "moral sense of Americans so benumbed," it was necessary to mobilize the strongest forces one could against the institution. Many abolitionists, therefore, could justify turning to Britain to lobby outside pressure. Frederick Douglass, deflecting criticisms of his lack of patriotism through his appeals to the British, argued that slavery was such an outrageous aberration against humanity, "such a monstrous aggregation of iniquity", that it required an appeal to the whole world to roll back slavery's strongholds. Driven into semi-exile by civil and barbarous laws, and by a system which cannot be thought of without a shudder, I was
fully justified in turning, if possible, the tide of the moral universe against the heaven-daring outrage."44

Moreover, slavery was destructive to the moral sense. America's own moral sense was in a state of limbo, abolitionists claimed:

Slavery is a system of wrong, so blinding to all around, so hardening to the heart, so corrupting to the morals, so deleterious to religion, so sapping to all principles of justice in its immediate vicinity, that the community surrounding it lack the moral stamina necessary to its removal. It is a system of such gigantic evil, so strong, so overwhelming in its power, that no one nation is equal to its removal. It requires the humanity of Christianity, the morality of the world to remove it.45

It was Britain's unique influence upon America that would help to establish a cordon of "moral fire" around the nation and thus force a reassessment of the true worth of democracy, Douglas argued. Although the whole world, "the civilized and the savage," was to erect the moral cordon, Britain had a key role in its construction. Any condemnation of the system from Britain would strike straight at the consciences of Americans who, abolitionists assumed, believed in the almost paternal wisdom of Britain regarding American development.46

As Sarah Remond, an African-American antislavery envoy, summarized her mission so eloquently, antislavery workers were in Britain to "gather up public sentiment and pour it like hot lead on the Americans."47
Raising the moral conscience of Britons had a more pragmatic dimension. Practically, American reformers knew that anything American antislavery workers said in Britain would be reprinted in the United States and this was more publicity than the movement could gain at home. For African-American abolitionists this was especially true. There were few African-American newspapers that had a continuous publishing life or a wide enough distribution to provide the publicity that the cause required. Frederick Douglass knew that though his words would be criticized in the American press, any publicity was preferable to no publicity. Douglass and other abolitionists tried to maintain abolition at the forefront of consideration by the contemporary English press. American abolitionists were sure to circulate any and all English newspapers, periodicals and broadsheets that mentioned their activities or the cause.

In their appeals Douglass and other American abolitionists stressed that slavery was a crime not only against God but against all the members of the human family. Therefore it belonged to the whole human family to redress that wrong. Britons could be easily roused, abolitionists asserted, because of their innate sense of "fair play, especially in a conflict between the weak and the strong," a trait they had most virtuously revealed in 1833. And where flattery did not arouse activism, guilt would. Captain
Charles Stuart succinctly summarized this sentiment when he pronounced:

The United States of America are our sister land. Like us, they boast of their freedom—like us, they are pouring the Bible and light all over the world—and like us, they disgrace their professions and tarnish their fair name, by keeping slaves. Freemen, like us; and, like us, slave masters.

They lay this sin to our charge, and unquestionably the guilt of the origin of it is ours. They are our progeny—they were long the subject of our laws. We tempted them, and they consented. The guilt of the consent and the continuance is theirs; but, as the crime of the temptation was ours, we owe them, on this head, all the amends which holy love can make.  

The Atlantic community was the vehicle for the resurrection of religious sentiment. Individuals and societies in both nations who devoted themselves to temperance, pacifism, prison reform, educational improvement and countless other beneficent causes constantly shared information, swapped publications, and loaned personnel. Abolitionists used these organizations as vital channels of information and propaganda dissemination. The transatlantic press was also an important vehicle for dissemination of both British opinion on slavery and for keeping the British public up to date with current American events. From fashionable periodicals down to the most obscure pamphlets, Americans avariciously devoured and circulated British abolitionist opinion in the United States. While some American households shunned American
abolitionist propaganda as vulgar, American abolitionists could rely on the snobbery of the educated classes to accept any and all foreign literature.\textsuperscript{53}

Most significant in this arena, at least for abolitionists' purposes, was the transatlantic ministry; the plethora of denominations whose ministers created a virtual congestion of traffic to and fro across the Atlantic. In both nations, yearly conferences attracted interested parties from across the sea. American anti-slavery societies, the American Anti-Slavery Society in particular, focused on groups that were especially receptive to the abolitionist message. Given the history of religious revivalism and social reform, churches were thus natural targets for their efforts. Abolitionists felt that if they could convert clergy and church members to the AASS program then churches could be transformed into powerful anti-slavery vehicles. Moreover, unlike other institutions, churches had the added benefit of operating nationally and thus their potential power was enormous. With their support, Americans would be powerless to withstand the moral force lobbied against it.\textsuperscript{54}

American abolitionists hoped that again, by example, British churchmen and their congregations could be induced to bring pressure to bear on their American brethren.

It was among the Atlantic church community that Britons produced their most extensive work on behalf of the enslaved. All American abolitionists in their appeals to Britons relied
upon common Christian rhetoric and appeal. It is not surprising that the peak of English anti-slavery coincided with the development of a vast "Atlantic ministry." British church leaders had great stature in America. Britain was the land of Knox and of Wesley and if these denominations condemned slavery proslavery forces would have no allies. From the 1830's onwards British clergy heaped odium on the "peculiar institution" from pulpits within England and America, in broadsheets, sermons, and personal remonstrances. The Nonconformists, the Evangelical wing of the Church of England and of course the Quakers were the mainstay of antislavery in Britain. Quakers had stimulated the initial assault upon slavery in Britain back in 1783. They were unsurpassed within nonconformity for their international connections. The Quakers in particular were responsible for spreading the movement in far more provincial and rural areas after the middle of the century and thus linking small communities to the larger, international stage. They dominated the largest anti-slavery organization of the period, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Between 1839 and 1868 over half of the committee members of the BFASS were Quakers. Provincially, Quaker abolitionists led the field; Joseph Sturge worked out of Birmingham and his influence was felt throughout the Midlands.55

The strategies of British and American abolitionists in using churches were various. First, they employed personal
persuasion, largely through individual contacts. Secondly, they ostracized American proslavery ministers who visited Britain, shunning them not only socially but banning them from spiritual functions also.\textsuperscript{56} British delegations also often attended the annual meetings of American churches to defend the abolitionist cause.\textsuperscript{57} Although historians have remained skeptical regarding the efficacy of such actions beyond the mere irritation of American ministers, these actions gave much publicity to the crusade. Each act of opposition prompted widespread publicity in the daily press of Britain, much of which the press in the United States picked up and printed.

The BFASS consistently stressed the sinfulness of slavery and asserted that if the religious world "could be induced to enter upon the subject, severing from it all its political relations, and viewing it simply as a question between God and man, the battle was won."\textsuperscript{58} But the fight was not so simple. Sometimes the united front of Christian opposition to slavery broke down. Christian efforts were often decidedly sectarian and mirrored the divisions that beset the American reformers. These movements often broke with their American counterparts, however, if the latter held communion with slave holders. Wilson Armistead of the Leeds Emancipation society underlined the important impact of church solidarity:
There cannot be a doubt that professors of religion and ministers of the gospel and Christian churches constitute the stronghold of Slavery. If, instead of conniving at its existence, they would throw their influence into the efforts of Anti-Slavery Societies, the evil would be abolished throughout the earth.  

The Free Church of Scotland became the center of a rift within anti-slavery ranks when in 1844 they attempted to raise money for the church from Presbyterians in the American South, in effect, taking money from slave holders. This led to a fratricidal battle within the British wing of the movement. Ultimately, the faux pas resulted in a "send back the money campaign". Garrison and his supporters Frederick Douglass and Henry C. Wright toured Scotland inducing individual congregations and ministers to return their contributions. Thereafter, the Free Church of Scotland did not make the same mistake twice and indeed remained one of the staunchest defenders of African-American rights until the twentieth century. By the Civil War abolitionists had not persuaded all British churches to convert themselves and their American brethren to the cause of anti-slavery or to forgo communication with ambivalent religious organizations in the United States. Nevertheless, during the 1850's churches and their abolitionist stance remained the most viable part of the transatlantic movement for abolition.

By the 1850's not only was the united front of Christian opposition crumbling but the anti-slavery movement was riven with divisions, mirrored on both sides of the Atlantic.
Moral suasion had clearly failed to persuade southern slave owners to abolish the practice and many moderates began to criticize Garrison's strategies. The World's Anti-Slavery convention of June 1840 held in Exeter Hall, London was a highpoint in Anglo-American cooperation. Although technically it drew together the world's foremost antislavery activists, most of the delegates came from Great Britain and the United States. The convention reveals that, for the first time, abolitionists formally recognized and declared that the antislavery struggle was a single, universal impulse. But this convention was as important for the divisions within the movement that it revealed. In general, the British movement mirrored the divisions and difficulties that beset the American movement.

At the 1840 convention the immediate cause of division was the "woman question." This had fomented a split within the American movement which had come to a head a month prior to the convention. William Lloyd Garrison and the radical wing of the abolitionist society had seized control of the AASS forcing the evangelical wing, led by Lewis Tappan, to secede and form the American and Foreign Antislavery Society. Garrison's combination of anti-slavery with a number of other humanitarian or radical issues, including anti-sabbitarianism, non-resistance, perfectionism and women's rights had precipitated the split. Indeed, for a time, Garrison contemplated attributing these causes equal
status with antislavery. Moderate abolitionists such as Arthur and Lewis Tappan, William Jay and James G. Birney feared that the movement's disparate attention was eroding its strength and legitimacy. Although antissababitarianism, women's rights, and other "extraneous" causes were never preached from an antislavery lecture platform, throughout the 1830's the antislavery movement had come consistently under fire from all quarters. Moderate abolitionists were distraught that the cause was receiving such bad press. Proslavery forces consistently harangued abolitionist groups as "radical", "fanatical", "threatening", and rife with "madmen." For abolitionists aiming to prove that abolitionism was respectable and orthodox in its views on all other subjects, Garrison was a liability. "It is down-right nonsense" wrote Elizur Wright, Jr., "to suppose that the Anti-Slavery cause can be carried forward with forty incongruous things racked on to it. You can't drive a three tined fork through a hay mow, but you can drive in the handle."  

Garrison's name soon became a symbol not only for the extreme or ultraist wing of the abolition movement but for the abolition movement as a whole. In particular, Garrison's endorsement of women anti-slavery activists prompted dissension. Conservatives demanded a narrow platform of antislavery sentiment around which all abolitionists could unite. As the movement stood it drove supporters from its
ranks with its "Quixotic crusade of knights-errant valorously battling for the rights of women!" While conservatives accused the Garrisonians of letting abolitionism be identified with other causes advocated by only a small sectarian movement, Garrisonians argued that it was in fact conservatives who were sectarian; antislavery was merely part of a broader movement for human rights and one which inevitably brought women into public activity. Opposition to Garrison's position started with his clerical opponents in New England who opposed the New England Anti-Slavery Society's practice of sending female lecturers to convert congregations. Abolitionists could not afford to lose the support of protestant churches on which it relied to spread the cause. In 1839 at the national meeting of the AASS Garrison's delegates defied the New York leadership and granted women, who previously had been allowed to attend meetings but not to vote, the right to vote in the proceedings. The ultimate schism came at the 1840 anniversary meeting when the Tappan faction failed to prevent Garrison from placing women in executive positions and so withdrew to form the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (AFASS). The schism helped to decentralize antislavery efforts and henceforth neither organization could truly speak for the abolitionist movement. The two factions struggled to keep their fronts up. Financially then, both groups needed British support to sustain themselves.
Americans brought these contentious issues to the World's Anti-slavery Convention in London, 1840. The conservative British Quaker leadership refused to seat American female antislavery delegates and an outraged Garrison declined to present his credentials and spent the whole conference sitting in the gallery with the female delegates in protest. Although many British reformers remained consternated by American backbiting, fractures soon appeared within the British movement also. George Thompson and Scottish abolitionists generally lined up with Garrison and Joseph Sturge and the more powerful wing, the London Committee, supported Tappan and the moderates. In 1839 the London Committee consolidated itself as the British and Foreign Antislavery Society. This was essentially an organization of "old guard" abolitionists, hangovers from the campaign against West Indian slavery, its most avid patrons being Thomas Clarkson, the Gurney family and wealthy Quakers from southern England. The Garrisonian faction was much smaller than the London dominated faction. Moreover, despite efforts throughout the mid-nineteenth century, the Garrisonians lacked a central organization. Garrisonians were instead dispersed in many provincial antislavery organizations. Again, Quaker families--the Webbs, Smeals, Wighams and Estlins--dominated these organizations and the faction had a distinct geographical bias being confined to Scotland, Ireland and the west of England. The Duchess of
Sutherland, Lord Shaftesbury, Lady Byron and their families commanded the last and smallest faction. Commonly referred to as the "Stafford House Set", these noble philanthropists contributed little to the organization of the anti-slavery movement and did much to heighten tensions between American and British citizens, abolitionists or not. Unlike other members of the abolitionist community the Duchess did little to hide her disdain for all things American.\textsuperscript{73}

By the 1840's the British situation thus began to parallel the American situation. The major difference was that in Britain anti-Garrisonians retained a tight hold of the national organization, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. George Thompson was the only figure of stature to retain his alliance with the Garrisonians. British Garrisonianism had three strongholds in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dublin, cities united by their traditions of autonomy and hostility towards the national group. British Garrisons also differed from their American counterpart on matters of politics. While Garrison and his followers withdrew from every form of participation in political life, British Garrisonians tended to support the Whig-Liberal party. They also espoused other radical reform issues including Chartism and the Irish repeal movement.

Although Garrisonianism remained a minority movement within Great Britain, Garrisonians commanded attention out of all proportion to their numbers. They were highly vocal.
More importantly, the Garrisonian faction retained the continuity between the anti-slavery movement and the freedmen's and civil rights movement. The Garrisonians' commitment to universal reform sustained transatlantic interest in the lives of African-Americans after emancipation.

The divisions that the 1840 convention precipitated had very serious ramifications for Anglo-American cooperation. The fratricidal battle of abolitionists was now being fought on both sides of the Atlantic. Throughout the 1840's and the 1850's scarcely an American abolitionist could appear on the anti-slavery lecture circuit without being denounced by one or the other side. Moreover, the 1840 convention and the previous rifts between American abolitionists resulted in a reconsideration of the movement's modus operandi. By the late 1830's many abolitionists relinquished moral suasion as a method of conversion. Abolitionists had failed to persuade a single large religious denomination to adopt an unequivocal antislavery policy and they thus felt that new tactics were necessary. Many now turned their attention to politics. This left British abolitionists twiddling their reformist thumbs. Politically, British antislavery bodies could not do anything to materially affect the slavery controversy. As such, many British organizations became little more than correspondence societies with their American counterparts. Garrison's supporters in Britain continued to be the voice of
moral conscience although Garrison too lost support for his overzealous involvement in internal British affairs, in particular for advocating the destruction of the monarchy. Garrison's forays into universal reform further splintered the abolitionist community. By the late 1830's this disintegration had convinced many African-American activists to reconsider their position within the movement. Many had been unhappy for some time with their subordinate position within the movement for the emancipation of their own race. Some African-Americans like Charles Remond retained their allegiance to the Garrisonians but many threw off the shackles of ideological constraint and forged their own way. They charged that white abolitionists, caught up in their fratricidal battles and diverting their energies to other causes, no longer served the immediate needs of the African-American population and were undermining the antislavery movement. Stonewalled by white racism even from within their own movement, conscious now that it was possible to be both antislavery and anti-black as the reluctance of anti-slavery organizations to attack neoslavery in the north demonstrated, African-Americans insistently advocated their independence. Increasingly African-Americans, such as Henry Highland Garnet and David Walker, opposed Garrison's position on non-resistance and urged violence to end slavery. They exhorted those African-Americans to challenge slavery politically. Such invocations
were anathema to the Garrisonians. Frederick Douglass, the Garrisonian's most prominent African-American lecturer, became increasingly restive with Garrison's radical ramblings and broke with him after their joint 1846 visit to Britain. By the 1851 AASS convention Douglass was proclaiming the practicality of political action and opposing the dissolution of the Union on the grounds that it abrogated his duty to slaves. The ultimate expression of this independence came in the 1850's when Martin Delany championed emigration to Africa, thereby renouncing the beliefs of most abolitionists that racial equality was a realistic aspiration in nineteenth century America. Black abolitionists such as Douglass, Delany and Mary Ann Shadd Cary eventually broke with the white dominated movement and promoted a nascent black nationalist movement.

Britons were more ambivalent to these later schisms than to the initial break between radicals and moderates. African-American lecturers had always been the "darlings" of the British antislavery lecture circuit. British antislavery activists and the public were very responsive to African-American lecturers, a fact that the American movement was quick to capitalize on. In particular, the sight and sound of victims of the odium that they were engaged in fighting was a stimulus for that moral sentiment the movement was anxious to cultivate. The realities of West Indian slavery had never really touched the lives of the British
public. The tours of ex-slaves Moses Roper, Moses Grandy, and Frederick Douglass whetted the British public's appetite for African-American speakers, however. Here were men who spoke with a special wisdom on the issue.  

Although African-American emissaries had visited Britain since the beginning of the century, such tours peaked in the 1840's and early 1850's. International antislavery conferences first attracted African-Americans. Later the Fugitive Slave Law forced many abroad. African-American lecturers pleaded the same issues as white abolitionists. Nathaniel Paul campaigned against the ACS. Frederick Douglass devoted much of his 1845/46 tour to a condemnation of British churches who maintained communion with their pro-slavery American brethren. African-Americans though were obviously specially motivated and gave added meaning to the abolitionist's movement protest against American inhumanity and its dream of a more egalitarian America. Violent opposition to the racial status quo was not an option for African-Americans. Thus, as Blackett has suggested, they were more anxious than their white counterparts to employ suasion to fight the cause. African-Americans were eager to isolate the United States from world opinion by constructing a "moral cordon" of antislavery feeling around her. This cordon would be bounded by

Canada on the North, Mexico in the west, and England, Scotland and Ireland on the east, so that wherever a slaveholder went, he might hear nothing.
but denunciation of slavery, that he might be looked down upon as a man-stealing, cradle-robbing, and woman-stripping monster, and that he might see reproof and detestation on every hand."

To bind this moral cordon together as an "impenetrable wall of morality" antislavery allies had to accept the "universal brotherhood of mankind." If one part of this brotherhood was oppressed then all mankind had a duty to deliver their brother. African-Americans thus sought to impress on Britons the shared humanity of man. This led many African-American abolitionists to blend as neatly as their complexions would allow into the British social scene. It is little wonder that Frederick Douglass thus became a favorite of British audiences. His urbane manner and dress pandered to western expectations of their social equals and thus facilitated acceptance of the notion of a universal brotherhood.

African-American lecturers, although in essence another fraction within the American abolitionist movement, served as a rallying point for British antislavery opinion and a focus of interest around which British abolitionist sentiment could at least temporarily unite. British abolitionists were interested in the slave, precisely the focus that African-American abolitionists implored American abolitionists to maintain. To this end African-American abolitionists sought to avoid extraneous issues. Ex-slaves who toured the British Isles avoided all possible references to the factional disputes within the Atlantic abolitionist movement asking
Britons not to contribute to an organization's treasury but rather to support African-American communities; sponsor newspapers, schools, churches. The most popular form of contribution was the purchase of a slave's freedom. Frederick Douglass was perhaps the most famous recipient of such British benevolence. Ellen Richardson, a member of the famous Quaker antislavery Richardson clan in Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, solicited donations from prominent British activists to purchase his freedom. Britons forwarded one hundred and fifty pounds sterling to Douglass' "owner", Thomas Auld, who signed a deed of formal manumission on 12 December 1846.\(^\text{87}\) The exodus of ex-slaves from the United States prompted the formation on November 4th, 1853 of the Ladies Society to Aid Fugitives from Slavery.\(^\text{88}\) The Society paid for the manumission of slaves and provided them refuge when their escape was made. Such transactions breached the Atlantic wall of opposition to slavery. Critics, largely American, accused Britons of trafficking with slave holders. However, reminders of the ordeal that awaited Douglass as a recaptured slave helped to temper such criticism.\(^\text{89}\)

African-Americans also cautiously avoided discussion of British internal politics, having learnt form Garrison's ill-considered invective that such opinions were best kept to oneself. This avoidance of domestic issues probably led Douglass to forego establishing a true international working-class movement.\(^\text{90}\) Working-class Britons extended to
African-American lecturers courtesies that they did not demonstrate to white antislavery workers. The "bricks and mortar" of the antislavery wall were largely white middle class reform minded individuals. But within the large crowds who flocked to hear African-American lecturers was a sizable proportion of the working-class population. This segment of the audience came not merely to hear of the injustices perpetrated upon the African-American worker but they brought with them their own agenda. Consistently at such meetings, working-class representatives called upon African-American abolitionists to address the issue of working-class poverty and oppression in Britain. Working-class supporters called upon African-American lecturers to condemn landlord laws and usages in Ireland, to endorse the Tenant League, and to denounce the system of wage slavery. Local working-class leaders also used African-American lecturers as examples of the hypocrisy of British middle class reformists, particularly in the BFASS whose meetings Chartists frequently disrupted, who cried fie on American slavery but refused to address oppression within their own nation. African-Americans had sympathy for such causes. Douglass had conversations with the most prominent Chartist of the time, William Lovett. On one occasion he also formerly identified the Anti-Slavery League with the eradication of slavery throughout the world, which included, he said, political slavery in England. But African-Americans quickly
abandoned even this most tenuous linkage to Chartism. Although sympathetic to the cause of the working-classes, African-Americans insisted that chattel slavery was the most oppressive labor system. African-Americans pointed to the fundamental differences between the two systems:

He [the wage worker] knows whilst the sweat pours from his hard-wrought frame, that his distant cot is safe, and is protected by the invisible but all-pervading power of the British law. He knows that when the evening comes and his toil is at an end, he may return to his humble but happy abode, and find it not robbed of the wife of his bosom, or the children of his love.92

Further, British workmen toiled for themselves, dwelt in their own homes and were secure in their domestic rights. These assertions were far from acceptable to the British working-class, however. Working-class activists continued to incorporate the image of slavery into their fight against industrial capitalism, placing the image of the "wretched seamstress" alongside that of the black slave.93

Such transactions did much to enhance Britain's reputation as an egalitarian and color blind society; a reputation monarchical Britain delighted in broadcasting to republican Americans.94 Britain returned to the United States virtually no fugitive slaves who sought refuge in Britain or her possessions under the Fugitive Slave Law.95 Many African-Americans made Britain their new homes and publicized their new lives in a land of equality in countless
memoirs. William Wells Brown, for example, wrote of his safe arrival in England:

For the first time in my life I can say "I am free". My old master may make his appearance here with the constitution of the United States in his pocket, the Fugitive slave law in one hand and the chains in the other, and claim me as his property, but all will avail him nothing. I can stand here and look the man in the face and tell him that I am his equal.  

Many of these ex-slaves became part of the African-American community in exile that supported the post-civil war Atlantic movement for African-American rights. Many became instant celebrities, particularly in Scotland. Moses Roper, for example, escaped slavery in 1830, fled to England and lectured upon the anti-slavery tour, and then made his permanent home in Britain. William G. Allen, a free black, fled to England in the late 1840's after facing violent mob protest when he married a white student of his from McGraville College, New York. He too became active in the anti-slavery movement, opened a school in Islington and spent the rest of his life in England. Henry "Box" Brown, who earned his nickname when he was smuggled out of America to England in a box in 1850, made his living in Britain by touring with his anti-slavery panorama. Abolitionists encouraged many of these ex-slaves to publish volumes detailing their lives as slaves and their heroic journeys to freedom. Of twenty such volumes published, at least a dozen were originally printed in the British Isles and many
previously published memoirs were reprinted as "British Editions." Prominent British abolitionists published many of these memoirs. Despite their personal differences, Richard Webb, the leading Dublin abolitionist published several British editions of Frederick Douglass' Narrative. Through such narratives, together with lectures, interviews, newspaper articles and dramas, black abolitionists exposed Victorian Britons to the horror of life under slavery. They demonstrated the destructive effect of slavery on family life and destroyed the myth of the happy and contented slave in bondage. They personalized the Fugitive Slave Law. And they described in explicit detail the physical torture of the chattel slave. Moreover, they belied the myth that African-Americans possessed inferior mental and intellectual abilities. Frederick Douglass in particular impressed his British hosts in this manner.

Undoubtedly a certain degree of voyeurism underpinned public interest in African-Americans visitors to Britain. Curiosity drew many to see the six-foot-five inch Moses Roper. It became even "fashionable" to entertain black abolitionist emissaries. The superficiality of some of the British interest is illustrated by Mary Howitt, wife of author William Howitt, who wrote:

I am just now deeply interested in the anti-slavery question, the real thorough Abolitionist view which would cut up the crying sin root and branch, and spare none of its participants. Our friend, William Lloyd Garrison, is now in London,
with one of the most interesting men I ever saw, a runaway slave, Frederick Douglass...I can talk of nothing but the "dear blacks."

But African-Americans nevertheless reported that they found little of the patronizing spirit so evident in the United States. Instead, African-Americans thrived in an atmosphere far less proscribed than they were accustomed to. Society did no segregate them, in fact the gamut of society welcomed them and they promoted not only abolitionism but the improvement of the entire black community.

Besides monetary contributions to specific African-American communities, African-Americans hoped to use British public sentiment to counteract racism within Britain itself. British sentiment could be used against proslavery American travelers in Britain, for example. Abolitionists also hoped to prevent emigrants from Britain carrying proslavery sentiments with them, particularly the thousands of Irish who flocked into Boston and the north-east every year. In this war to gain the hearts and minds of Britons, African-Americans played an essential part. Their ability to mobilize British public opinion was greater than the more detached white anti-slavery workers.

Black abolitionists remained an important part of the Atlantic abolitionist community through the Civil War. Their lecture tours and proceeds from their bazaars bankrolled the National Anti-Slavery Standard and the AASS's lecture agents
and kept the antislavery movement solvent. More importantly, African-Americans lend continuity to the Atlantic abolitionist movement. Their work went beyond the abolition of slavery to propagate general racial equity in the United States. From the beginning of antislavery organization, black abolitionists stressed that emancipation was not the end but merely the means to an end. Clearly, African-American abolitionists envisioned a long future for the transatlantic abolitionist community.

Women played a similar role within the Atlantic abolitionist community. A source of fractionalization both within and between the American and British movements, women also helped to bind the Atlantic system together. Women had always been important to the national antislavery societies of both nations. White women became involved in the campaign against the slave trade from the 1780's and from 1823 the campaign against slavery itself. Women in both nations, at the same time limited by contemporary expectations of gender behavior and determined to challenge these embargoes, performed similar functions. They supported local and national abolition societies, abstained from slave-grown produce, and wrote antislavery tracts. At this level women circulated petitions and antislavery tracts, held meetings, organized lectures, and, most importantly, raised money necessary to bankroll the wider abolitionist movement. Petitioning and money raising became the focus of women's
groups early on. Although excluded from the wider political theater American and British women were at the core of the petitioning movement. In Britain in 1833, for example, the "Ladies of England" presented one petition to parliament bearing 187,000 signatures. Between October 1830 and April 1831 some 5,484 petitions were sent to parliament, the majority of which women organized and signed. Similarly in the United States, between 1837 to 1839, women were instrumental in organizing the petition movement against the gag rule. After 1833 the importance of women in the British movement heightened. The antislavery movement of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had relied upon political pressure for its successes. The political process, of course, largely excluded women from participation, although their petitioning of parliament was an important facet of the antislavery effort. Women's contribution to the cause had thus been extra-parliamentary in nature. Women promoted abolition through boycotts of slave-grown produce, aroused public opinion, and were largely responsible for the money raising efforts that kept the antislavery movement solvent. After 1833 with the political expedient removed, women's roles were enhanced. Moral suasion and financial aid to the American movement became all the more important to the cause. Women continued to support the free produce movement, they gave practical aid to fugitive slaves who had fled to Britain.
American women mirrored the activities of their British sisters. From the early 1830's they became increasingly important to the impetus to abolish American slavery. Women formed the first female antislavery societies in Boston and Philadelphia in 1832 and 1833 respectively and women's involvement spread quickly through the northeast and Pennsylvania over the next few years. American women's activism was an extension of their republican activism: the guardians of home, hearth, and morality. Such responsibilities had already taken form in women's efforts on behalf of the peace and temperance movements. Their antislavery activity was thus just a logical extension of previous reform activity.

After the Emancipation Act of 1833 British women turned readily to the cause of American abolition. British female antislavery societies had cemented the links between the British Anti-Slavery movement and its American counterpart during the 1820's. Abolitionists greatly exploited these relationships in forging a genuine Atlantic abolitionist community from the 1830's through the 1850's.109

From the 1830's the Garrisonians did much to enhance these links and transfigure the bond from one of mutual support to British support of American efforts. William Lloyd Garrison, Charles Stuart and George Thompson—in particular—were instrumental in configuring this transition. All sponsored female anti-slavery activism and
through their efforts a true transatlantic sisterhood was born in the 1840's and 1850's. These leading antislavery activists all encouraged women to form societies modeled after British efforts on their tours in the United States. They also urged the expansion of such endeavors in Britain. The hub for female transatlantic contacts was the Glasgow Ladies' Auxiliary Emancipation Society. This society channeled information about the British and American campaigns. It was women who sustained it. Female antislavery leaders like Elizabeth Pease of Darlington, Eliza Wigham of Edinburgh, Mary Estlin of Bristol, Anne Knight of Chelmsford, Anna Richardson of Glasgow, and Harriet Martineau were the female Garrisons. The Darlington, Newcastle, Edinburgh and Sheffield Ladies' Anti-Slavery societies in particular, played a major role in sustaining the transatlantic contact through the Civil War. These organizations exchanged information and ideas as to how best conduct the antislavery crusade. Women organized and staffed all of these organizations and sustained them by shared religious affiliation and, perhaps most importantly, by personal friendships.

Such personal friendships became well-developed after the 1840 World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London. Before the conference began British women began mixing with the American female delegates. In particular, Elizabeth Pease and Anne Knight formed close personal friendships with
American delegates, friendships that would figure prominently in the future participation of women in the Atlantic abolitionist movement.

The convention also proved to be factionalizing, however, as the cause of women's rights threatened to divide the Atlantic community. As for the impact of the convention upon feminism in Britain, British female delegates praised the convention for opening the avenue for discussion of women's rights and their role within the British abolitionist community, but others felt that the controversy had forced them onto the defensive and forced them to justify their public forms of campaigning while distancing themselves from support for women's rights. 111

Divided by prioritizing of women's goals, race also wracked the female abolitionist community. African-American women naturally joined with white women in condemning slavery. Indeed, it was African-American women who formed the first all female antislavery society in Salem, Massachusetts in 1832. But racial belief often overrode the relation of gender concern. African-American women did integrate with white women in antislavery societies. The Philadelphia and Boston female antislavery societies welcomed African-American members.112 On the other hand, many white female abolitionists, while expressing "sisterhood" with female slaves, did not allow the participation of African-American freedwomen within their organization. Such
exclusion, historians argue, points to fundamental differences in the goals of white and African-American female abolitionists. Where the predominant goal of white dominated organizations was to eradicate slavery, African-American women went beyond this to broadly support the sustenance of a black community. Some women's belief that racial equality was neither possible or desirable underlay African-American exclusion from white antislavery societies. But white and black women united in their goals to reform their own racial communities. Both black and white female antislavery workers considered abolition as merely one string to their bow. African-American women, like white women, concerned themselves also with the moral uplift of their communities. Indeed, the reform heritage of both groups was steeped in efforts to purge their communities of intemperance and immorality.

British Garrisonians, especially women, were particularly united with the wider African-American community. Where the conservative women of the BFASS solely concerned themselves with providing for the liberation of slaves, the women of the Glasgow, Edinburgh and Darlington Emancipation Societies made regular contributions to support the infrastructure of free black communities, black schools, black churches and even black businesses. They also took strong stands on racial discrimination and segregation. Sarah Parker Remond's tours of and life in England illustrate
how African-American women found support for community building within Britain.  

Sarah Parker Remond (1826-1894) was born into a prosperous New England black family. Her father was a lifelong member of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society and her brother, Charles Lenox Remond, was a renowned Garrisonian. In 1857 the American Anti-Slavery Society appointed her as a lecturer and in 1858 she accompanied Samuel J. May to England to begin her speaking tours. British Garrisonian women such as Mary Estlin of Bristol, facilitated her introduction into British society and throughout her tour British women remained a source of strength and support. Remond undertook an extensive lecturing tour of Great Britain between January 1859 and January 1861. Not only did she speak out against slavery in the United States but also racial discrimination. Considering herself a representative of both enslaved and free blacks, Remond drew attention to the wider pattern of discrimination within the United States. Opposition to segregation and discrimination within the United States formed yet another point of division between Garrisonians and the BFASS. Most importantly, it would presage patterns of post civil-war support: conservative support would largely disintegrate while the Garrisonian minority would continue to fight for full equality.
In the mid-1850's it appeared as though the transatlantic antislavery movement was breaking down. Antislavery activity reached its apogee in the 1850's in both the United States and Great Britain. As the fifties wore on the South became entrenched in its defense of slavery and abolitionists' hopes of freedom dissipated. The number of antislavery activists visiting England declined. American abolitionists started to experiment with alternatives: emigration to Africa or the West Indies. Without the stimulus of American abolitionist societies or individuals mainstream anti-slavery societies in England started to wind down. Membership levels fell, funds decreased, and some provincial anti-slavery societies simply disappeared. Britons were at a loss as to what to do next. The BFASS turned its attention elsewhere. The Garrisonian wing and supporters of Frederick Douglass were the only factions of the movement to show any signs of life after the mid-1850's. In 1859 the Garrisonians finally managed to organize a central society of sorts. Frederick W. Chesson founded the London Emancipation Committee to coordinate the activities of Garrisonians living in London. Important to its sustenance was the support of African-Americans such as William and Ellen Craft and Sarah Parker Remond who were living in exile. It remained important to American activists to maintain a certain level of awareness in Britain, particularly for African-Americans who were finding sanctuary.
across the Atlantic. This was an implicit demonstration of opposition to American racial arrangements and an important tool of leverage against pro-slavery forces in the United States. As Lewis Tappen commented "the best way of getting something done in America was to make it known that British abolitionists were against it." But even in Scotland, the backbone of the Atlantic abolitionist movement, the disquiet of the movement was revealed. Groups in Glasgow and Edinburgh had never been entirely comfortable with Garrison's religious views and after 1850 broke away to form their own organizations. Attempts to heal the rift with the BFASS largely failed. It was only the establishment of the newspaper, the British Advocate, and in 1859 an attempt to reestablish the Anti-Slavery League, that marked a rapprochement within the antislavery movement.

On the eve of the Civil War then, the Atlantic abolitionist movement was faltering. The movement had become progressively more fragmented, American abolitionists were more concerned with the internal political affairs of the United States, and British abolitionists who had always relied on their American counterparts for leadership, floundered in a mire of competing loyalties and sheer impotency.

Such inactivity did not dispossess the movement of its effectiveness. It is intrinsically difficult to gauge the effectiveness of international pressure movements, especially
ones that disavowed revolution, violence or foreign governmental pressure in favor of moral appeal. The Atlantic antislavery movement allowed American abolitionists to extend the debate and to inform British opinion. This group was both "venomous, and influential" as one contemporary diplomatist called them. As such, the Atlantic abolitionist community formed a group that neither the British or American governments could afford to ignore on the eve of the Civil War.

William Lloyd Garrison always asserted that the help of British abolitionists was important to the cause. On a personal level Garrison found British help indispensable. British Garrisonians helped to keep the movement financially solvent if nothing else. But besides the financial contributions that the British made to the AASS, Garrison's used Britain as a ladder to enhance his personal reputation as an antislavery leader. The purpose of his initial voyage to Britain in 1833 was to heighten his prestige. Garrison profited from the moral capital that British abolitionists had accrued through the abolition of West Indian slavery. And during the early years of the American antislavery movement most American antislavery workers sought this good opinion as an aid in establishing credibility in the United States. The contribution of the BFASS and other conservative antislavery organizations to other wings of the American movement is less certain. And it is to these organizations
that historians point when belying the effectiveness of the Atlantic reform community. After all, they point out, British abolitionists failed in their attempts to convert the hearts and souls of Americans to antislavery. Emancipation, after all, was not largely the result of moral suasion. The Atlantic movement was largely a failure, for example, in inducing southern churches to condemn the institution of slavery and British churches were sometimes fair-weather friends on this issue. However, moral pressure and example were important to American abolitionists. British abolitionists were aware that slavery was an anachronism and that they were almost duty bound to rid the nineteenth century of its moral pollution. This conviction made them determined activists and helped in turn to stiffen the resolve of their counterparts in the United States and push the slaveholding South into an increasingly defensive position. In this way, British abolitionists contributed to the polarization that ultimately resulted in the destruction of the Union and the dissolution of slavery.

Most importantly for the future of the antislavery movement and the post war civil rights movement, one needs to assess the success that the movement had in altering racial opinion on both sides of the Atlantic. The movement had certainly not achieved the acceptance of blacks as social equals but the transatlantic movement as a whole never aimed for this. Atlantic antislavery campaigners rarely viewed
blacks as social equals although exceptions were made for well educated and Christian African-Americans. Although abolitionists did not accept the stereotype of blacks as violent, indolent and promiscuous, they replaced the stereotype with an almost equally damaging caricature: that of the passive and degraded victim, a stereotype that the British antislavery movement had employed since the 1780's.

The acceptance of this stereotype is vividly illustrated in the overwhelming reception that Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* received in England. First published in March 1852, the novel had more success in Britain than in the United States. Within the first eight months it had sold one million copies. When Stowe toured England in 1853 she was feted by royalty, the nobility, and the whole of fashionable society. Although Stowe's visit did much to expose extreme anti-Americanism in the aforementioned quarters, much genuine antislavery sentiment was revealed by the popularity of her tour. Her simple antislavery message cut across the complicated sectarian lines that wracked the Atlantic antislavery movement. The novel attracted women in particular through its appeal as a typical domestic and sentimental novel of the nineteenth century which, on one level, was written by, for, and about women. But its popularity was spurred by more insidious racial undertones in the novel, undertones that fitted with racial preconceptions of the day.
As Clare Midgley points out "Uncle Tom" was a positive figure only for white abolitionists. "Uncle Tom" had become a term of abuse for African-American passivity. Stowe utilized such racial stereotypes for antislavery purposes. The passivity of Uncle Tom left white abolitionists a role in ending slavery. "For this role to be maintained, black nobility had to be represented by white abolitionists as characterized by passive suffering rather than active resistance."

The Civil War challenged these stereotypes, however, and was a time of major transition for the Atlantic abolitionist community. The specter of African-Americans emancipated and fighting against the slave power was enough to cause pause among some British abolitionists, the myth of the passive slave now swept away by the military necessities of a war that Britons at first only incompletely understood. British abolitionists began to question their involvement in a reform movement whose raison d'etre Lincoln's pronouncement in 1863 seemed to have swept away. British reformers struggled with the full implications of the campaign they had sustained for thirty years and grappled with the problems, ideological and practical, of their role in realizing full emancipation. American abolitionist confusion in the early years of the war merely heightened British uncertainty. Aggravated by a tense diplomatic situation, the Atlantic abolitionist movement became acrimonious and disparate. With the ranks of the
Atlantic abolitionist movement in disarray and depleted from its heyday in the 1840's the future of trans-Atlantic agitation on American racial arrangements seemed far from certain.

NOTES

1. The "monster of darkness" was slavery and a popular rhetorical device among abolitionists, especially Frederick Douglass. See, for example, Reception speech at Finsbury Chapel, Moorfields, England, May 12, 1846: "Slavery is one of those monsters of darkness to whom the light of truth is death...The slaveholders want total darkness on the subject. They want the hatchway shut down, that the monster may crawl in his den of darkness, crushing human hopes and happiness, destroying the bondman at will, and having no one to reprove or rebuke him."

2. Liberator, 18 September 1846, 146


4. Such disputes erupted over Texas and the Canadian boundary, for example.

5. The American Colonization Society was founded in 1817 and remained active until the 1860's. Bushrod Washington was the organization's president and the ACS counted Henry Clay among its prominent members. It aimed to colonize free African-Americans in Liberia and lobbied unsuccessfully for congressional endorsement of colonization. Secondly, it sought to aid in emancipating slaves and terminating the slave trade. The ACS argued that the impotence of the federal government in the face of state laws made it impossible for slavery to be halted by national government. The ACS's program of relocating African-Americans on the West African coast reached its heyday in the 1820's and by 1832 over a dozen legislatures had given official sanction to the organization. By the 1840's the ACS had reduced its program to colonization. In the long run colonization was not successful. The cost of transporting African-Americans would run into billions of dollars and among colonization's supporters there was much internal dissension. The ACS later faltered amid disorganization and financial mismanagement.


9. Lewis Tappan (1788-1873) and his brother Arthur (1786-1865) came from a wealthy New York family. They dominated the early American antislavery movement. Joshua Leavitt (1794-1873) was active in various reform circles besides antislavery, including women's rights and free trade, but nonetheless belonged to the Tappan faction. He edited the *Emancipator*, the New York *Evangelist*, and later the *Independent*. He later helped to form the Liberty Party. William Goodell too embraced causes other than antislavery, including temperance reform (he later helped to form the temperance party). He edited the *Friend of Man* and also helped to found the Liberty Party.


11. To some extent, Philadelphia supported Garrison's position.

12. Garrison to Brougham, 1 August 1832, *WLG Papers*, BPL.

13. The British Emancipation Act of 1833 was a significant event for African-Americans, especially free northern black communities who held celebratory 1 August meetings until the
Civil War. As late as 1914, Marcus Garvey launched his Universal Negro Improvement Association on 1 August.


15. For Garrison's campaign against Cresson see Joseph Phillips to William Lloyd Garrison, 6 June 1832, BPL, MS.A.1.2. vol. 2 1832 Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, No. 21; William Lloyd Garrison to Harriet Minot, 19 March 1833, BPL, MS.A.1.1. vol. 1 Anti-Slavery Letters from Garrison, No. 24; Joseph Phillips to William Lloyd Garrison, 30 August 1833, BPL, MS.A.1.2. vol. 3 Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, No. 65. Cresson's campaign was undoubtedly hindered by Garrison and in August of 1831 he wrote to a friend that he was returning to his homeland because Garrison had ruined his chances in England, Nathaniel Paul to William Lloyd Garrison, 31 August 1833, BPL, MS.A.1.1. vol. 3 Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, No. 66.

16. Garrison to Brougham, 1 August, 1832. Brougham Papers, University College, London, quoted in Temperly, *British Antislavery*, 21. Henry Peter, Baron Brougham and Vaux (1786-1868) was a famous radical politician who, through the House of Lords, had been in part responsible for the extinction of slavery. Garrison also sent Brougham a pamphlet outlining his thoughts on the subject of colonization directed to the British public entitled *Thoughts on African Colonization*. This important pamphlet, which had become the definitive anticolonization pamphlet, incorporated much of Stuart's argumentation from his pamphlet, *A Letter on the American Colonization Society* (Birmingham, 1832). See Barker, *Stuart*, 69-70.

17. Elliot Cresson (1796-1854) was a Quaker, wealthy merchant and Secretary of the American Colonization Society.

18. Along with William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson (1760-1846) was the leading figure of the British anti slavery movement before the 1830's.

19. Charles Stuart allegedly dogged Cresson the length and breadth of Britain, countering the colonizationist's every argument with broadsides that the British and American press hungrily devoured. See Barker, *Stuart*, 75-85.

20. From the manifestoes of the Edinburgh and Glasgow abolition societies.

21. Traditionally British sympathy was going to require ignition from its upstart offspring.

22. BFASS Reporter, January 18th, 1840.
23. The Abolitionist, 4 August, 1834.

24. Rice, Scots Abolitionist, 4, E. Wright to B. Green, March 17, 1835.

25. S. A. Steinthal, American Slavery: A Sermon, Preached at Christ Church Chapel, Bridgewater (Bridgewater, 1853), p.17.


28. By 1830 improvements in hull design and rigging had reduced the transatlantic passage from eight weeks to twenty to thirty days. There was a greater frequency of services between the two nations also.


32. Reprinted in BFASS Reporter 5th October, 1851. George Thompson visited the United States three times: 1834-5, 1850-51 and 1863-7. On each tour issues of sovereignty were raised and added fuel to the anti-abolitionist fire. See, for example, Louis O. Cowan to William Lloyd Garrison, 21 June 1834, BPL, MS.A.1.2. vol. 4 Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, No. 46; George Thompson to William Lloyd Garrison, 24 September 1834, BPL, MS.A.1.2. vol. 4 1834 Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, No. 59.
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CHAPTER 2
THE ATLANTIC ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT FLOUNDS, 1860-1863

There is a change in the public opinion in Great Britain in reference to the coloured race...Since the Civil War such a change has been fostered by the Southern Confederates and their natural allies who have united together to endeavour to neutralise the interest felt for the oppressed negroes.¹

Such a change is indicative of a perceived cooling in British sympathy for the African-American cause during the Civil War. British support for emancipation had peaked in the early Victorian reform era of the 1830's and 1840's. After that, support had been constant but fainter and more factionalized. Indeed, by 1861, public interest seemed to have reached an all time low and even previously committed British antislavery workers were abandoning the cause. Asked for a contribution to the freedman's cause, one old activist replied that he "would rather help the negroes to a rope, and sweep them from the earth into heaven as soon as possible," a sentiment that, a reporter noted, was in perfect accordance with the prevailing opinion of the nation.²

Sustaining public interest in any humanitarian cause over long periods of time is a challenge for any organization. In a period as tumultuous as the mid to late
nineteenth century, the effort appeared almost impossible. A period of tremendous industrial, economic, and imperial upheaval created many distractions for all classes of society. But it proved to be especially diverting for the middle-class, heretofore the backbone of the anti-slavery movement. Their beneficent activism channelled itself into every other kind of domestic social reform leaving little time or energy for foreign causes. Moreover, the British abolitionist movement remained factionalized by the events of the late 1850’s. In particular, the raid of John Brown on Harper’s Ferry had left pacifists in the BFASS and among the Garrisonian clique unable to reconcile themselves with radical abolitionists who supported such use of force. More importantly, even for those who remained committed to the antislavery cause, the American Civil War promoted confusion and a dilemma of divided loyalties. Briton’s overwhelming popular opposition to slavery as an institution did mean unanimous support for the Northern cause. Thus, mistaken though Southerners might be in their support of the slave system, Britons—and especially the Irish—still believed that those in the South had the right to self-determination. As a result, after the attack on Fort Sumter, Britons remained divided between humanitarianism, fidelity to the politico-diplomatic interests of the nation, and the intellectual heritage upon which free nations were constituted. Thus at first, Britons responded only fitfully
to the problems of emancipation and many provincial antislavery societies simply disbanded or turned their attention elsewhere.¹

Britons cannot bear alone the responsibility for the lack of interest shown in the slavery issue during the early years of the war, however. American abolitionists acted equally tardily. Although most American abolitionists eventually embraced the war as the means to achieve the abolition of slavery, this acceptance was not only slow in coming but proved equally divisive to the American abolitionist movement and the Atlantic campaign. In consequence, American abolitionists did not effect a plan of attack to raise foreign public sentiment until after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. Only then, when the war could be interpreted as a moral crusade, did American abolitionists concertedly canvass British opinion and aid.

*  

The Anglo-American abolitionist movement floundered during the early years of the American Civil War. Although the outbreak of war heightened British interest in American affairs, it did not produce the outpouring of British support for the North that American abolitionists had anticipated.⁴ Though American abolitionists had expected the war to provide a catalyst for anti-slavery feeling, British reluctance to move quickly on this issue frustrated their expectations. The war presaged a severe crisis in Anglo-American relations.
Within weeks of the attack on Fort Sumter, the British government issued a "Proclamation of Neutrality" prohibiting any British participation in the American conflict and recognizing the belligerent status of the Confederacy. Although no one publicly defended slavery, the British people largely accepted and supported these actions. To Americans, British neutrality appeared an attack on the Union government and suggested that Britain might intervene on the Confederate side. Indeed, the Confederacy firmly believed that Britain could and would be swayed to support the Confederate cause because of the commercial importance of the South's cotton to Britain's textile economy, upon which, according to the London Times, one fifth of the British population was immediately dependent.⁵

During the early years of the war, such an assumption was not unfounded given the British government's private vacillation towards the South. Britain refused to close its ports to Confederate ships or trade, and aided the Confederacy in building vessels to be used in the war against the North. Indeed, British merchants and the commercial classes tacitly supported the Confederate war effort.⁶ Diplomatic incidents throughout the war, most notably the Trent and Alabama affairs, further strained relations between Britain and the North.⁷ The Trent incident in particular, when a Northern vessel stopped a British mail carrier in the Caribbean and removed two confederate envoys James Mason and
John Slidell, caused even the most ardent British abolitionist to give vent to deep-seated anti-American sentiment and helped to resurrect long-standing grievances between the two nations. "We think that the American nation is boastful and has an extravagant idea of its own gifts, graces, power and destiny," wrote Richard Webb after the Trent affair. At best British abolitionists perceived that the conduct of the U.S. government in these matters was "offensively haughty, overbearing, and intentionally humiliating to us" and that the incidents had caused near irreparable damage to Anglo-American relations. The incidents led to a general outpouring of mutual and virulent antipathy. Led by the London Times, British newspapers regularly expressed anti-Union rhetoric and parliamentary speeches frequently did nothing to calm Northern sensibilities. Unable to look beyond the strident declarations of Britain's conservative wing, Northerners could not fail to be dismayed by British reaction.

Historic undercurrents of Anglo-American hostility added further fuel to the fire. The British were not predisposed to condemn political rebellion for its own sake. Indeed, some Britons derived vindictive pleasure from the North's attempts to crush the rebellion, which reminded them of a similar rebellion just a century before. Other Britons also welcomed dis-union as a means to weaken the "upstart" United States
who threatened Britain's industrial, commercial, and military preeminence. ¹⁰

There was also considerable natural sympathy for the Confederacy in England which did not require Southern propaganda to rouse it. Many Britons viewed the South as the heirs of the nationalistic aspirations of Mazzini and Kossuth and pointed out the contradictions between the Union's attempts to stop secession and their celebration of America's rebellion against Britain a century before.

These diplomatic incidents provoked a crisis that had ramifications beyond the immediate political world. While Anglo-American diplomatic relations were in an imbroglio, the response of Britons to the war also alarmed, consternated, and confounded American abolitionists and fomented a rift in the Atlantic reform movement. To American abolitionists the "Proclamation of Neutrality" confirmed how far Britons as a whole had swayed from their antislavery lineage. Indeed, the silence of British anti-slavery organizations and their seeming acceptance of British governmental policy in the early years of the war baffled many American activists, while the few actions taken by British antislavery groups merely served to increase their alarm. British abolitionists besieged Garrison with letters early in the war criticizing Lincoln and defending the actions of the South as those of a nation merely fighting for liberty.¹¹ After having roused itself from inactivity in 1861 the BFASS even agreed to
support the confederacy if it made certain guarantees regarding the curbing of slavery. Such sentiments were, to American abolitionists, astonishing, absurd and "more revolting" than those "to be found in any of the Southern journals."

That such sentiments prevailed in Britain not only says much about the domestic and nationalistic sentiments of Britons, but also illuminates several weaknesses in the Atlantic abolitionist community. Such deficiencies had to be corrected if Britain were to redeem her antislavery reputation. The war revealed to American abolitionists just how intensely ignorant the majority of Britons were about American affairs. Despite nearly three decades of intensive agitation and growing interest in activities across the Atlantic, American abolitionists constantly despaired at the lack of general British knowledge about the United States. "The excitement in London is daily increasing," John S. Jacobs wrote in 1861, "but the greater proportion of the people seem to be ignorant of the character of the slaveholder and of the cause of the disturbed state of the Union, and still more so with regard to the best means of abolishing slavery." By the late 1850's British interest in American affairs had retreated from its peak in the mid-Victorian period. This lack of understanding was largely due to the slide in popularity of the abolitionist cause in the 1850's. Slavery and American affairs took second place to
British concern with more immediately pressing domestic issues. The Crimean War, suffrage reform, poor relief, temperance, prison reform, and the innumerable problems created by the century long transition from an agricultural to an industrial society all proved diverting. While the British public managed to sustain a spectator's interest in American affairs, only the few remaining British abolitionist societies sustained an interest informed enough to call for intervention and far-sighted enough to relate the throes of sectional conflict in America to the slavery issue and British long-term political and economic interests. Although the visit of several fugitive slaves to Britain in the late 1850's piqued the interest of British anti-slavery organizations, these individuals were preaching to an already converted audience.

Moreover, these individuals preached sentiments that the British were long accustomed to. The typical American abolitionist traditionally relied upon emotive story telling to evoke the sympathies and arouse the ire of British audiences. The political dynamics of the sectional contest had been of interest to only the most die-hard antislavery supporter. Such speeches did not inspire money-giving either, which was the dominant concern of Americans in Britain in the late 1850's and early 1860's. But the old guard anti-slavery humanitarians of the early nineteenth century were unable to attract to their ranks a new generation of
supporters, as the attention of the younger constituency of social reformers turned to pressing domestic problems.

The meaning of the war and President Lincoln's war aims also confused Britons and made it difficult for American abolitionists to elicit interest in American affairs and support for the North. Even Richard Webb, one of Ireland's most active and well informed abolitionists, expressed confusion as to the war's effect on the "great goal."

However the abolition of slavery may result from your civil war it is really most puzzling to know what to deduce from even the abolition newspapers. Such dissensions in the Cabinet - such contrary conduct on the part of the generals - some for - some against slavery - such demands for 'conservative' caution on the part of the editors - such declarations that the war is for the Union - not for abolition. All this is most confusing and confounding."

Lincoln's initial declaration that he was fighting the war to preserve the union perplexed British humanitarians across the board. Richard Webb wrote to an American friend shortly after the outbreak of the war that:

Slaves have been repeatedly returned to their masters and neither Lincoln nor Seward has yet spoken an antislavery syllable since they took office...and as we heard nothing except from the abolitionists of this war for its (the Union's) maintenance being likely to weaken slavery it is not surprising that no general interest was felt amongst us...If the war had been at the first or if it became even now an openly antislavery war the result would have been altogether different."
Thus, to the minds of many abolitionists, and, indeed, the British public at large, in the absence of any expressed antislavery sentiment by the Union leadership, it appeared that on the issue of slavery "there was not much to choose between the two sections."^19

Moreover, some Britons were unsure of the North's rights in trying to restore the Union. American politics and the constitution were a mystery to the great majority of the British public: "American politics and the whole framework of the American political system" wrote Webb in defense of American criticism of British inaction, "are so intricate and complex - that I can't wonder that 99 out of 100 Englishmen are confused and confounded and mistaken when they attempt to form or pronounce an opinion."^20 American abolitionists agreed. "Almost all your writers and public speakers are ever blundering in regard to the constitutional powers of the American government, as such, and those pertaining to the States," complained Garrison to George Thompson.^21

Although publicly many British abolitionist organizations struggled to commit themselves in the American conflict, individually Britons formed rigid opinions and ignorance was no excuse for indecision. Despite a lack of familiarity with the central issues in the sectional conflict, Briton's inherent belief that, in the words of Walter Bagehot, "what moved America moved the world",
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increasingly encouraged Britons to take sides in the dispute. As the *Economist* proclaimed in 1861:

> The tidings from what we can no longer call the United States bid fair, for some time to come, to surpass all others in interest and importance. The relations of this country with America, commercial and political, are so intimate, that every transaction on the other side of the Atlantic has its echo and vibration here. Nothing that passes beyond our shores can affect us so powerfully or concern us so much as the proceedings and condition of the great Federal Republic.

Britons eagerly devoured news of the conflict in the United States, therefore. As they became more informed about the conflict Britons took strong positions. Daily newspapers -- from the penny weeklies to the half-crown quarterlies -- avidly discussed American dis-union and helped to create a cauldron of contention in the provinces as well as the metropolitan areas of Great Britain. The character of the news that the British received naturally influenced their stance. Newspapers' concentration on the military course of the war and especially the setbacks to the Union army at the commencement of the war, helped to generate much pro-Confederate sympathy. These early defeats of the Union army convinced many Britons that the North was doomed to failure in its attempts to prevent permanent Southern secession. The partisan reporting of the London *Times* and other newspapers which remained staunchly anti-Northern throughout the early years of the war further confirmed this view.
Indeed, the *Times*’ unflagging support of the South led one American columnist to dub it "the great Pro-slavery journal of the world."²⁴ Initially, a handful of newspapers—including the London *Daily News* and the London *Star*—remained unfailingly critical of the Confederacy and eulogized the actions of the Union but what, as George Thompson said, "are these among the multitude of papers that have gone wrong?"²⁵ Despite this and despite other pronouncements that the "voice of the *Times* was no more that of England than that of the South was of America," American abolitionist fears that Britain was not going to intervene on the side of liberty were not allayed.²⁶ "Britain's hostility to the federal cause is a rank betrayal of her abolitionist heritage" intoned the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1861.²⁷

The seemingly atrophied state of American abolitionism at the outset of the war did nothing to counterbalance the one-sided information that the British public received. For the first eighteen months of the war British abolitionists heard relatively little from their American counterparts. The war had placed many abolitionists in an uncomfortable position, and one that explains the Garrisonians’ reluctance towards action in particular. Having advocated the dissolution of the union for years as a route to slave emancipation, Garrisonians were unsure of the mechanics of emancipation when faced with the reality of secession. British abolitionists and a large proportion of the British
public had also believed that if the South established a union of its own, then, standing alone, she would be unable to maintain a system so opposed to the public opinion of the rest of the civilized world. Moreover, Britons had never conceived that the North would fight rather than allow the South to secede. Conceding that the South had the right to secede, however, would have placed Britons in the slaveholding camp. Even had the North triumphed in such a war, before 1863 many British Garrisonians seriously doubted that this would signal an end to American slavery. Slavery, after all was not an issue during the early years of the war, they reasoned. Thus, for the first few months of the war American and British Garrisonians remained silent. Finally, American Garrisonians committed themselves and endorsed the Union, a volte face which surprised many British Garrisonians who remained unconvinced by Garrison’s protestations that supporting the use of force in the cause of abolition did not compromise pacifist principles!

To British abolitionists, American Garrisonians appeared to have surrendered moral principle for political expediency. Britons besieged Garrison and other American abolitionists with letters critical of both Lincoln and the Northern role in the war and asking that some representative of the American movement be despatched with due haste to help explain the complexities of the war and the American abolitionist position. The American Antislavery Society
planned to despatch Henry Clarke Wright to England in July 1862 to answer these calls. However, Clarke's delicate health and Garrison's fears that Clarke's presence in England would be an embarrassment if Britain, as it seemed at the time, were to officially recognize the Southern Confederacy, indefinitely postponed such a trip. Further requests for American speakers were met by vacillations and the first official representative of an American antislavery organization did not reach Britain until 1863. In the meantime, though African-American refugees and fugitive slaves flooded Britain, without organizational backing these individuals became merely sideshow entertainments, "features" with which the British public was long accustomed. Thus, it was left to white American visitors, who typically belonged to the proslavery monied classes, to inform much of British opinion upon the war.

If ignorance regarding American affairs was rife in Britain, Americans were hardly better informed regarding British affairs. Those representatives of the Union cause who did visit Britain in the early years of the war were as ignorant of British culture as Britons were of America. This only further served to retard the antislavery cause in Britain in the early period of the war. Ignorance led American abolitionists into actions and initiatives that were harmful to the Northern cause. George Thompson complained to Garrison in 1862, for example, that "Union Americans" in
London—a group of American ex-patriots who publicly supported the war for the restoration of the Union and the Northern cause—had shunned the aid of London antislavery societies and turned instead to the press for aid in disseminating information. Unfortunately, the organization naively enlisted the aid of the London American, a newspaper notorious for its venomous attacks on abolitionists and the Northern war effort.32

Nationalism underpinned all such misunderstandings. This cut a large swathe in the abolitionist community most notably over the Trent affair. A few noteworthy American abolitionists, most conspicuously Samuel May, had defended the seizure of the Confederate envoys, Mason and Slidell since to May and his supporters, the Confederate envoys were rebels and therefore fair game for capture. This riled many British abolitionists who were staunch defenders of international law and the rights of asylum for English land and ships. It also pointed to another pressure under which British abolitionists labored, a pressure which American abolitionists should have understood all too well: the question of abolitionists loyalty to the nation.33

While ignorance, apathy, and a breakdown in transatlantic communications erected a barrier to Atlantic abolitionist efforts early in the war, this barrier was not insurmountable. In maintaining a baseline of interest in the cause a small group of British Garrisonians was crucial.
While British antislavery organizations disbanded or remained silent, the Garrisonians catapulted themselves into a new leadership role within the Atlantic abolitionist community. Indeed, the Civil War proved a watershed in the leadership of the antislavery crusade in Britain. The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the leading abolitionist society in Britain up to this point, as Quaker dominated as it was, could not and would not commit itself to the cause of the Union. Garrison's about face did not shake the pacifist beliefs of the BFASS leadership and rather than becoming embroiled in the politics of Anglo-American abolitionism, the organization instead chose to ignore American affairs for the initial months of the conflict. For the first time, then, Garrisonians became the vanguard and the majority faction in the Atlantic abolitionist movement and Garrison's role in stimulating renewed British interest for the slave was to have profound consequences for his reputation in the post-war period.

British Garrisonians had largely sustained their support between the 1850's and the outbreak of the Civil War, albeit at a reduced level. Neither British nor American abolitionists had been instrumental in the startling events of the 1850's: Harper's Ferry, the political compromise of 1850, and the Kansas question. Nonetheless, Atlantic Garrisonians had remained a highly informed and interested pressure group. This knowledge was put into use as the
prospect of dis-union became a reality. The London Emancipation Society, (LES) founded in 1859 by F.W. Chesson, George Thompson's son-in-law, continued to function throughout the early years of the war, attempting to counteract pro-confederate sympathies and lobby the United States in favor of emancipation. Indeed, the efforts of the British Garrisonians during the early 1860's point to the fact that blame for the dwindling in British support lay with both sides. It was the British Garrisonians who consistently pleaded with American antislavery organizations to send a well-established antislavery lecturer to England, a demand that was not met until 1863. In the meantime, the LES was essential in disseminating pro-Union and anti-slavery sentiment throughout Britain. Its executive committee, composed of several well-placed and highly respected political figures and Members of Parliament, including John Bright, Peter Taylor, Richard Cobden, J.S. Mill, and Lord Houghton, used its influence to evoke governmental sympathy for the Union and to stop what Garrison called the "plague" of Confederate propaganda from overwhelming British sensibilities. Other members of the committee, such as Justin McCarthy, editor of the Morning Star, were able to use their influence to evoke widespread public support for the Union cause. Most energetic in these regards was George Thompson, the President of the Committee. Thompson, a longtime friend and admirer of Garrison's lectured tirelessly
throughout the country on behalf of the Union and anti-slavery cause.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite these efforts, British Garrisonians bore the brunt of American abolitionist criticism during the early years of the war. Even George Thompson, a strenuous worker for the Union and anti-slavery cause even at the height of its unpopularity in England, was a consistent target of American abolitionist vitriol. American abolitionists constantly criticized him for failing to do more to change the sentiment of the English public and government. Loyal British abolitionists thus had to fight a two front war in the early months of the secession contest. Whilst endeavoring to arouse their fellow Britons to take unilateral, decisive action regarding the North and slavery they also constantly had to defend themselves and the British public as American abolitionists assailed them with accusations of disloyalty. American abolitionists were particularly fond of quoting the London Times which consistently adopted an anti-Northern stance for the duration of the war. British abolitionists were hard pressed to convince American activists that the paper's sentiments were far from representative or fair. In 1862 George Thompson wrote to Garrison stridently defending the charge that British sentiment towards the slavery question had changed since the beginning of the war.

\textbf{In the endeavor to arrive at a sound and unprejudiced judgement on the true state of public}
feeling in this country, certain facts should be kept in mind.

The sentiment of our leading journals, of a portion of our public men, and of the aristocratic circles, at the present time, on the subject of slavery, are precisely similar to those which prevailed in the same quarters during the struggle for the emancipation of our own slaves. In this respect, England is neither better nor worse...On the vital question of slavery, the heart of the people is sound. It would be impossible to carry a pro-slavery resolution in any unpacked assembly in the kingdom. I could obtain a vote of censure from the constituents of every man who has vindicated the cause of the slaveholding rebels. Then, again, our anti-American journals have been careful to conceal the truth. They have exposed every blunder; blazoned every pro-slavery act of general or officer in the army; have republished the harsh criticisms of Abolition speakers, and, above all, the repeated declarations of members of the Republican party, that the war was not for the abolition of slavery.*

His criticisms underline the problem which lay at the core of Atlantic abolitionist relationships at the beginning of the war: a failure of cultural understanding precipitated by American abolitionist reluctance to take a more active role in animating British antislavery sentiment.

What pro-Northern and antislavery information Britons did receive thus came from unsponsored emissaries to the United Kingdom. The most publicized trip by an American advocate during the early years of the conflict was made by George B. Cheever, pastor of the Church of the Puritans in New York City. Cheever had been a member of the American Anti-Slavery Society but religious differences had forced a break with Garrison. Cheever remained a completely
uncompromising anti-slavery activist, however. His determined assertions that the Bible in no way sanctioned slavery alienated him from more moderate Congregationalists. In 1859 he helped to found the Church Anti-Slavery Society (CASS), an interdenominational organization whose goal was to persuade American churches to commit themselves to the abolitionist crusade. Cheever became one of the organization's most engaged lecturers, going on the road to convert Christian churches to anti-slavery.43

In the summer of 1859 Cheever turned his efforts to Britain. Petitioning anti-slavery British churches to bring pressure to bear upon their American counterparts had been a stock tactic of the ante-bellum abolitionist campaign with perhaps the strongest message coming in 1840 at the World's Anti-Slavery Conference held in London which issued a severe rebuke to pro-slavery churches in the United States.44 Despite great activism on their part, British churches had largely failed in their attempts to convert the most recalcitrant of their American sister churches.45 Nevertheless, in 1859 Cheever dispatched an assistant, Miss Johnstone, to collect money for his church from committed anti-slavery churches in Britain in order that he might continue the fight for "Christian abolitionism."46 This act unleashed a storm of criticism in the United States.47 Pro-slavery forces railed that Cheever had "egregiously" exaggerated the extent to which abolitionism was persecuted.
in America, that Cheever's "mendicant Pharisaism" degraded American Christianity, and, of course, that Cheever's actions were so unpatriotic as to border upon treasonous:

The fact that abolitionism anywhere in America calls upon Great Britain for pecuniary aid may reasonably arouse the general indignation of the community. The less British abolitionists have to do with slavery in the United States, the better for us. It is our concern, solely and exclusively.  

Moreover, conservative quarters blanched at the fact that a "female" agent should have been sent overseas to seek alms.  

The reaction of pro-slavery forces encouraged British churches and Garrisonians to come out in support of Cheever. So-called "Cheever Meetings" were held in Edinburgh and Glasgow, organized and attended by a non-denominational collection of local clergymen and endorsed by the Garrisonian organizations in those two cities. Indeed, Cheever's stance on slavery also helped to forward the growing rapprochement between the CASS and American Garrisonians. The National Anti-Slavery Standard ran a series of articles endorsing Cheever's efforts and his tour of England in 1860.  

Cheever was no stranger to Britain having visited Edinburgh in 1836 as a guest of the Garrisonian, George Thompson.  Once in England Cheever was taken under the wing of the LES who were relieved that at least one well
recognized American advocate was now in Britain. The Society organized a lecture tour for Cheever whose constant haranguing of the unchristian policies of American churches made headlines throughout the United States and, as the epithets the newspapers bestowed upon him testify, added fuel to the abolitionist struggle. Pro-slavery forces attempted to push all the old buttons to raise public opposition to Cheever, including likening his campaign to "practical papacy" in an attempt to capitalize upon stock anti-Catholic sentiment. Moreover, his highly publicized tour from the summer of 1860 through the winter of 1861 served to help draw the lines in the growing secession dispute. Cheever's tour of Britain clearly increased conservative and Southern rancor at abolitionists whom they blamed for the nation's ills. Precipitating "foreign meddling" in the domestic affairs of the nation only increased Southern choler against Cheever, the CASS, and abolitionists in general.

Besides collecting money to support his living in New York, Cheever's presence in Britain also persuaded many British denominations to direct statements condemning slavery at sister organizations in the United States. The Western Unitarian Christian Union, the United Free Methodist Churches Conference, and the Baptists issued statements calling upon American churches to condemn slavery. What impact these condemnations had upon American Christians is hard to gauge. The Methodist Episcopal Church came out as pro-emancipation
in 1864 although, like many northern churches, they were forced into a fait accompli by the succession crisis.\textsuperscript{56}

Although the AASS gave tacit approval to Cheever's visit to Britain and applauded his efforts in endeavoring to arouse British opinion on the subject of slavery and the war, they balked at dispatching their own advocates. The task of eliciting British support was left to independent American advocates, the most visible of whom were African-American at the commencement of the war. Moreover, British Garrisonian organizations, unlike their parent society, were crucial in facilitating the promulgation of pro-Northern sentiment and anti-slavery propaganda. It was the LES who supported the rash of escaped slaves and black abolitionists who flocked to Britain in 1860 and at the beginning of the war.\textsuperscript{57} W. H. Chesson indeed attributed to these fugitives the crucial role of keeping alive a baseline of support for the North and for abolitionism during the darker early days of the war.\textsuperscript{58}

Those that rushed to England pursued three distinct agendas. First, were those who came as individuals seeking asylum for themselves and/or money for the release of family members and friends in the South.\textsuperscript{59} Second, were those whose immediate object was to garner British support for the Union and to undermine the effects of Confederate propaganda by stressing the antislavery commitment of the North.\textsuperscript{60} Finally, there were individuals who represented organizations that looked to the long-term emancipation of African-Americans and their
resettlement in Africa. Each of these individuals and groups had both a shared and separate constituency to which they could appeal in England which in the long term helped to heighten Britain's racial consciousness and general awareness of American events. In the short run, however, the platforms and propaganda of each group often clashed and led to ugly jurisdictional and personal quarrels which did nothing to serve the cause of freedom in Britain and proved grist for the Southern propaganda mills.

The rash of African-American refugees who flooded to Britain served to sustain the important position that African-Americans had traditionally played in the antebellum Atlantic movement. Foremost among black abolitionists campaigning in England to raise pro-Union support was John Sella Martin. Born into slavery, Martin had escaped bondage in 1856 while working as a boatman on the Mississippi. By 1857 he had joined the antislavery lecture circuit and began training as a Baptist minister. In 1860 Martin became pastor of the Joy Street Baptist Church in Boston and in 1861 he made the first of four trips to England. His immediate aim was personal, the trip to England being almost a by-product of his desire to go to France and to restore his never robust health. These plans were later scotched but Martin's friends persuaded him to undertake an antislavery lecture tour of Britain. With impressive letters of introduction from some of the leading abolitionist and
religious figures in the United States, and the blessing of the abolitionist governor of Massachusetts, John Andrew, Martin gleaned introductions to some of the most powerful circles in British humanitarianism, religion, and politics. He spoke at the London Emancipation Society on two occasions in 1861 and the organization eventually engaged him to speak nationwide.

Martin found that his task was an uphill one, however. Since the beginning of the Civil War the number of African-American refugees had escalated. In London everywhere you turned you saw "no end to colored people...begging money to build churches, buy relations, establish newspapers [and] build schools" Martin noted. So many fugitives had flooded England with their causes that they were becoming commonplace and therefore less effective. Martin at least had the advantage of being a well-respected clergyman, but, as later reports reveal, he constantly had to battle against public apathy and perceptions that he was merely "one more Negro nuisance."

This ambivalence extended to organized antislavery societies. Martin failed to win over the BFASS, later calling the organization an "antiquated affair, the members of which met once a year for the purpose of instituting deputations that did nothing but sprinkle rose water on the feet of a few conservative lords." Even the LES took some persuading, and Martin openly clashed with its leaders on more than one
occasion. Martin found that he had more success when he talked not of Northern war aims but of his personal experiences as a slave. This netted Martin great gains as his trawling of the British antislavery lecture circuit raised enough money to buy the freedom of his sister and her children.\textsuperscript{57}

Martin's experiences in 1861 are typical of the early period of the war. Lagging confusion about war aims, diplomatic animosity, and economic anxiety all hindered less than organized attempts to educate the British public about the "true" meaning of the war.\textsuperscript{68} Rather, the typical portrayal of the African-American as noble and suffering had more affect on a public ill-educated in, and reluctant to elevate their knowledge of, American political and constitutional issues.

Martin's tour of Britain, however, revealed important continuities with the antebellum emancipation movement, continuities that were capitalized on in the remaining years of the war. Martin stood in the grand tradition of other African-American agitators who had toured Great Britain before him and who would tour afterwards. Not only lacking widespread institutional backing in the United States, but also defying what support he had, Martin, like Douglass, was very much his own man.\textsuperscript{69} The most successful African-American agitators in Britain were those who acted virtually independent of any official American abolitionist endorsement
and who relied on an emotive intuitive appeal, usually based on personal experience, to their audiences. No matter how empathetic, enslavement was outside the experience of all white abolitionist emissaries to Britain. And it is clear that British audiences appreciated and responded to such personal experience.

The picture is more complicated than this, however. It does not explain why Britons responded to Martin when ennui greeted many other African-American fugitives in the late 1850's and early 1860's. What these fugitives seemed to lack and what Martin possessed in abundance was, ironically, an appeal to "class." Those middle-class Britons who attended Martin's lectures and fundraising activities were always consciously struck by his eloquence, his manners, and his "nobility." Martin's education and his intimacy with literary and reformist social circles in Boston had cultivated in him an easy familiarity with social etiquette that British reformers responded to. Like Douglass, Martin was well-educated and well-accustomed to the social mores of "polite" white society and consciously used these to his advantage. Where African-American reformers and fugitive advocates thus seemed to have fared best in Britain was in conforming to British expectations of behavior.

The notion that this was a reflection of the Victorian desire to paternalize the role of British humanitarianism, creating a figure--the exslave--who would be protected and
nurtured into a state of civilization by his social betters, has some validity. The largely middle-class orientation of the abolitionist movement in Britain supports this. However, the audiences that Martin, Douglass, and the dozens of other African-American advocates who were tramping the country preached to comprised a large percentage of working-class supporters. These constituencies could identify with slavery as a concept and something within their experience. But more than this African-American abolitionists in Britain seemed to offer up the chance of social mobility to their working-class audiences. It is clear that the independent African-American advocate, largely free as he was from the constraints of a middle-class organizational and moral harness, served as a role model for white, working-class Britons. Indeed, African-Americans such as Douglass, Martin, William Craft, and William Wells Brown exemplified the Victorian virtue of the self-made man who elevated his social position through self-improvement, persistence, and independence. Indeed, in exemplifying this tenet of Victoriana, African-American abolitionists cut across a purely class and racial-oriented appeal.

Other American organizations trolling the antislavery lecture circuit in Britain during 1861 point to another continuity with the antebellum Atlantic movement: emigration. Despite the general failure of the American Colonization Society's efforts in Britain during the 1820's, support for
colonization and emigration had proceeded unobtrusively throughout the 1840's and 1850's. Prompted by British humanitarians, the British government had recognized Liberia's independence in 1847, and despite consistent opposition to any form of colonization by the major British antislavery organizations, colonizationists were able to raise a modicum of sympathy and money to support emigrationist enterprises throughout the 1840's and 1850's. Such activities did not reach a peak in Britain until the 1860's, however. In 1860 and 1861 many American emigrationists were in Britain to raise support for their various enterprises. Foremost among these crusaders were Martin Delany, Robert Campbell, and Henry Highland Garnet. These leaders, particularly Delany, abhorred the ACS and distanced themselves from it as much as possible. The notion of emigration from the United States was one with which Britons were familiar and therefore perhaps more predisposed to support. On the one hand the revival of the emigrationist stream in Atlantic reformism came at an opportune moment, capitalizing as it did on the current and growing British obsession with Africa. On the other hand, its revival and the fratricidal war that the American emigrationists waged on British soil merely added to British confusion regarding the goals of the American abolitionist movement.

The cause of emigration in the United States was fraught with indecision and factionalization, and beset by a clash of
towering egos by the 1850's. The enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 had led many African-American leaders, Delany included, to believe that slavery was in danger of becoming nationalized and to realize that African-Americans were safe nowhere in the United States. Increasingly disenchanted with the United States when appeals to the federal government for protection came to naught, many endorsed Delany's sentiments when he concluded in 1852 that "I have no hopes in this country--no confidence in the American people--with a few excellent exceptions--therefore, I have written as I have done, Heathenism and Liberty, before Christianity and Slavery."73 For Delany, the future for African-Americans in the United States looked increasingly in doubt; the prospect of racial equality and justice was merely a pipe-dream. Emigration, however, offered the promise of the redemption of the race and the chance at self-determination.

More importantly, emigration's ultimate achievement would be the emancipation of slaves in the South. For, by producing cotton in their new homeland, free black emigrationists would price slave produced Southern cotton out of the market forcing slaveholders to emancipate their slaves. Such success would also stimulate a "reflex action" among those who remained in the United States by "enhancing their pride in black achievement and encouraging them to continue opposing slavery and race prejudice."74 Likeminded North Americans met in Toronto in September 1851 at the North
American Convention of Emigrationists which was beset by division from its initiation over the destination of emigrants. Although the convention voted to encourage African-Americans to settle in Canada and not Africa or the West Indies, the decision regarding the ultimate destination of African-American emigrants was not laid to rest permanently. Under Delany's urging another conference was called to settle this issue. At the Cleveland conference on National Emigration in August 1854, Delany emerged as the self-styled leader of the emigrationist cause in the United States. In his keynote address, "The Political Destiny of the Colored Race," Delany underscored his fears that Canada would long remain a refuge for African-Americans arguing that it could be ripe for annexation by the United States. Rather he believed that areas which had a large black population were more suitable for emigration. African-Americans would have a better chance of fully participating as equals in the economic, political, social, and cultural lives of countries which were not dominated by a white, Anglo-Saxon population. Thus he recommended emigration to South and Central America, close to "home" and, as he knew, favored by most American supporters of emigration. His ultimate goal, however, was always settlement in Africa, an ambition he increasingly developed after the closing of the convention.

Unfortunately, the convention divided abolitionists, black leaders, and even Delany's own movement down the
middle. By 1857-58 when Delany was openly agitating for re-emigration to Africa, members of his own movement, such as the Reverend Theodore Holly who advocated a Haitian settlement, had turned against him. His own organization, the Emigration Convention, which in August 1858 changed its name to the Association for the Promotion of the Interest of the Colored People of Canada and the United States, refused to sponsor an exploratory investigation of the Niger River as an area for black resettlement. Moderate black leaders, such as Frederick Douglass, an erstwhile friend of Delany's, now unleashed an emotional attack on the radical emigrationists. Criticized as divisive, lambasted for his contention that racial equality was impossible in the United States, and berated for abandoning the cause of the slave, Delany nonetheless refused to be derailed from his ultimate goal of establishing black resettlement in Africa. Indeed, Delany launched his own counterattack on black moderates criticizing them for looking to white abolitionists as leaders of a black cause, most of whom he considered "pseudo-liberals who retarded black leadership and initiative" and who engaged in "much rhetoric" but little action. White domination was the inevitable price of white support, Delany charged.\textsuperscript{75}

Despite his opposition to white humanitarian aid, it was precisely to white philanthropy that Delany turned in 1859. Since 1858 Delany had canvassed black doctors, businessmen, and scientists interested in establishing a site in West
Africa for the resettlement of African-Americans. He also founded the Niger Valley Exploring Party (NVEP) as the initial exploratory and treaty-making body to carry his vision into effect. In 1859 the Association for the Promotion of the Interest of Colored People of Canada and the United States commissioned Delany, Robert Campbell, J. W. Purnell, Robert Douglass, and Amos Aray to undertake a reconnaissance mission to Africa under the aegis of the NVEP. The Association made it clear, however, that they would only sponsor the "scientific" aspects of the expedition and refused to finance any attempts to resettle African-Americans in Africa. Thus Delany and his compatriots were thrown back on private sponsorship. Having failed to raise sufficient funds for his expedition Delany dropped Douglass, Purnell, and Aray from the party. Such economies appeared to Campbell to be inadequate, however. In a move that undoubtedly infuriated Delany, if not ideologically then because it threatened to undermine his leadership, Campbell, unilaterally visited England in April 1859 to raise additional funds. Here Campbell found abolitionists and cotton manufacturers especially responsive and succeeded in collecting more than £200, the major source of funding for the expedition, in a little over a month. The subsequent trip to Abeokuta, Lagos, and Liberia in 1859, resulted in an agreement to resettle African-Americans on the uncultivated land of the Egba. Thus stymied by their own organization's
refusal of funds to support another venture, but encouraged by English support, Delany and Campbell returned to England in 1860 to raise additional sums.  

This undertaking seems on one level to have been a move of pure expediency on Delany's part. For in 1859 he had vehemently attacked Campbell's English expedition:

Grant, for charity's sake, that it was done with the best of motives, it was flagrantly and fatally at variance with every principle of intelligent— to say nothing of enlightened—organizations among civilized men, and in perfect harmony with that mischievous interference by which the enemies of our race have ever sought to sow discord among us, to prove a natural contempt for the Negro and repugnance to his leadership, then taunt us with incapacity for self-government.

By 1860 Delany resolved this seeming contradiction with his earlier statements on non-cooperation with white philanthropists by excepting Britain from the gamut of Anglo-Saxon nations who had done nothing but harm to the black peoples of the world. Britain's anti-slavery heritage and her expulsion of slavery had helped to redeem her reputation and expunge her misdeeds as the chief architect of the Atlantic slave trade.

In Britain Delany and Campbell moved quickly to capitalize on all those elements which had made African-American activists popular in Britain. There was undoubtedly a certain novelty value to Delany, being the first recorded African-American explorer seen on British shores. This cast
him in the grand tradition of the self-made man made good
that had undoubtedly attracted Britons to other African-
American visitors. The self-taught son of a slave, he was
markedly and stridently independent, educated, and
passionate, all hallmarks of character to which British
audiences appeared to respond. More than this, however,
Delany could capitalize on the British rabid obsession with
Africa and all things African. Indeed, all of his initial
speaking engagements were to discuss the scientific and
economic aspects of the mission and it is clear that Delany
was accorded much respect as an explorer, not necessarily as
an humanitarian, abolitionist, or civil rights activist.82
His initial engagements were at the home of Dr. Thomas
Hodgkin, who had responded to Campbell's financial appeals in
1859.83 From these introductions Delany then spoke both
publicly and privately throughout London.

By this point, however, Delany was treading on the toes
of parallel emigrationist organizations that had also
established British links in the late 1850's. Foremost among
Delany's competitors was Henry Highland Garnet. Garnet had
received much publicity in British abolitionist circles when,
in the Autumn of 1861, the U.S. government issued him a
passport, an act that was a major step towards the
nullification of the Dred Scott decision. In October of 1861
he used that passport to travel to Britain in an effort to
raise money and support for the African Civilization
Garnet and Delany, although sharing similar convictions about emigration, differed in tactics. Garnet's acceptance of white and colonizationist support for his African Civilization Society (AFCS), Delany had, prior to 1861, deemed totally unacceptable. Garnet and Delany also parted ways on Garnet's emphasis on the evangelical aspect of emigration: "civilized" African-Americans, Garnet believed, would carry law and order and Christianity to Africa and thereby elevate the race. While this had particular appeal to British missionary groups and accorded with the Anglo-Saxon idea of the beneficent spread of progress in the "benighted" nations of the world it served as a bitter source of division between Delany and Garnet. It was these disagreements the two men carried to England in 1860.

These differences surfaced in a resentful contest for support in Britain. In garnering British support Garnet had a head start for he, unlike Delany, already had some credibility in Britain. British abolitionists were well acquainted with Garnet who had visited Britain in 1850 as a representative of the free produce movement. Moreover, since 1858 the Reverend Theodore Bourne had been in Britain as an agent of the AFCS attempting to convert British abolitionists to the emigrationist cause and laying the groundwork for the founder member of the society. This Bourne had succeeded in doing by eliciting an endorsement for
the African Civilization Society from the LES and BFASS. Bourne also planned to organize a British branch of the AFCS whose goals were to promote "the Christian Civilization of Africa, by means of colored settlers from America," and the instruction the "natives to improve modes of art, manufactures, and the cultivation of the soil." Several interested industrialists, members of parliament, and abolitionists formed a committee to circulate Bourne's initiative and to raise support for emigrationist efforts. But Bourne's success was short-lived, however. Before the committee could fully organize itself as the leading representative of American emigration in Britain, Delany stole the show. He moved quickly to usurp the position of Bourne, Garnet, and the AFCS as the foremost spokesperson for African-American emigration in Britain. Delany reorganized the committee under his own auspices in July 1860 as the African Aid Society. Headed by Lord Alfred Churchill this organization became the mouthpiece for emigrationist efforts in Britain.

The organization's stated goals were to assist the migration of Africans from Canada, to encourage the production of cotton and other cash crops by the introduction of skilled labor, to extend Christianity, and to encourage the further exploration of the African interior. By encouraging the growth of cotton production it was hoped that Britain could be weaned off its reliance on Southern cotton
thus forcing southern slaveholders to emancipate their slaves. The society's immediate aid to Delany was in providing him with the funds necessary to continue his lecture tour of Britain in the hopes of attracting more commercial sponsorship for his ventures. 89

In abolitionist histories British abolitionists (and Delany no less) credited Delany not Bourne and the AFCS with the foundation of the first national emigration society in Great Britain, a fact that Delany would capitalize on in his fund-raising speeches. In so quickly arrogating leadership of the atlantic emigration movement, Delany cleverly latched onto the two factors that guaranteed his cause success. First, he tapped into the anxiety that textile manufacturers and their workforce felt regarding the safety of America's cotton supply. By the late 1850's concerned manufacturers had formed a Cotton Supply Association whose remit was to "obtain as full and reliable information as possible respecting the extent and capabilities of cotton cultivation in every country where it could be grown." 90 British support for Delany was thus part of the belief that he could find an alternative source of cotton. Second, as Garnet himself rued, Delany exploited his color and the British receptiveness to African-Americans promoting their own cause. 91

Delany clearly knew how to manipulate publicity. Some of the most distinguished political, commercial, and titled heads of Britain patronized the African Aid Society a fact
that Delany used to good effect, and he seemingly overlooked the more economic and less humanitarian reasons behind the support of many British industrialists. This deliberate ignorance was more than just utilitarian, however. It is clear that Delany, no less than previous African-American activists, was flattered at being feted by the ennobled heads of Britain. Indeed, Delany's semi-autobiographical account of his experiences in Europe is replete with proud descriptions of the honors bestowed upon him by his white benefactors.

Delany's responses are interesting in light of his avowed black nationalist philosophy. The AAS was a multifaceted organization melding together the interests of not only Delany and other black nationalists but of church, abolitionist and industrial groups in Britain. Consider a sample of its membership: George Thompson, a radical abolitionist; William Craft, an African-American fugitive; Thomas Langden a Lancashire cotton producer; the British Methodist Association, a Christian missionary society; Thomas Hodgkin, a supporter of the ACS; and Martin Delany, a black nationalist. Each constituency had a competing agenda which created a schizophrenic organization riven by internal dilemmas. One might wonder what place black nationalism and radical abolitionism had in an organization where some members believed that it was the special role of Anglo-Saxons to bring civilization and Christianity to the poor "benighted and backward" peoples of Africa. Indeed, such melding of
black nationalism with British economic interests has, for some historians been evidence of the decline of "pure British abolitionism" and of the descent of a new veil of racism that destroyed trans-Atlantic cooperation on racial questions for the remainder of the nineteenth century."

There was, however, never any such phenomenon as pure British abolitionism. Abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic had always cobbled together constituencies of supporters, often with little regard for philosophy and with more regard for the financial and media benefits of having Britons speak out on behalf of American blacks. Delany, like many of his predecessors, was pragmatic in this regard. Given the nature of transatlantic communications and cultural differences between America and Britain, Delany believed that it was unlikely that anything other than a close examination of the mechanics of fund-raising and a scrutiny of contributors was going to inhibit the raising or the spending, of monies. Thus, Delany concerned himself more with the immediate, financial, and practical results of such endorsements rather than more abstract philosophical consequences.

In this regard Delany also benefitted from his color. Many Britons exhibited an implicit trust of African-American activists who campaigned on their own behalf. Oftentimes their causes and references were in fact subject to far less scrutiny than white American activists campaigning of behalf.
of black slaves and freedmen. The credentials of African-American agents in Britain seemed explicit and unchallengeable to Britons who were much more wary of their white counterparts especially when they seemed to espouse some sectarian cause. African-American activists like Delany then were in ways far more able to bridge social, economic, and philosophical schisms within British society which made them highly effective fundraisers and advocates.

This is nowhere better illustrated than in Delany's part in a mild diplomatic incident in the summer of 1860. In July 1860 Delany presented a paper to the International Statistical Congress in London. This congress, presided over by Prince Albert and chaired by the firebrand and sometimes less than politic abolitionist Lord Brougham, was the leading gathering of scientists of the period and Delany was appointed as a full delegate to the congress. Delany, of course, not considered a citizen of the U.S. in his own country would never have been an official representative had not his weighty friends pulled some strings. Delany considered his admittance to the conference as "a triumphant recognition" of the progress of African-Americans. The official American delegates included battle-worn defenders of Southern rights such as the author and Judge A. B. Longstreet of Georgia, the head of the American delegation, and official representatives of the United States government such as George Mifflin Dallas. Lord Brougham, who did not understand
the meaning of reticence, publicly acknowledged Delany's attendance in his opening address. "I beg my friend Mr. Dallas to observe," he said, "that there is in the assemblage before us a Negro, and hope that fact will not offend his scruples." Incensed by what they viewed as a personal attack on the official United States, Longstreet and the remainder of the American delegates departed. Longstreet later protested that Brougham's remarks were signal that he "could not be received as an equal, either in country or in character, while the negro was received with open arms." What offended him more than Brougham's remarks, however, he admitted, were the "plaudits" from the audience that greeted Brougham's comments "like a tempest of hail upon my half-English spirit."35

Indeed, American officials interpreted Brougham's remarks as a gross insult to the United States and even considered asking Britain for an apology. Most U.S. newspapers followed suit.36 The incident resurrected old fears during a period of heightened tensions regarding the interference of a foreign power in American domestic affairs. "A Briton was the last man on earth who should cast contemptuous reflections upon the United States," opined Longstreet. He continued after a long list of America's virtues that, "such a nation is not to be taunted, certainly not by Great Britain." After all, Americans had not asked for slavery, he continued, "it was forced on her against her
wishes,...screwed down upon her, pressed into her," by Britain.97

African-American and white abolitionists likewise saw Brougham's remarks as a rebuke to the United States, and a well-deserved one. Even Douglass took pains and great length in his paper to applaud Delany and the actions of the Congress.

Never was there a more telling rebuke administered to the pride, prejudice, and hypocrisy of a nation. It was saying, "Mr Dallas, we make members of the International Statistical Congress out of the sort of men you make merchandise of in America. Delany in Washington is a thing; Delany in London is a man. You despise and degrade him as a beast; we esteem and honor him as a gentleman. Truth is of no color, Mr. Dallas, and to the eye of science, a man is not a man because of his color, but because he is a man, and nothing else." To our thinking, there was no truth more important and significant brought before the Statistical Congress. 131

American newspapers, however, almost without exception viewed the episode as a grave national insult.

American emigrationist efforts in Britain, historians have alleged, unwittingly helped to foster the growth of racist sentiment that descended over Britain in the 1860's preventing future Anglo-American cooperation on civil rights issues. While there was certainly a definable shift in the racial climate in Britain in the late nineteenth century, Delany's and Garnet's eliciting of support for African-American emigration illustrates more than the triumph of commercial and racist interests in Africa over philanthropy.
For clearly threatened pocket-books did not motivate all those who supported Delany's schemes. To be sure an equally obnoxious motivation stimulated much support, a *modus operandi* that besieged the post-war Atlantic movement: paternalism. However, although the foremost supporters of Delany's and Garnet's schemes were British missionary organizations and businessmen, abolitionists did lend their support to the ACS and AAS.99 Delany's lecture tours were not confined to speeches before various chambers of commerce: he held successful rallies with the largest and most notable provincial antislavery organizations.100 The importance of Delany and Garnet lies not so much in their support of emigration, but in their keeping the issue of slavery in front of the British people in a period of waning enthusiasm.

The multiplicity of reasons for supporting the emigrationist cause point to the more complex reality of the Atlantic movement throughout the nineteenth century. As such the movement typified the multifarious nature of many reform movements in the Gilded Age and especially the Progressive Era: reformers' largest concern was the ends and not the means.

It is also hardly surprising that British antislavery reformers found themselves attracted to emigrationism given the scarcity of official delegations from established American abolitionist organizations. Delany and Garnet were two of the mere handful of such endorsed solicitors. American
abolitionists vacillated in sending emissaries to Britain despite the pleas of their British compatriots. By using abolitionist support of emigrationism as an index of the change in the racial climate in Britain, historians have therefore done British abolitionists a disservice. Emigration societies were the only organized movements in the field in the early 1860's. But the blame for this should not lie solely with British abolitionists. The fault lies not so much in the rising tide of racism in Britain as with the failure of American abolitionist societies to respond to a clear desire for leadership in rekindling British activism.

Consequently, only when American abolitionists again asserted such leadership would the British movement revive. Once American abolitionists committed themselves to what, in their eyes, had now become a war against slavery in 1863 did the appeals for British aid increase and did Britons respond. Lincoln's emancipation proclamation transformed the war into a moral crusade and thus restored the ideological underpinnings of the Atlantic antislavery crusade.
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"THE GENUINE ROAR OF THE BRITISH LION SO LONG ASLEEP:"

THE REVIVAL OF THE ATLANTIC ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT,

1863-1865.

Only by bringing in the slavery issue, and thus transforming a question of American politics into a great moral issue was it possible to arouse the moral forces of Europe.¹

Despite the signs of ominous decline that historians have perceived in the episodes of 1860 and 1861, the events of 1863 at least temporarily dispelled such clouds. For a turning point in British support for African-Americans came in 1863. Despite fears among some British abolitionist groups that emancipation would provoke a servile insurrection among slaves in the South, generally attitudes across Britain changed after Lincoln's 1863 Emancipation Declaration. For a brief interim, between 1863 and 1865, the Atlantic abolitionist movement seemed restored to its days of former glory: marching behind the banner of a moral crusade once again. American abolitionist societies flooded Britain with agents, African-American fugitives found a mouthpiece for their condemnation of slavery and the support of the North,
and the impact of British abolitionist feeling was felt both by the British and American governments. The purpose of the war now appeared clear and support for the Confederacy in Britain waned. At last, in the words of Samuel May, Americans could hear "the genuine roar of the British lion."²

British abolitionists, not content with the overwhelming praise heaped upon them by their American counterparts, strenuously argued that Britons had never been fickle. Rather, they interpreted the outpourings of support as "not so much a change of sentiment as an expression of sentiment hitherto concealed."³ Such contentions were not merely the product of defensive rhetoric but rather point to the problems and politics inherent in the Atlantic movement. The pro-slavery British organs of the early years of the war were the products of a distinct economic class. The Times in particular, as a bastion of aristocratic, conservative beliefs had to some extent done a disservice to the sentiment of the abolitionists, whose constituency always had been middle-class. To Americans, however, the Times was the voice of England and thus a reliable barometer of British sentiment. British abolitionists, on the other hand constantly disputed this, complaining that by accepting the Times' position as an accurate conveyer of English sentiment Americans only ever heard the voices of politicians and aristocrats.⁴ "The malignity which finds its organ in the London Times," argued Goldwin Smith, "was that of a party,
and not of the English people. American failure to understand the culture and the complex social and political system of Britain thus produced inaccurate impressions on one side and wounded feelings on the other which all contributed to a problematic Atlantic relationship.

Indeed, despite the euphoria that Lincoln's proclamation injected into this relationship, Anglo-American cooperation was not all that it could have been during these years. That Anglo-American cooperation faltered had less to do with what historians of abolition have claimed was a rising tide of racism in Britain and more to do with the more mundane matter of conducting reform campaigns on a day to day basis. An analysis of the organization and execution of campaigning for "the cause" of abolition during the Civil War in Britain reveals the real complexities of transatlantic activism. For it is only at a microcosmic level that one can perceive the petty jealousies, inter-organizational disputes, and clash of titanic personalities that fostered despair, disgust, and resignation among even the most committed American activists in Britain. In reality these seemingly frivolous inconveniences created substantial obstacles to effective campaigning.

* 

For American abolitionists emancipation was clearly the key in the campaign to gain the world's undivided support, particularly England's. "When we were merely fighting for
the old Union the world looked coldly upon our government" Frederick Douglass declared. He went on:

But now the world begins to see something more than legitimacy—something more than national pride. It sees national wisdom aiming at national unity; and national justice breaking the chains of a long enslaved people. It is this new complexion of our cause which warms our hearts and strengthens our hands at home, disarms our enemies and increases our friends abroad. It is this more than all else which has carried consternation into the blood-stained halls of the South. It has sealed the fiery and scornful lips of the Roebucks and Lindsays of England, and caused even the eloquent Mr. Gladstone to restrain the expression of his admiration for Jeff. Davis and his Rebel nation. 4

The immediate outpourings of support for the Northern cause which were "bursting out in every part of the kingdom" after the Emancipation Proclamation greatly encouraged American abolitionists. 7 Even the BFASS finally abandoned its silence and endorsed the North and returned to active abolitionism. 8

We rejoice and are exceedingly glad at the numerous evidence we are now receiving that the sober judgement of the thinking and right feeling portion of the people is getting expression, is having a marked effect, and is making itself felt even in quarters little accustomed to yield such influence. 9

Those "quarters" included the aristocracy and the government. By February of 1863 British abolitionists claimed that the great antislavery meetings were "having their effect on the government already," and that no minister could "hold his place" if he recognized slavery. 10

149
It was again, however, British Garrisonians who took the lead in organizing public avowals of support. The Thompson dominated LES was responsible for large public demonstrations of support around the kingdom, most notably in Bristol, London, and Scotland which continued to be the hotbeds of antislavery activity. The LES organized the largest demonstration of support at Exeter Hall, London, a meeting at which, George Thompson claimed, "the mouths of pro-Confederates" were henceforth forever closed by the 10,000 strong crowd who endorsed a series of pro-Union resolutions. To express their approval for the actions of Lincoln, the Committee also organized a deputation to Charles Adams, the American ambassador to the Court of St. James. Many provincial anti-slavery societies then chimed in by formulating their own addresses to Lincoln applauding him for his efforts and by sending their own deputations to the American ambassador.

American abolitionists lauded Thompson for his efforts in rousing the support of his countrymen and for turning "the current of English feeling into a Niagara against the secession element in that country." Indeed, American abolitionists implored George Thompson to tour the United States in 1864 "as one who has rendered us important service in this day of our trial." Thompson accepted. Leading American abolitionists, churchmen, and even the Vice-President and Congress prepared special receptions in his
Every major anti-slavery organization in the country feted him. The highlight of Thompson's tour was his audience with President Lincoln at the White House, an event abolitionists regarded as one of the highpoints of Anglo-American cooperation. At that juncture many abolitionists truly felt that nothing could now stand in the way of total victory.

Together Britain and America looked set to vanquish the forces of evil everywhere. "In the present outlook," Douglass rhapsodized, "there is nothing more encouraging on the face of the moral sky, than is this reaction in England." Indeed a mood of great optimism swept both British and American abolitionist quarters. The British movement, in particular, spoke in almost apocalyptic terms, foreseeing the rallying of Britain to the Northern cause as the final chapter in the glorious battle against slavery and the forces of evil epitomized by the South. "You will henceforth see all changed here," wrote George Thompson to William Lloyd Garrison.

The word has gone forth - the cure has been given - the priests received its instructions from headquarters; & for the future the United States, England, and the Czar, against Napoleon & Jeff Davis--Anti-Slavery Britain and the north against...the flesh mongers of the South.

To promote this cause and to secure "the British public sentiment in opposition of the Southern Confederacy," American abolition societies hurriedly arranged for their
agents to travel to Britain. Within the American Antislavery Society, however, such dispatch did not come without controversy. In March 1863 Garrison asked Wendell Phillips to be the AAS's emissary in Britain; Phillips, however, declined. His disgust at Britain's conduct thus far during the Civil War was partly behind this refusal. Phillips had been a vituperative critic of Britain in light of its recognition of the South and continued to vilify the nation even after 1863 as "selfish and treacherous," a viper who could not be trusted to renege and at any moment commit herself to the Southern Confederacy. Phillips might well have believed, therefore, that his reception in Britain would have been frosty at best. Phillips was something of an Anglophobe even at the best of times. Indeed it was his comments at the beginning of the conflict that did much to sour relations between the BFASS and American abolitionists. Garrison then asked Gerritt Smith, but he too refused arguing that England, on the basis of the outpouring of support for the Union after the Emancipation Proclamation could "get along very well without my help." Finally, after an appeal from Phillip's wife, Moncure Conway became the "unofficial" official American antislavery emissary. American abolitionist organizations stopped short of officially endorsing him, however. Many expressed doubts about his reliability as a true advocate of the cause:
Conway, a native Virginian and the son of a slave owner, had only recently converted to abolitionism. Nevertheless, Conway had proven himself an outspoken and fiery advocate of the cause thus far. His advocacy had resulted in his dismissal from a Unitarian church in Washington, D.C. in 1856. But he continued to use the ecclesiastical rostrum, this time in Cincinnati, as a bully pulpit for his views. His talents as an orator and writer undoubtedly allowed him to bridge the worlds of humanitarian reform and art in America and this made him a very adaptable advocate in Britain. He was despatched to England in May 1863 and it was the LES that introduced Conway to British society. He spent much of his mission living with Peter Alfred Taylor, a member of the LES and M.P for Leicester, whose home, Aubrey House, had become an unofficial gathering place for those interested in American affairs. Members of Parliament, prominent newspaper editors and reporters, industrialists, and reformers of every stripe found Aubrey House to be a refuge for progressive attitudes. Taylor's wife was instrumental in establishing a Ladies Emancipation committee which claimed as it members some of the most famous, and indeed infamous, women of London. Her interest and commitment were apparent by her engagement of Sarah Remond—an African-American activist campaigning in Britain—as her companion. It was from this base at Aubrey House that the LES dispatched Conway on the exhausting
British antislavery lecture circuit. His "beat" was extensive: Conway gave lectures in both England and Scotland.

But how much good Conway did the cause is as debatable now, as Conway and his contemporaries indeed debated then. Although British abolitionists at first warmly welcomed him as a source of "real information" regarding American affairs, Conway does not appear to have penetrated outside the small circle of sympathizers already in evidence. After a series of meetings, largely held in the dissenting chapels of London, Conway remarked that "I had a feeling that I was teaching the already taught."32

Indeed, many contemporaries argued that Conway did positive harm to the Atlantic abolitionist movement. In England Conway presented himself to the Confederate diplomatic commissioner, James Mason, as the official spokesperson of the anti-slavery forces of the United States. Assuring Mason that he could thus deal with him in good faith, Conway declared that, if the Confederate States would immediately emancipate their slaves, the Northern abolitionists would oppose the prosecution of the war.33 Mason rejected this offer in a letter reavowing the South's support of slavery, but the damage was done.

Conway seems to have pursued this idea on a whim, perhaps inflamed by his own anti-war sentiments and a belief that American abolitionists had sacrificed the moral high ground by endorsing violence as a means to an end.34
Although Conway never represented himself as a member of any particular American abolitionist society, Garrison's endorsement of his expedition to England made it appear to many as though Conway was officially promoting the Garrisonian line. American and British abolitionists alike took great pains to condemn Conway's unprecedented actions. Garrison acted immediately to distance the AAS from Conway and his "folly." Garrison made a public declaration of condemnation of Conway in the New York Tribune and Anti-Slavery Standard and stated that he would never make such a deal with "those who stand before the world black with perfidy and treason...and are carrying on the war expressly and avowedly to obtain wider scope and stronger safeguards for their cherished slave system."  

Conway's imprudence was ill-timed. Garrison was well aware that a vote was pending in the House of Representatives on British support for the Confederacy. Even an ambivalent reply from Mason to Conway's offer may have tipped the vote. British supporters eventually rescued Conway from this diplomatic nightmare. Samuel Lucas, John Bright's brother-in-law and editor of the Morning Star, portrayed Conway's overtures to Mason as a clever ruse designed to bring the South's stalwart defense of slavery out into the open and therefore disabuse Britons of their notions that the Confederacy could be bargained with in the matter. This was picked up by other pro-Northern journals in Britain and may
even have slightly helped to shift British sentiment towards the North.\textsuperscript{38} This appears to be the "line" that the American Garrisonians chose to follow as well. Eventually Conway's "mischievous overture" was forgiven as it became clear that the Union was winning the war militarily and the threat of British interference on the side of the Confederacy subsided.\textsuperscript{39}

Despite these hiccups, British support became freer and thicker after the Emancipation Proclamation, stimulated in no small part by the increasing parade of not only delegates from American organizations but from a plethora of church groups, missionary associations, educational institutes, and governmental organizations.\textsuperscript{40} In addition all of the major freedmen's aid associations also dispatched emissaries after 1863.

Reformers established over fifty freedmen's aid societies in the U.S. during and in the wake of the war. The majority of these societies consolidated their resources into three leading organizations: the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission (WFAC), the National Freedmen's Relief Association (NFRA) and the American Freedmen's Aid Commission (AFAC).\textsuperscript{41} Lack of sufficient resources and widespread support within the United States forced all of these organizations to turn to international sources to sustain and supplement their efforts. From 1863 onwards these organizations sent many agents to Europe and particularly to England. Many of the
big names of American antislavery undertook brief tours including Levi Coffin and Henry Ward Beecher. In addition to the official envoys of these multifarious organizations countless independent activists also inundated Britain between 1863 and 1865. Together these organizations and individuals charged themselves with providing for the security of the estimated four million freedmen and women.

This bombardment could not fail to keep the issue of the freedmen before the British public eye. The American "invasion" helped to spur the growth of approximately 45 freedmen's aid organizations in England, Scotland and Ireland and stimulated the growth of local, national, religious and evangelical societies who contributed an estimated £120,000 of much needed direct support to the freedmen. But the deluge of American activists also served to saturate and confuse the field in Britain. The campaign to organize British sympathy and stimulate practical aid for the freedmen was, in many respects, as disorganized as the antebellum Atlantic antislavery campaign. The myriad methods, messages, and manpower of these multiple mendicants thus often obfuscated and militated against the very real and practical needs of the freedmen and therefore impeded transatlantic understanding.

Despite the initial rush of Americans to Britain, British support still was not immediately forthcoming. Many British abolitionists initially refused to support freedmen's
aid, for example, on the grounds that freedmen's aid and anti-slavery agitation were two separate issues. An apologist for the Freedmen's Aid Association also excused inactivity on the grounds that Britons were generally more engaged in the question of the whole American war. Only women appear to have rallied to the first pleas for support. Indeed British antislavery activists first suggested that freedmen's aid ought to be the preserve of women's auxiliary organizations in Britain. Women of the Birmingham Ladies Negro's Friend Society founded the largest freedmen's aid society outside London, the Birmingham and Midland Freedmen's Aid Society, in 1864. Women also founded the initial freedmen's aid society in Scotland, the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society. The implicit rationale for such a response appeared to have been that such business was best suited to women's virtues and sensibilities.

It was the appeals of Levi Coffin that finally spurred English activists into motion. Coffin's personal acquaintance with English Quaker visitors to the United States was his inspiration and his chief means of introduction to the British abolitionist community. Armed with testimonials as to his character and endorsed as a legitimate agent of the WFAC, Coffin's Quaker contacts introduced him to the London community of reformers. Although both the WFAC and Coffin's missions were avowedly non-sectarian, the Quakers were the conduit through which
Coffin reached the British public. Coffin arrived in London at a propitious time of year: the London Yearly Meetings. At the Quaker annual meeting gathered the foremost political and reformist figures of the day: John Bright, William Edward Forster, Samuel Gurney, and Henry Pease. The annual meeting also comprised many Friends with whom Coffin was well acquainted: John Pease, Benjamin Seebohm, and John Hodgkin. Convinced by Coffin's pleas, these reformers issued him a further set of testimonials to other Friends, different denominations, and prominent politicians, and transmitted his appeal to regional centers. Coffin, with the help of Friends began to organize a series of meetings in London to put the cause before the public and abolitionists. Within a year his labors resulted in the organization of the London Freedmen's Aid Society (LFAS) and twenty provincial auxiliaries. The LFAS consisted of some of the most prominent abolitionists of the day: Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton as President, Samuel Gurney, Treasurer, and Frederick Tompkins and F. W. Chesson, Secretaries. This lineup both confirms the continuity with the antebellum British abolitionist effort and the continuing need for sponsorship by prominent men in Britain. As the LFAS pointed out, they deemed the presidency of Buxton as extremely "important" because "the gentleman possesses an historic name." This lent both the authority of socio-political status and reform tradition to the organization.
Coffin placed himself at the disposal of this powerful organization, pledging to work in their name and paying all monies into their treasury for them to disburse as they saw fit. From there Coffin, aided by LFAS committee members Frederick Tompkins and James William Massie, set out on a lecturing tour of the British Isles.\textsuperscript{53} Coffin's tour of England, Scotland, and Ireland netted great financial rewards. An estimated $100,000 poured from British hands into Freedmen's aid organizations coffers. This added further encouragement to other American freedmen's aid associations and independent advocates to try their hand in the British Isles.

Coffin's importance lies not only in his position at the vanguard of the Atlantic freedmen's aid movement, however. His mission to Britain set the parameters within which subsequent American organizations and individuals would be forced to labor. The arrangements that Coffin made to facilitate his tour would both help and hackney his successors throughout the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Coffin was but the first of many American activists to travel to Britain to plead the cause of the freedmen. Between 1863 and 1865 an estimated one hundred and fifty advocates for the cause sought money, refuge, or other support within the British Isles. Many of these American activists came upon their own initiative, emboldened by Coffin's very public and successful tour in 1864. The
initiative taken by the American organizations helped to diffuse the charge of "English meddling," and the organization's claims that aid was a matter not of politics but of humanitarianism also helped to allay criticism. However, once in Great Britain, British hubris and the territorial and competitive nature of British freedmen's aid societies worked to stifle American initiative.

Coffin in many ways had set the pattern for such restraint. In formally placing himself under the aegis of the LFAS he established a precedent for the future orchestration of American abolitionist tours by the various British freedmen's societies. Some advocates found this at worst intolerable and at best a severe handicap to their ability to raise support. The trials of the official delegates for the American Missionary Association (AMA) provide an illustrative case.

The American Missionary Society sent its first delegate, Dudley C. Haynes, to Great Britain in 1864, just after Coffin's arrival. In 1865 J. Sella Martin arrived in the British Isles to supplement Haynes' efforts. Martin's correspondence reveals that Coffin's precedent in dealing with British abolitionists organizations hampered the former's activities. Martin believed that Coffin's deal with the LFAS had left him with little choice but to similarly place himself under the LFAS. Likewise, Martin's successor, Rev. J. C. Holbrook felt compelled to do the
same. In defending his acceptance of these terms of subordination, Martin revealingly commented that although the LFAS may not have helped in his operations, "if I did not put myself under it...it possessed an immense power of obstructing my work."  

Indeed, the LFAS had some heavy hitters on their executive committee, men from families whose antislavery legacy was legend both within Atlantic abolitionist circles and the wider British public. Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton Jr., son of the revered leader of the parliamentary fight against British slavery, was President. Samuel Gurney, longtime activist and a leading Quaker reformer, was treasurer. Both men commanded enormous influence in reformist circles because of their place within the historic pantheon of antislavery reform. To spurn them would be suicidal. 

But to Martin, and especially to Holbrook, it appeared as if such a move had little to offer. The LFAS would not provide financial sponsorship for their tours, or indeed greatly aid them in organizing meetings. However, both soon learned, as did other American visitors, that the London Society could provide the endorsements and the introductions vital to the success of any American advocate in the British Isles after 1864. Having the mere names of a Buxton or Gurney on a broadsheet or circular advertising meetings or collections for the freedmen guaranteed at least attendance, if not great renumeration.
From the viewpoint of the British freedmen's aid societies, endorsement and control of the efforts of particular American activists lent further prestige and legitimacy to their own organizations. Thus, there was some competition between the plethora of British freedmen's aid societies that grew up after 1863 to persuade American fundraisers to sign on with them. Battles grew particularly heated in 1865 when, in an attempt to coordinate the efforts of the multitudinous freedmen's aid societies in Britain, a National Committee of British Freed-Men's Aid Societies was formed. The LFAS stubbornly refused to be part of this new organization and jealously fought over American visitors.

These petty jealousies continued within the National Union, however, and complicated matters for Americans. By signing on with one British organization, Americans found it hard not to arouse the resentment of other competing organizations. Such resentment sometimes manifested itself in outright sabotage that did damage to the supposed focus of efforts: the freedmen and women of America. "I find it exceedingly difficult to get along and not awaken the jealousy of the Friends who are most earnest in their efforts in this cause," complained Rev. Holbrook of the AMA. "I have to act very cautiously not to offend any parties. I keep aloof from all squabbles and try to work with all and secure the confidence of all." But walking the middle line was very difficult and as the freedmen's aid societies
of England became increasingly wrapped up in their own internal squabbles, American's ability to draw attention to the plight of the freedmen and to raise money diminished.

The squabbles of the various freedmen's societies were not the only threat to receipts, however. Freedmen's aid societies in Britain defended their almost forced endorsements of American visitors as a way of protecting the unwitting public from squandering their money on illicitly represented causes. Self-promoters, amateur fundraisers, financial incompetents, and outright crooks campaigning and raising funds in the name of African-American slaves and freedmen had burned British abolitionist organizations and the general contributing public since the beginning of the war. "It is the misfortune of almost every good cause," wrote Douglass in 1861, "that men will take advantage of it, often to the serious detriment of the cause itself." 62

In the early years of the war many Britons had already fallen prey to the likes of such "scoundrels" as Reverend Balme of Chicago who traversed the length and breadth of Britain not in his advertised cause, antislavery, but in the real pursuit of the personal enrichment of said Reverend Balme. 63 The AMA became all to quickly aware of their less worthy competitors and the detrimental impact that such fakers had on their endeavors. Louis Chamerovszow of the BFASS, for example, reported to Martin within days of his arrival in England that Britons had lately been the victims
of the shady dealings of Reverend Cyrus P. Grosvenor of New York. Grosvenor had toured England in 1862 ostensibly to collect funds for the New York Central College for African-Americans, of which he was allegedly President. He did not submit to endorsements or control from any of the established freedmen's or antislavery societies but did, allegedly through fraudulent means, receive testimonials from leading members of the Independent and Congregational churches in England. Armed with these references he levied contributions ostensibly for the said college. The Reverend eventually settled at Ryde on the Isle of Wight where his neighbors, desiring to know a little more about him, began to make enquiries. Grosvenor was evasive in his replies and could not produce proper accounting for his remittances nor would he say exactly what role Central College played in the education of African-Americans. Very shortly after these enquiries commenced, the Reverend and his wife abruptly left Ryde and disappeared, allegedly with several thousand pounds raised from generous British philanthropists. The case, that had met with great publicity, could not fail but to make Britons cautious in their contributions to the cause.

Martin and the AMA were twice prey themselves to the misrepresentations and questionable endorsements of others. In 1863 William Mitchell, a Baptist minister from Toronto, fraudulently used Martin's name to raise funds for the construction of a chapel and school for fugitive slaves.
Authorities later arrested Mitchell in Wales for failing to pay his bills and his remittances of the £400 that he had raised were questioned.\textsuperscript{65} James William Massie, an Irish-born Independent, was also a thorn in the side of the AMA. Although not officially commissioned, Massie worked for the AMA in Britain on his own initiative. Massie was not an influential advocate, however. Vacillating and at times just plain idle, he did little to fill the coffers of the AMA with British gratuities. Reputedly also rather short-tempered and bellicose, Massie alienated many in the British reform community. His worst handicap and character flaw, however, was his history of financial shenanigans and mismanagement. British reformers would not let him forget that he had once filed for bankruptcy and, based on the well accepted adage that there was no smoke without fire, British reformers also accused him of misappropriating money to cover his expenses. Massie found it extremely difficult, therefore to raise funds.\textsuperscript{66}

The actions of Mitchell and Massie left a stain on the name of the AMA and gave Martin, Holbrook, and their successors additional obstacles to surmount. Holbrook, in particular, wasted much of his time in Britain defending the AMA against charges resulting from Massie's misconduct. Little wonder then that when the AMA wished to appoint a successor to Holbrook and were considering Massie, Holbrook penned extensive missives to Whipple and Strieby, secretaries
of the AMA, imploring them to reconsider. "Send someone else," he implored, "then Massie will have nothing to do and will give up and leave."67

Such incidents were not uncommon and threatened the credibility of the entire Atlantic freedmen's aid movement. British abolitionists thus took great pains to ensure that the advocates who sought British aid were indeed legitimate. British freedmen's aid societies in 1865 began to insist that no agents from America be sent over unless they were willing to place themselves under the guidance of one of the recognized British organizations. This was a substantial change in policy. American abolitionists of the antebellum period had been more or less free agents. Although greatly assisted by British abolitionist societies in organizing the mechanics of their tours—speaking engagements, meetings, collections—no American abolitionist had felt pressured by British organizations to submit to such regulation and overseeing.

British organizations also demanded that all monies raised by American speakers be sent to the general treasury of the British sponsor before it was remitted to the United States. This, on one hand, was good financial practice, given the misappropriation of funds in the past and the notorious, although not criminal, financial mismanagement on the part of some American activists.68 But American activists found this requirement intolerable. The LFAS, for
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example, not only demanded that all monies raised by Martin and Holbrook be submitted to its central treasury but that all revenue raised by all American activists endorsed by the LFAS be remitted and then equally divided among the various American societies that had delegates in Britain. This was the source of much bitterness between British organizations and American delegates and was the source of much friction between the American representatives themselves as campaigners argued that other, less diligent delegates, were benefitting from the assiduous work of others. Much of this bickering became public and resulted in smear campaigns that reached the national press that sought to discredit a rival organization's emissaries. Such shabby squabbling over money exacerbated the already strained feelings between agents engendered by intense competition for limited funds in a field that at times appeared saturated with entreaties for assistance.

Endorsements and fund dispersal were all part of the etiquette of fund raising in England. British societies were insistent that American visitors observed an unwritten code of conduct in soliciting aid. American delegates could not, for example, ask directly for aid at meetings. Meetings were to lay the problems of the freedmen before the audience. Then if the audience so desired, they could donate money, blankets, books, or other such gifts to be used by the freedmen. British societies considered the direct asking for
money to be "beggary"—the height of bad taste—and frowned upon such requests. Direct solicitation could jeopardize British sponsorship and American representatives and their organizations could find themselves censured. Rev. C. C. Leigh, for example, made this mistake by delivering a one hour plea for funds to the Friends Central Committee. Disgusted by such an appeal it duly censured him. Moreover, accusations of "beggary" also became a convenient way to discredit rivals.

British opposition to "beggary" also reflected British desire to take credit for the contributions of the public. The letters of American activists are replete with requests to their parent bodies to acknowledge the receipts of money raised in Britain by letters of gratitude and mentions in the organization's newspapers or annual conferences. Clearly British organizations did not like to think Americans had to beg them for money. Voluntary charity created an illusion of beneficence that British activists were keen to cultivate.

Such limitations and constraints at times made the field impossible for Americans. It not only constrained their freedom to advocate for their organization, but it put them into a state of direct and often bitter competition with rival organizations for the endorsements of societies and the generosity of the British public. Though 1865 proved to be a peak year in terms of revenues raised for the freedmen in Britain, it saw some of the worst and most public displays of
dissension among American delegates in Britain. When Martin travelled to Britain in late May of 1865, he arrived to find the field suffuse with supplicants from all of the major American freedmen's aid societies and many independents as well. Included on the lecture circuit in 1865 were: Levi Coffin and Reverend Henry Martyn Storrs of the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission; Reverend Charles C. Leigh of the National Freedmen's Relief Association of New York; Dr. Dudley C. Haynes of the AMA; and Reverend Crammond Kennedy of the American Freedmen's Union Commission. This was in addition to the scores of independent American advocates, some of whom had come to plead for support of their personal freedmen's projects, some on behalf of the established churches of the United States, and others at the request of established churches and missionary associations in Britain. The competition for endorsements, funds, meetings, and public hearings was thus intense and promoted some unsightly and undignified public arguments.

Such problems were not, however, nationwide. In Scotland and Wales delegates of the AMA found refuge from the infighting and the constraints placed on their activities by English societies. Here American activists found themselves largely outside the reach of the powerful London and national societies who tended to confine their activities to England. Scotland had a well developed network of local but successful societies, and Wales was a field that the national societies
had left largely untapped. In November 1865 both Martin and Holbrook of the AMA abandoned England for Scotland and Wales, respectively. Here the AMA found little competition from either American or British abolitionist organizations or missionary societies. Moreover, unlike in England, whatever the AMA raised in Scotland went directly into its coffers. They also found a rich abolitionist heritage among the Scots they could capitalize on. As ante-bellum Americans had discovered, Scottish activism and support for antislavery was staunch and largely unwavering even during the dark years of the 1850's.

Martin was joined in his Scottish campaign by other independent advocates such as Henry Storrs of Cincinnati and, unencumbered by the strictures of English abolitionist organizations, their widespread meetings met with substantial success. Scottish abolitionist organizations, churches, women's groups, and members of the general public hitherto inactive in abolitionist affairs established freedmen's aid societies that funneled money, blankets, clothing, educational materials, and food to the freedmen of the United States. Vigorous freedmen's aid societies emerged in the major Scottish cities of Dundee, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and Glasgow and strong provincial organizations in towns such as Perth, Banff, and Peterhead supplemented the efforts of the metropolitan areas. Scottish organizations and individuals
contributed at least £10,000 to the freedmen's cause during reconstruction.

American activists undoubtedly also benefitted from the capital that Scots could make from antislavery. The lack of English organizational control of Scottish abolitionism and the seeming pride that Scots took in raising substantial sums of money without the population or resources of her larger, more populous, and more prosperous neighbor to the south, reflected the larger and historic Scottish railing against central control from England, be it political, economic, or otherwise. Scottish political localism was given vent in another form as Scots refused to bow to the dictates of the major English antislavery organizations and consistently chose their own path and remained virtually autonomous in their activities. American activists utilized this Scottish localism to good effect during the 1860's. American activists deliberately targeted Scottish churches, both because of their altruistic abolitionist heritage and because of the church's traditional desire to emancipate themselves from dogmatic directives from south of the border. Thus, the Scottish United Presbyterian Church and the Scottish Free Church plunged into freedmen's activities.

Beyond the shackling of the English-based metropolitan antislavery movements, however, the patterns of organization were fairly similar. As in England abolitionists tended to rely on established names within the pantheon of the Scottish
abolitionist movement: the Wighams, the McCleods, and the Smeals had all been major names in the antebellum abolitionist movement and continued to rally Scots to the freedmen's cause.

Wales, however, was a different story. Wales had remained a largely untapped source of reform sentiment in the antebellum period and American abolitionists had been little concerned with its organization. Consequently the Welsh population had undertaken only a few desultory efforts to support abolition confined largely to the few metropolitan centers in South Wales, Cardiff and Newport being the most prominent. Indeed the relatively few major urban areas and the factionalized and rural nature of Wales presented probably the greatest barrier to concerted organization. Indeed the freedmen's aid movements the AMA established under the aegis of Holbrook were largely confined to those same areas. However, participation markedly increased. "I find a growing interest in our cause here," Holbrook wrote enthusiastically to the secretaries of the AMA in 1865.81 Here links with England actually facilitated Holbrook's success. Working through the Congregational Union of England and Wales he successfully organized large freedmen's aid leagues in Neath, Newport, and Cardiff.82

The work in Scotland and Wales suffered, in the long run from the same flaw that beset much freedmen's aid work in England: a lack of follow through. Beset by family
pressures, lack of institutional support at home, the needs of the religious communities that many American agents had left, and a distinct hatred of the English climate, many American agents returned home with their work half completed. In November 1865, for example, owing to family pressures and the spiritual needs of his congregation in Boston, Martin begged the AMA leadership to allow him to return home, which they did. Martin left the field at a crucial juncture. He had just returned from Balmoral where Dr. Macleod had endeavored to introduce him to Queen Victoria. As a result there was a positive "mania" as Martin put it to engage him as a speaker. "Is it not a shame to leave a field like this?" he confided. Despite his entreaties, the AMA did not dispatch a replacement for Martin and Holbrook was left to satisfy the demands of British freedmen's and other groups alone, a task that he constantly complained to the AMA leadership that he was totally unable to meet.

The lack of follow up was a problem across the gamut of American abolitionist movements in the 1860's. Reading the reports of American agents in Britain, popular newspapers, and other organizational sources, it is clear that there was a great hunger for action in Britain. But it is also clear that action needed American leadership, despite what British organizations might otherwise allege. This demand for American leadership was less due to a lack of intrinsic British leadership ability, and more to do with the lack of
tools with which to seize the initiative. In other words, any reform organization in the late nineteenth century, besides being saddled with the more esoteric difficulties of cross-cultural understanding, was perhaps equally hampered by the difficulties of trans-atlantic communications.

This cut both ways. The main sources of news for American abolitionist organizations regarding developments in Britain were through the letters of their agents and newspapers. The latter, as we have seen, were hardly reliable sources for Americans because they were more engaged in partisan political wrangling than in accurate reporting. The former were a more reliable source but, as with British newspapers, their news took time to reach their destination. Many American agents in Britain were thus handicapped in their activities by the necessity of lengthy delays in directives from the United States. Indeed, representatives of organizations were mostly shy of taking thoroughly independent action for fear of misrepresenting their organization's mission. Many also lacked the initiative to respond to situations without central direction. American agents were thus caught between the proverbial rock and the hard place that reformers in memorial have found themselves in. Shackled by organizational directives and infighting both in America and Britain they could neither act on their own initiative or succeed as independents because such institutional support was essential for effective campaigning.
in the first place. Only extraordinary personalities—such as a Douglass, a Martin, or a Garrison—proved able to transcend such organizational politics to succeed independently. 86

American agents in Britain were also shackled by their ongoing absence from the United States. Touring Britain for two or sometimes three years at a time meant that Americans also experienced the same communication problems that beleaguered Britons, as far as getting up to date news of American affairs. Agents' letters to their parent organizations are replete with pleas for more up to date information, statistics, stories, and anecdotes about the current American situation. During the war itself as events moved quickly in the Union's favor after 1863 American agents in Britain struggled alongside their British counterparts to keep abreast of current developments. 87

Keeping current was important for the constant struggle after 1863 was to persuade Britons that Americans still needed their aid. After 1863 some abolitionists did sway from the cause considering that either the care of the freedmen was now a matter of domestic politics or that the needs of slaves were now over. Similarly, with the establishment of so many American freedmen's aid societies and reports of the supposed relieving of the freedmen's most immediate needs—hunger and clothing—by generous giving Britons perceived the needs of the freedmen to be satisfied.
In response to this, in 1864 British abolitionist groups, many under urging from American agents, began to send members to America to see for themselves the intolerable conditions that war had imposed and that these conditions had not been alleviated. The organizations then circulated the reports of their members through organizational broadsides and most of the English national dailies of the period.38

Descriptions of physical suffering did much to renew the commitment of Britons to the cause and they were also persuaded by recourse to the familiar language of the abolitionist movement. In lobbying for the relief of the freedmen's most pressing needs—food, clothing, and shelter—agents relied on the familiar rhetoric of the antebellum abolitionist movement. American and British abolitionists appealed to Briton's consciences by reminding them of the role that Britain had played in fostering the slave trade:

By our own past conduct to the negro race, we have placed ourselves under special obligation to come forward and help them freely in their present exigency. Whether the first cargo of slaves was conveyed to North America by the English or the Dutch, it is undeniable that we at a very early stage participated in this nefarious traffic; and we as a nation have largely shared in the profits of this cruel and unrighteous toil.39

American agents implored both abolitionists and the general public to take responsibility for past actions. "If slavery is an evil, we have fostered it; if a crime, we are the perpetrators," lambasted the Manchester Examiner and
The British public were called upon to pay for the profits they and British industry had made from enslavement. American activists mirrored these pleas and implored British abolitionists to continue their work, reminding them that the cause was only half completed. Their American brethren further reminded the British public that President Lincoln himself, in the wake of his assassination much eulogized in Britain, had placed responsibility for slavery and therefore its amelioration on British heads.

American activists, therefore, placed the British public in debt. And the depth of their indebtedness was heightened by none too subtle reminders from American activists that even at the height of the war, Americans had maintained philanthropic ties with Britain and helped to alleviate her economic distress. Americans had contributed £70,000 to alleviate the cotton famine that the war had caused in Lancashire. Such ties were part of the historic bonds of philanthropy that linked Britain and America that stretched back to the contributions that Americans made to alleviate the Irish famine of 1847.

Appealing to the collective conscience in this way had been a stock tactic of the antebellum movement and it had lost none of its edge in the 1860's. Despite the other deficiencies of the Atlantic movement British abolitionists and the general public responded well to these pleas. Material aid in the shape of clothing, food, and blankets
flooded to the United States. The marshalling of such support was usually the work of women's auxiliaries attached to the major Freedmen's aid societies or antislavery organizations, however. As in the ante-bellum movement, women tended to perform the "grunt" work: organizing and participating in sewing circles, bazaars, blanket and clothing drives and the day to day toil of door to door fundraising. Women failed to find a single place on the executive committee of most organizations. But British female activists were perhaps the strongest constituency in support of the cause of the freedmen and American agents made deliberate appeals to their sensibilities in their entreaties for aid.

American abolitionists also relied upon traditional appeals to the common origins of the two nations. American abolitionists had conducted, and continued to conduct, campaigns in mainland Europe but they were not as extensive, fervent, or successful as the British campaign. Americans mounted special appeals to Britain based upon the fraternal relationship between the two nations:

We [Americans] have felt that England was our kindred, of the same family--stock, brothers, (or "cousins" at least;)--and that--having a common language and literature and faith--a common origin and a closer connexion than between nations generally, we had a right to look, nationally, for more consideration at her hands than from others.
Such appeals had been commonplace in the antebellum Atlantic movement and American abolitionists now revived them to stimulate new concern for the freedmen.

Most emotive in this regard were the ways in which both American and British abolitionists asserted a familial relationship with black slaves and freedmen. In 1865, in a special appeal to the women of England, the American abolitionist Rev. Charles Gilbert reminded British women that fraternal bonds linked them to African-American freedmen. Describing British women as "sisters" he called on them to contribute to freedmen's aid as they had pleaded for the freedom of their sisters in slavery:

We have all been familiar with the picture of a negro, in an imploring attitude, kneeling on one knee, with fettered feet and enchained hands; and underneath the picture appear the words, "am I not a man and a brother?"

This would precisely be the question that the next period of the Atlantic movement would raise. To what extent were members of the Atlantic community willing to pledge themselves to the elevation of the freedman to a position of economic, political, intellectual, and spiritual equality? Campaigning and contributing for direct, physical relief was for many very different from crusading for moral, intellectual, political, and economic improvement. In pondering their future role in such quests British reformers would be heavily influenced by events nearer to home. Racial
protest within their own backyard would force many white Britons to question not only their own government's racial politics, but their personal beliefs in common humanity and the proper role that foreign nations ought to play in the internal, domestic affairs of others.

However, this was in the future. By 1865 the campaign for the physical relief of the freedmen was in full swing. At least fifty freedmen's aid organizations were in operation across Britain and one American freedmen's organization estimated that at least one-fifth of all monies collected for the freedmen thus far had come from British sources.\(^9\) Such an outpouring of support reassured Britons that they were both accounting for past wrongs and were sure in their role as the moral leaders of the western world. The British lion was roaring once again.
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98. Temperly, *British Antislavery*, 259. It is difficult to estimate precisely how many freedmen's organizations were in operation. Bolt places associations in 39 cities and towns across Britain in 1865 but there were clearly more organizations than this. Moreover, in towns and cities without such organizations American activists as we have seen were able to levy contributions to the cause.
I believe the discussion of the American war for the last four years, and the sympathy that has been shown for the South in that time has deteriorated public feeling in this country on the subject of slavery. We have not now the same feeling as we had twenty years ago...Do you think if there was the spirit in us that there was in our fathers, that that vile thing could have occurred in Jamaica? Do you think you could have the Times newspaper writing day after day to defend the blackest atrocities that ever were committed against our fellow creatures? My countrymen, that could not take place if our feelings, our sentiments, if our thoughts were as sound as the thoughts of our fathers five and twenty years ago.

In October 1865 the moral certitude and optimism of the British reform community faced a serious challenge. Spurred by economic distress, administrative inefficiency, racial tensions resulting from the entrenched white planter opposition to emancipation, and wild rumors that slavery was about to be reintroduced, freed black West Indians rebelled in the parish of St. Thomas-in-the-East, Morant Bay, Jamaica.
On 11 October hundreds of black residents protested against the local magistrate, and, after the militia intervened, lay siege to the courthouse and burnt it to the ground. This was the preamble to a riot that spread quickly across the parish. The siege and fire killed fifteen magistrates, the ensuing disturbance escalating these early casualties. Troops acting under the order of the Governor, Edward John Eyre, speedily and violently put down the riot. Thus, by the end of October approximately 500 black Jamaicans lay dead and, in the violent pacification that followed, many more were tortured and hundreds had their homes razed in vindictive and vengeful acts of destruction by white troops and white residents. The most prominent victim of the pacification was George William Gordon. Gordon, a popular mulatto politician and magistrate, and Eyre's most prominent political rival. Eyre had previously finagled Gordon's dismissal from the island Assembly. Gordon thus became the scapegoat for the hostilities. Charged with instigating the rebellion, Gordon was tried under martial law and hanged. 

The Jamaican rebellion and its severe repression sparked demands for an immediate investigation into affairs in Jamaica. The British government appointed a royal commission to inquire into the events of October and it presented its official findings in a report to Parliament on 18 June 1866. The report concluded that the outbreak at Morant Bay had been premeditated. The rebellion's objective, it claimed, was to
secure royal lands free of rent and to drive all whites from the island. Further, the report stated that, faced with the very real threat of the rebellion spreading to the whole island, Governor Eyre was to be commended for the "skill, promptitude, and vigor" with which he "managed" the early part of the insurrection.\(^3\)

The report continued, however, to censure Eyre for the longevity of the repression and for what it characterized as the "excessive...reckless...barbarous...wanton and cruel" treatment meted out to the black population under Eyre's orders. Subsequently, the British government removed Eyre as Governor of Jamaica. Despite this official censure, British civil courts later acquitted Governor Eyre and many of his officers of human rights charges brought against them in private suits.\(^4\)

Historians have often viewed this rebellion, and the reaction of the British government and public to it, as a watershed event both in the life of the Atlantic freedman's movement and in the racial climate of Britain. Indeed, for some historians the repression of the rebellion and the British government's response to it was the catalyst for the final triumph of racism over humanitarian forces in Britain. The government's failure to more severely censure Eyre and the establishment's refusal to convict the perpetrators in civil suits stands in the minds of some scholars as damning testimony of a nation which, by the 1860's, had forfeited its
claim to world moral leadership. Such scholars further argue that by its response Britain had forsaken her international humanitarian heritage and slid into an era of introversion as she struggled to come to terms with more pressing domestic issues.

Moreover, the rebellion, Christine Bolt has further asserted, spelt the end of any meaningful Anglo-American cooperation on civil rights and instead ushered in a new era of "Anglo-Saxonism" in Britain that precluded any resurrection of the Atlantic movement. American abolitionists, she contended, dismayed with both the violent response to the rebellion and the quietude of British abolitionists on the issue withdrew from the Atlantic relationship to face the perils of racial reconstruction alone. England could be of little use to United States abolitionists in her current amoralized state. What was left of the British reform impulse channeled itself elsewhere and America's racial arrangements became a matter of her own internal, domestic politics. In the debates on the "Jamaican Affair," as conservative circles euphemistically referred to the rebellion, the true national feeling on race became known and it was not progressive.

The Jamaica rebellion certainly was a watershed event in the history of the Atlantic movement. Publicly, racial attitudes did indeed harden in Britain after the rebellion. Arguably, however, such a hardening was a consequence of
longer processes rather than the product of one lone minor uprising in one distant British colony in 1865.\(^5\) The stiffening of public attitudes on the racial issue must be placed in a continuum that began even before the outbreak of hostilities in the American Civil War. Those same conservative factions that rallied to Eyre's defense were the same factions who had sided with the Southern plantocracy throughout the American conflict and before. The locus of ambivalence on the slavery issue, therefore, had not shifted significantly over more than a generation.

It is also too simplistic to claim that the outcome of the rebellion and the post-mortem debate in Britain illustrates the triumph of racism and the death of the abolitionist movement in Britain. The most patent evidence to the contrary was the continued funnelling of money to the freedmen's cause up to the turn of the century. As subsequent chapters illustrate, Britons continued to furnish a crucial portion of the monies devoted to freedmen's aid.\(^5\)

Moreover, despite American activists' obvious and abject disappointment regarding the British public's response to the Governor Eyre affair, such dissatisfaction did not preclude them from continuing to regard Britain as a useful staging ground for attacks upon American Jim Crowism. Britain provided, at least in American eyes, an ideal and an open forum for debates on race, a forum that was extremely circumscribed for abolitionists and civil rights workers in
the United States. Indeed, although the revolt itself, as well as popular ignorance regarding the social and economic conditions that had precipitated it, were an acute embarrassment to the British abolitionist community, both British and American activists "spun" the revolt into a summary lesson on the meaning of real emancipation. American abolitionists indeed believed that the revolt would do nothing but encourage philanthropy for the American freedmen. As the earlier 1831 Jamaican revolt had roused anti-slavery feeling in Britain, so the 1865 revolt roused sympathy for the freedmen and condemnation of the social and economic abuses that had precipitated this latest uprising. Others used the revolt as political capital, drawing parallels between Jamaica and the U.S. and using the revolt as ammunition for a more radical strategy for reconstructing the American South.

On a larger scale, the rebellion put race "on the map" as a key topic of late nineteenth century discourse. In Britain, the rebellion precipitated a national dialogue on race, a dialogue in which antislavery and freedmen's aid groups participated vigorously. Debates raged in every corner of Britain, from Parliament, to newspapers, to private homes, not only about the Jamaican rebellion and the manner in which it had been suppressed, but about the place of African and indeed all "coloured" peoples in the British Empire and wider world. This debate starkly revealed the
racial divide in Britain and separated the "real friends" of African people's from those who embraced elitist notions of Anglo-Saxonism.

Despite precipitating this discourse, however, it is crucial to understand that the post-mortem of the Jamaican rebellion was not fundamentally concerned with issues of racial justice and fitness. What those Americans who attacked the hypocrisy of Britain's official position on race could not comprehend was that the Governor Eyre controversy was ultimately not a debate about race, but rather a debate about class, constitutionalism, as well as law and order within the British Empire. Indeed, the discussion was ultimately taken out of the hands of the abolitionist minority in Britain, first by Liberal politicians who saw in the crisis a useful corollary for their fight for universal male suffrage, and then by conservative Eyre supporters who viewed the affair as illustrative of the unfitness of lower class Englishmen for political autonomy. From this contest, abolitionists withdrew refusing to embroil what they saw as an essentially philanthropic effort in the tentacles of domestic and imperial politics.

The debate in Britain over Jamaica was thus much more than a simple "race war," as Thomas Holt characterized it. Similarly it was much more than a straightforward "black and white" conflict between "two warring factions" as Douglas Lorimer conceived. Indeed, internal domestic political
conflicts yet again superseded abolitionists' more strictly humanitarian goals. While Liberal politicians were turning the debate into an issue of domestic politics, hard-core abolitionists were struggling to keep the British public's focus on issues of racial equality. To this end they were more successful in convincing their American constituency. To Americans who had an incomplete understanding of the intricacies and politics of class relations in Britain, the Jamaican affair was purely and simply a racial debate. To pro- and anti-slavery groups in the United States the premier lesson of the Jamaican rebellion was thus a corollary to their own domestic debate: "how fit are Africans for freedom?" It was this issue that abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic would endeavor to answer affirmatively.

* 

Before we can understand the impact that the rebellion had upon the Atlantic movement, it is essential to understand the role that a free Jamaica played in the Atlantic relationship prior to the Morant Bay rebellion. The emancipation of slaves throughout the West Indies had served as both a symbolic and practical touchstone for American abolitionists since it had gone into effect on August 1, 1834. West Indian emancipation stood as an ideal. Every year American abolitionists celebrated the anniversary of the implementation of the West Indies emancipation proclamation and it became a rallying point for American aspirations for
the same. British abolitionists commemorated the anniversary too. During the ante-bellum years commemorations on both sides of the Atlantic were a tacit reminder to the world of Britain's moral leadership and a rebuttal to the contrary claims of Southern and other pro-slavery forces who constantly strove to undermine Britain's credibility by publicizing other injustices within the British social and political system.

To abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic the West Indies provided an example of the success of emancipation. Abolitionists were keen to prove that the West Indies demonstrated that slaves were fit for freedom: that the plantation economy had not suffered because of emancipation; that slaves could be self-sufficient, hard-working, moral, Christians; and, perhaps most importantly, that whites did not have to fear for their physical safety in the presence of a large, freed, black population.10

Jamaica, in particular was of supreme interest to American abolitionists. Jamaica, as the West Indian island with whom Americans had the most developed business and personal associations, was a natural focus for those Americans who wished to predict a positive future for freedmen within their own nation. Having had one of the largest slave populations and an extensive system of plantation agriculture, it's economy most closely paralleled that of the South. Thus Americans naturally and attentively
followed the fate of its economy after emancipation. Finally, as the island nearest the US mainland, anti-slavery forces looked to Jamaica with hope, convinced that abolitionists—British and American alike—could use it as a staging post for the invasion and ruination of the Southern slave system.

Jamaica was contested terrain, however. While American abolitionists looked to Jamaica with hope, pro-slavery Southerners looked to the island with fear. As abolitionists promoted the island as an example of the social and economic wisdom of emancipation, pro-slavery forces tried to claim the island as an icon in their campaign to perpetuate the institution. With the threat of West Indian emancipation still before them, Southern whites prophesied that freedom would result in another massacre of whites on the scale of the Santo Domingo massacre of 1791. Although this fate failed to materialize, Southern whites still maintained an intense interest in the West Indies and seized upon any blunder as an ominous portent for those who sought the same prospect for American slaves.

Southerners did not have long to wait. As early as 1835 it was clear that Jamaica was in trouble and thus the island quickly became a symbol of the awful consequences of slave emancipation. Despite encouraging early reports about the relative tranquility of the island, by early 1835 troublesome stories had emerged. Missionaries and abolitionists reported
from the islands the perpetuation of some of the worst abuses of the slave system: freedmen were being flogged, children and pregnant women were being forced to perform heavy labor in the fields, and apprentices were being compelled to labor on treadmills.\textsuperscript{12} Conditions indeed became so worrying that the Jamaican administration even wrote to the British government requesting antislavery demonstrations in England to try and bring the planters to heel. Such pleas prompted British abolitionists to embark on expeditions to the islands to see firsthand exactly what was going wrong.\textsuperscript{13} Without exception these excursions reluctantly reported that Jamaica was in the worst state of all the Caribbean islands.\textsuperscript{14}

For while reports by British observers generally painted a positive picture of the stability of most of the West Indian islands, Jamaica was the exception. The apparent economic stability of the other West Indian islands in the post-emancipation period made it more difficult for Southerners to find grist for their mills of a black instituted armageddon. But the political, social, and economic system of Jamaica was highly contentious. To pro-slavery Southerners, Jamaica's experiences illustrated the two things they most had to fear from emancipation: economic disaster and a decline in racial control. Jamaica, Southern slavery apologists ruminated shortly after emancipation, would soon become an all black state and "probably ultimately become like their mother, Africa, slave marts in the hands of
petty negro kings." Southern newspapers had their viewpoint vindicated by no less than the American consul to Jamaica, Robert M. Harrison, who reported early after emancipation that whites were leaving the island in droves and that violence was imminent. Every white man, he claimed, was "standing on a volcano and knows not when it will explode."  

Naysayers of emancipation thus predicted an utter collapse of Jamaica between 1834 and 1861. Most importantly, Southerners continued to claim that not only were the freedmen reverting to paganism and barbarity, thus unleashing on a helpless white population all those animal passions that had only been contained by the strong hand of white overlordship, but that planters were suffering a devastating economic decline. Although the evidence suggests that Jamaica's economic problems commenced before emancipation, planters in the South stubbornly maintained that emancipation was the ruination of the island's economy. First and foremost, they argued, it deprived the island of a labor system: blacks would not and could not be induced to work as freedmen. As Southerners witnessed first the mass exodus of white labor from the island and then the failure of the apprenticeship system, they could not help but conclude that the utter devastation of the plantation economy would follow.  

The Jamaican economy did indeed suffer--especially in relative terms--after emancipation. Sugar production fell
fifty percent between 1834 and 1850 and such economic dislocations were seized upon by Southern slavery apologists. Indeed, to Southerners the whole pre- and post-emancipation Jamaican "situation" was a case study, not in humanitarianism, but in economics. Pro-slavery Southerners ascribed economic motivations underlying West Indian emancipation. Far from giving Britons a claim to world moral leadership as a product of an humanitarian impulse, they argued, the British "liberators of the slaves" were no better than Southerners.\textsuperscript{17} Humanitarianism lay a distant second to more materialistic impulses. To bolster this argument Southerners only had to point their listeners toward myriad other examples of oppression within the British empire:

If the motivations behind British emancipation were humanitarian why did not Great Britain help diminish the miseries of the people in Ireland?\textsuperscript{18}

Southerners also pointed to the deplorable condition of caste and class in Britain's Indian possessions and the denial of equality to a large proportion of the British public at home as evident proof of the real motivations behind West Indian emancipation.\textsuperscript{19} "While the English are going about reform for the Blacks in the West Indies," the \textit{Charleston Courier} chastised, "the white slaves in Britain are working themselves to death."\textsuperscript{20} Wage slavery was thus not merely a concept for liberal reformers.
These evident inequities also provided ammunition for Southerners' attacks on British and American abolitionists. Now that British abolitionists had achieved their objective, Southerners believed, there was nothing to prevent them from turning their attention to the abolition of slavery in the United States. Abolitionists would now "go South" and "poison the minds of the slaves" there. Not content with destroying "their own colonies, they are now desirous of seeing slavery abolished in every other country and countenance any villain who may preach up what they call liberty and equality as well a amalgamation between the whites and the Blacks." By any means, the character and conduct of abolitionists thus had to be attacked. Abolitionists were, in the eyes of Southerners, the ultimate hypocrites:

While beggars are starving in the streets of London, it is a very easy thing to realise a subscription for the benefit of Humbug, King of the Cannibal islands.

Moreover, Abolitionists and missionaries, particularly those active in Jamaica, posed a direct threat to the American South. The island's proximity to the American South gave abolitionists, Southerners believed, an easy port of entry directly into the heart of slave-holding territory. American Consul Harrison indeed warned Southern politicians on many occasions about the threat of British abolitionists embarking on ships bound for New Orleans.
Jamaica also attracted American abolitionists. The American Anti-Slavery Society, for example, dispatched numerous agents to report on conditions in Jamaica with a specific view to disproving Southern propaganda about the problems of the island. Two such advocates, James Thome and J. Horace Kimball who visited the island in 1837, caused a particular stir by their corrective of popular perceptions. These "vile wretches who are employed by the fanatics in England to write and stir up strife, between our New England and Southern States concerning Slavery" did much to help redress the negative picture of Jamaican life portrayed by Southern slavery apologists. Their book, *Emancipation in the West Indies: A Six Month's Tour in Antigua, Barbados, and Jamaica in the Year 1837*, portrayed emancipation as an overall success. While not disputing that Jamaica had its problems, Thome and Kimball laid the blame for economic and social dislocation at the feet of the white planter class, not the freedmen.

The activities of British and American abolitionists and missionaries in Jamaica thus compounded an already fraught Anglo-American diplomatic relationship. A series of crises—the Maine boundary dispute, the burning of the *Caroline*, the Texas question, and the "Wrecked Ship Controversies"—worsened relations between 1830 and the 1860 and led to real fears that war was imminent.

The Wrecked Ship Controversies, for example, merely
cemented the notion that Britain was hell-bent upon eradicating slavery not just within her empire but throughout the world and that she would violate international law to do so. According to British regulations under the anti-slave trade and emancipation statutes any slave ship that was either wrecked in British waters or forced into British ports due to inclement weather or other factors would have all its slaves declared free. These stipulations caused international crises in the 1830's when the American ships the Comet, the Enconium, and the Enterprise were wrecked or forced into British waters in the West Indies. The British government declared slaves on all of these ships free and this precipitated a diplomatic imbroglio which was only resolved years later, when, under protest, the British government agreed to compensate the owners of the freed slaves. In 1841 the British government took similar steps when slaves on the American ship the Creole mutinied and sought refuge in Nassau harbor. The British government granted freedom to all those slaves who had not been involved in the mutiny and these actions aroused a fresh round of protest from American Southerners. The controversy over the Creole, however, lingered on until 1855 when the British finally agreed to compensate the owners of the freed slaves.

The Wrecked Ship Controversies not only raised Southern anxiety over the British legal system's assault on the status
of slaves as property, but also over the specter of black violence which these slaves represented. The fear was that the freedmen of the slave ships would just add to the growing numbers of blacks on West Indian islands, especially Jamaica, and this would make free black interference in Southern life increasingly likely. Pro-slavery forces believed that soldiers trained in Jamaica would infiltrate the South and teach Southern slaves how to use weapons and lead them in rebellion. Reinforcing these fears, in 1845 Consul Harrison warned the US government that in the event of a war with Britain, Jamaica would be used as a staging post for an invasion of the South.

Jamaica was thus a central battleground for anti- and pro-slavery forces in the antebellum period. That battle was most often publicly fought out every year on August 1st when worldwide attention paid to the anniversary of emancipation naturally provided a large audience for either side. For American abolitionists in particular, the anniversary of West Indian independence provided a forum for publicizing the American anti-slavery cause. Every year from 1834 to 1861 public demonstrations were held throughout the United States, celebrating the anniversary of the end of slavery in Jamaica and the other West Indian islands. These occasions witnessed some of the largest anti-slavery gatherings of the year and they were a chance for the abolitionist movement to publicize the scope of public anti-slavery sentiment in the country.
The meetings were invariably attended by the leading abolitionist figures in the United States who, knowing that national newspapers invariably reported upon the anniversary, utilized the occasion as a platform for anti-slavery proselytizing. Frederick Douglass later spoke of its significance:

While slavery existed in our country and while it was necessary to agitate the public mind upon the question of its abolition, the 1st of August was a most valuable auxiliary. The celebration of the day gave us the full advantage of contrasting the noble example of Britain with the mean example of America. We could commend one while we denounced the other. 32

These occasions also drew the British and American movements together. It was no accident that tours of British abolitionists to the U.S. coincided with the anniversary and featured prominent British sympathizers upon the speaking platform. Such appearances lent not only credence, legitimacy, and hope to the American cause, but it was also a tacit acceptance of the moral leadership that Britain had shown through this "sublime event of the nineteenth century, and the one of all others most creditable to the age," in the words of Frederick Douglass. 33

The anniversary demonstrations were also of particular importance to the American black community. The celebrations were often opportunities for black populations to demonstrate their desire for emancipation and to celebrate vicariously their own independence. Upon an anniversary celebration in
western New York state attended by thousands of local black residents Douglass wrote:

The black man has no Fourth of July here, on which to display banners, burn powder, ring bells, dance and drink whisky; so he makes the First of August, in some instances, to serve this purpose. 34

That "independence" celebrations were held by American blacks on August 1st and not July 4th was a potent statement of the hypocrisy of the claims made in the American Revolution. The anniversary celebrations also fostered self-help and self-sufficiency among African-Americans by promoting leaders within their own community. In particular, as the Civil War began and African-Americans increasingly sought to take their own fate into their own hands, the prominent speakers on anniversary platforms were the outstanding African-American activists of the day: Frederick Douglass, John Sella Martin, and William Wells Brown were all featured celebrities who sought to draw parallels between the current struggle between the States and the struggle a generation ago in Jamaica as an argument for slave emancipation. 35

A free Jamaica thus continued to be a battle-ground both for American pro- and anti-slavery forces as well as for Anglo-American relations in the years before the Civil War. And when that latter conflagration began, the desire to harness West Indian emancipation as a model became ever more urgent. This was especially true for abolitionists. Most
famous was the very public treatise published by Lydia Maria Child of the AASS in 1862. Abolitionists used her outspoken argument on the success of West Indian emancipation as their major lever to urge upon President Lincoln immediate emancipation.36

However, events in Jamaica during the Civil War seemed to arm pro-slavery American forces more heavily, in particular the 1865 rebellion. An armed uprising was every Southern plantation owners' nightmare and played upon his deepest fears. Indeed, the 1865 rebellion was hardly the first time that pro-slavery forces had used Jamaica as a negative portent of a post-emancipation world. Jamaica, of all the West Indian islands, had a tradition of violent protest. Slave rebellions in Jamaica were larger and more numerous than anywhere else in the West Indies or the United States.37 Indeed, West Indian emancipation in 1833 was in part a product of the rebellion that beset Jamaica in 1831. The "Christmas Rebellion" as it was called, was in fact far more widespread than the 1865 Morant Bay uprising, involving at least ten times as many people and engulfing most of the parishes on the western edge of the island. The 1831 rebellion had a positive impact on the abolition cause within the British empire. The uprising aroused the sympathies of the anti-slavery movement and persuaded British authorities that emancipation was inevitable.38 Although no actual rebellions occurred in Jamaica between the 1834 and the
Morant Bay uprisings, the island was far from peaceful. Riots and conspiracies threatened the stability of the island almost continuously with serious disturbances erupting in 1839, 1848, and 1859. Such disruptions merely added fuel to pro-slavery fires.

Abolitionists argued, however, that the disturbances were rather more eloquent testimony to the inequities and short-comings in the British program for the reconstruction of Jamaica after emancipation. Among the myriad causes of these post-emancipation melees were certain common factors: the threat of re-enslavement, the burden of poverty, and the unequal application of justice. Together with an increasingly politicized black population, these ingredients resurrected themselves to precipitate the most threatening post-emancipation riot at Morant Bay in 1865.

As newspapers—abolitionist and otherwise—reported, by 1865, the economic and social condition of Jamaica was alarming. This decline was to no small degree due to the sectional conflict in America. A decline in the sugar market, coupled with an increase in the cost of imported staples such as food and clothing caused by the American Civil War, had diminished wages and brought widespread unemployment. Compounded by a decade of plague, drought, and floods, an increase in population, a fifty percent decrease in the numbers of operating plantations, and taxation whose burden had recently shifted from the planter to the peasant
class, the bulk of Jamaica's population found itself in "a
distressing state of poverty."\textsuperscript{39} It was when British
authorities refused to respond to petitions for relief—in
the form of low rent on lands and a more equitable treatment
of large and small landholders in the court system—that, on
11\textsuperscript{th} October 1865, the black population of Morant Bay seized
the town. From there the rebellion spread throughout the
rest of St Thomas' parish in the east before being savagely
repressed.

The first reports that Britons received of this uprising
did not address the underlying social and economic basis for
the rebellion, however. Instead initial accounts portrayed
the rebellion as a barbaric act of an ungrateful people
totally unsuited for freedom. Most significantly, it was
through these reports that Americans first learned of the
uprising. The picture painted of British sentiment was thus
none too favorable and, unsurprisingly, prompted many
American abolitionists to declare initially that Britain had
abandoned her heritage.

Admittedly, to a degree these perceptions were correct.
The rebellion clearly brought to the surface long held racial
prejudice in England and revived antipathy against Africans.
"Events have proved," wrote the London \textit{Daily Telegraph}, "that
the negro is still a savage."\textsuperscript{40} The \textit{Morning Herald}
concurred, concluding, despite the lack of accurate reporting
coming out of Jamaica, that black Jamaicans had proved themselves unfit for freedom.

It was the London Times, as usual, that led the charge against the intellectual, social and civil equality of Africans as revealed by Jamaica. 41 From the outset the Times portrayed black Jamaicans as the aggressors. It described in vivid detail the myriad murders, tortures, and abuses that the numerically superior black rioters had allegedly perpetrated upon the minority white population. On these grounds the Times exonerated Governor Eyre and the Jamaican police, columnists asserting that the rebellion would almost assuredly have overtaken the whole island had the governor not moved so quickly and with such "justified severity." 42 For conservatives there could be no doubt that the uprising in Jamaica was a premeditated conspiracy for a black take-over of the island, inspired, no doubt, by recent events in Haiti, even led by the insurgents of that island. Its barbarity proved one thing to the conservative press: Africans were not a fit race. On the contrary, Jamaican "negroes", asserted the Times, were "ungrateful brutes" who repaid their beneficent liberators with bloodshed and anarchy.

Conservative Englishmen and women rallied to the defense of the white Jamaican political and economic elite. They denied that black Jamaicans had been oppressed, pointing out that Jamaicans had risen to the heights of the judiciary on
Jamaica, had equal legal recourse, and had plentiful food and work. In short they had been given everything which "ought to have made them the happiest and most contented peasantry in the world." But even this was not sufficient to "eradicate the original savageness of the African blood." Thirty years of freedom, conservatives levelled, were clearly insufficient to breed a "civilized" man and had failed to eradicate the essential debased nature of the African.

In this indictment of the Jamaican rebels, conservatives resurrected every old stereotype about the African race. Black Jamaicans had created their own problems, specifically economic ones, through reversion to their most base characteristics:

"The negro has no stomach for work... His labour cannot be relied upon... Except under the pressure of some present stimulus his incorrigible laziness prevails."3

As such the "negro" had to blame only himself if he could not make a living from the land. "A miserable low morality, gross and grotesques fanaticism" supplemented his idleness and prevented him from utilizing the opportunities that Britons unselfishly presented him with.4 His "horrible ingratitude," however, had revealed the impotency of philanthropy to change the hearts and heads of the African race. Philanthropy too, though, had patently failed to change the "hearts and heads" of the most determined
opponents of Africans as the *Times*'s comments on this failure reveal:

We have been trying now the best part of a century to wash the blackamoor white, with all kinds of patent soaps, infallible dyes, sweet oils, soothing liniments, rough towels, and soft brushes. But he remains as blacks as ever, as thick-skinned as ever, his hair as woolly, and his cranium as hard.46

Such ingratitude was also in part due, charged the press, to black impotence and mental deficiencies. Such charges simultaneously degraded Africans and vilified political opponents at home. The conservative press endeavored to convince the public that the savagery of the Jamaican uprising could not have been conceived without stimulus from "outside" (read white, abolitionist) influences. Why had men who had "wants hardly above those of a brute" rebelled, queried the London *Times*?47 Black Jamaicans, it concluded, had not known they were oppressed until they were so told.

The attack upon the humanity of free blacks also provided conservative Britons with an opportunity to disparage the anti-slavery movement by portraying its members as traitors to the British constitution. In laying blame for the revolt, for example, Governor Eyre was swift to point the finger at one man: Reverend Henry Beane Underhill, Joint Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society and anti-slavery activist. In 1859 Underhill had visited Jamaica and compiled a lengthy report on the conditions he found there. In 1865,
troubled by increasing reports of economic distress, Underhill had complained in a letter to the Colonial Secretary of the deplorable conditions of black Jamaicans.\textsuperscript{48} In the dispatch he laid the blame at the feet of the colonial legislature and counseled several solutions.\textsuperscript{49} It was this letter that was charged with inflaming passions on October 7th. The Baptist Missionary Association had circulated the letter among members of Governor Eyre's administration and it soon found its way into the colonial press and became "common property" as Underhill explained it.\textsuperscript{50}

The publication and Eyre's subsequent refusal to act upon any of Underhill's recommendations, inflamed an already tense situation.\textsuperscript{51} Black Jamaicans appeared to have found a champion in Underhill and over the next few weeks black Jamaicans held "Underhill Meetings" across the island to endorse his views and to petition the Colonial Office and Crown for redress. To Eyre, such meetings and petitions, legal though they were, were tantamount to sedition and ultimately were the cause of the October uprising. The conservative press railed against Underhill for weeks as the intentional instigator of the uprising. Ostensibly the attack was far more than personal, however. A member of the Anti-Slavery Society, Underhill became the straw man for racial philanthropy and for the emancipation of African-Americans.

Most importantly, as the \textit{Times} pointed out, events in Jamaica augured ill for the prospects of African-American
freedom. The uprising in Jamaica was a warning to the United States to proceed cautiously "now that it is known that not even thirty years of freedom and full political rights are capable of giving the Jamaican negro the instincts of a civilized man."52

Freedom, like property, has its duties as well as its rights; but this truth is beyond the comprehension of a negro. His idea of freedom seems to be simply exemption from the necessity of labour. He has to be told...that he must work as hard after emancipation as before...This is not at all to his taste. If he can escape the work before him...he will do so, even though the process may depress him to the condition of a brute.34

The vituperation in these attacks should not fool us, however. The mouthpieces of such sentiments had not changed for over twenty years. The London Times led the charge against American antebellum emancipation and British support for the Union just as it was now leading the charge against blacks in the wake of the Jamaican affair. There is thus a consistency of approach in conservative circles in Britain. What accounts for the seeming increase in conservative volume in 1865 was that conservatives had now, for the first time, been handed an example of their worst fears on a plate and they were willing to do everything they could to capitalize on it.

Such virulent attacks upon black Jamaicans were clearly intended to damage the Atlantic abolitionist community. Abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic had to engage in
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a hasty rearguard action to contain the potential harm effected on the cause of the American freedman. It was American abolitionists who responded most promptly. Even before the final reports on the rebellion and its repression were in, the American Anti-Slavery Society was publishing accounts that sought to downplay the extent of the rebellion and portray it as little more than a "riot."\(^5^4\) Within Britain the virulence of the conservative press's attack upon the nature and character of African peoples forced American anti-slavery activists on both sides of the Atlantic and at all levels into an impassioned crusade to rehabilitate publicly the reputation of black Jamaicans and Africans.\(^5^5\)

Faced with the prospect that American Reconstruction would be adversely affected by the events in Jamaica, American abolitionists in Britain led by Sarah Remond scrambled to defend the character of the race and in some cases to disassociate American blacks from Afro-Jamaicans. Despite early reports that described in lurid detail the atrocities committed by the rebels, the American press more readily and speedily moved not only to condemn the British military for their retaliatory actions, which might be expected, but to also reveal sympathetically the underlying economic and social underpinnings of the uprising.\(^5^6\)

Indeed, prior to the uprising the New York Times correspondent for Jamaica was reporting incipient dissatisfaction caused by the mis-government of the island:
Everything is done in this unfortunate country to increase the misery and distress of the people, but no one cares to remove her cut of the slough of poverty and ruin...They [the legislature] must be aware that there is a deep surging of popular feeling throughout the country that will not easily be allayed. 57

The reporter outlined the economic distress of the population and the growing belief that the new governor was subverting the constitution with regard to property. The press reiterated these beliefs in the wake of the rebellion. 58 Moreover, the abolitionist media took pains to dismiss the charges that the uprising was part of a concerted conspiracy by the blacks of the island to exterminate the white population. 59 Weighing all the facts, the Times concluded that the insurrection was "really [nothing] more than a kind of bread-riot, made by very poor and ignorant people." 60

Acceptance of the propaganda of the London Times and other organs of the conservative press did not go unchallenged for long in Britain either. 61 The rebellion shook the British abolitionist community out of its complacent torpor. On October 18th, 1865, before the news of the rebellion reached Britain, Goldwin Smith, eminent abolitionist, radical politician, and academic, had written to an American friend that the solution to the problem of racial friction in the United States was the relocation of African-Americans to the West Indies which was thriving "happily" under a "paternal government."
Goldwin Smith, like others, was soon disabused of these notions. British abolitionists, particularly the BFASS, were quick to defend the actions of the Jamaican rebels by outlining the poor social and economic conditions that had given rise to the reaction. The blame for the rebellion was promptly laid at the feet of the plantation aristocracy who, encouraged by British support for the slaveholding confederacy at the beginning of the Civil War, felt emboldened enough to resurrect pre-emancipation oppressive work conditions and oppression.

Such outpourings of counter-intelligence from the side of anti-slavery groups at first inspired abolitionist groups to promise a full and complete restoration of British moral leadership. "The righteous reaction is at hand," Waddington of the FMAS declared, calling upon all to "wait and you shall see that our country will do itself justice in this momentous matter."

However, the restitution of British moral leadership was not to be so easily achieved. Firstly, the same fractious infighting that had bedeviled British anti-slavery philanthropy in the past severely hindered action on Jamaica. Just as jealous rivalries and the resultant lack of coordination between anti-slavery groups had lessened the effectiveness of the American campaign in Britain, so the Jamaica rebellion put another barrier in the way of that cooperation.
In early 1865 the prospect of overcoming such handicaps looked promising, however, as British freedman's aid groups sought to coordinate the raising of funds for freedmen worldwide. But British freedman's aid associations greeted an initiative for an aid Union—an umbrella organization to coordinate the raising of funds for American ex-slaves—with mixed feelings. The prospect for unanimous support for such a device finally evaporated, however, after October 1865 as abolitionists struggled over whether charity at home or charity abroad should take precedence. Consequently, many British societies refused to touch the issue of Jamaican aid. Others decided to take a middle road, claiming support for both freedmen in Jamaica and the United States. The Birmingham, the Manchester, and the Leicester associations all widened their activities to aid the Jamaican freedmen. The Birmingham association, however, insisted on keeping the two issues distinct. The London based FMAS, on the other hand, believed the two issues to be inseparable and argued for widening the scope of its organization to embrace the cause of black Jamaicans. Such differences of opinion, doomed any hope for coordination among freedmen's organizations in Britain. The charter of the National Freedman's Aid Union of Great Britain and Scotland, as the official verbose title of the Union ran, allowed the organization to extend its interests to freedmen outside the United States if it so chose. But two of the most powerful
groups in Britain, the Birmingham association and the Friends Central Committee, opposed the resolution. The Union was thus shorn of its raison d'etre.

The opposition to supporting Jamaican freedmen, on the surface at least, appears to validate the claims of those pro-slavery Southerners who found only hypocrisy and an imperialist agenda behind British freedmen's aid. However, at the heart of the reluctance of such groups to aid the freedmen of their own empire was the thorny, age-old dilemma, that has beset such philanthropic endeavors down into our own century: the thin line between charity and politics. By the end of 1865 some abolitionists were already treading this thin line, mobilizing to sway the British government's colonial policies. British abolitionists, for example, were the first to call for the removal of Eyre from office. By early December the deputations from the BFASS besieged the office of the Colonial Secretary, Edward Cardwell, demanding Eyre's dismissal.

Most outspoken in its opposition to Governor Eyre was the London based FMAS. It was this organization that most clearly illustrated the perils of mixing politics with the traditional claims of philanthropy. Many members of the FMAS were radical politicians. Indeed, of all abolitionist organizations, the FMAS had the greatest membership overlap with the Jamaica Committee. Mill, Thomas Hughes, Lushington, and Taylor were all FMAS members and prominent
activists in the Jamaica Committee and from the outset the FMAS was a staunch supporter of the Committee.

Many other abolitionists lent their support to the committee. However, most of the abolitionists who joined the Jamaica Committee or argued for a widening of their organization's operations to encompass Jamaica stressed that they undertook their actions solely for humanitarian reasons. Initially, abolitionists made collections for the freedmen avowedly and only in the name of humanitarianism—to lessen the physical suffering of ex-slaves. British abolitionist organizations voted to aid Jamaican freedmen as part of their efforts to aid American ex-slaves arguing that:

the truth is that Jamaica has long been a great stumbling block to the cause of emancipation in America. The friends of freedom across the Atlantic are extremely anxious that it should be removed.\(^70\)

Abolitionists hoped that a successful resolution to the Jamaican affair would provide a benchmark for the emancipation and accommodation of black populations everywhere. As Jacob Bright summarized the abolitionist's position:

We could not help the Freed-men of America in any way so well as by helping them through the Freed-men of the West Indies. If it were shown that justice were done there between white and black, an example would be set which would extend to all future times...It would be a great thing if we were in a position to point to our own example in the West Indies, and prove that the blacks there have as much protection as the whites.\(^71\)
He continued that he believed that the questions affecting the freedmen of America and Jamaica could not be separated, and that "we should be found deserting our friends in the former country because we were attending to our own people in the latter."^72

Bright's latter comment, however, reveals the problematic motivations behind the Jamaica Committee's actions. It is essential not to over-simplify the incentives of those involved in the Jamaica Committee. The Committee's membership was bifurcated between traditional philanthropists and those radical politicians who seized upon the Morant Bay rebellion to make political capital. It eventually became clear that the Jamaica Committee was more concerned with domestic political arrangements than the injustices committed against colonial subjects.^^73

The leadership of the Jamaica committee showed a clear overlap with the leadership of the suffrage fight in Britain. Mill, John Bright, Edmond Beales, and Thomas Hughes, all radical M.P's with a reform agenda, were also members of the Committee's executive. Mill and his radical allies within the Jamaica Committee were indeed quick to draw parallels between racial conflict in Jamaica and class conflict in Britain. Much as Mill and company supported the principle of justice to Afro-Jamaicans "there was much more at stake than only justice to the negroes," as Mill wrote. Questions of liberty, democracy, and rule of law were preeminent.
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As not only physical differences but social situation fueled racist opinion in Britain, so anti-Eyre supporters could find capital in the analogous position of Jamaican peasants and the British working class.\textsuperscript{74} After the publication of the Royal Commission's report on the Jamaican affair in June 1866, the opposition to the repression took on the elements of a political campaign against propertied whites both at home and abroad.

Moreover, the innate racism exhibited by some members of the Committee amply illustrated that many Britons considered Jamaica a matter of imperial politics rather than racial equality. Thomas Huxley, for example, admitted that he had no love for blacks, and William Forster revealed that he and others had nothing but feelings of contempt for what was clearly an "inferior race."\textsuperscript{75} The Jamaican affair thus revealed the true friends of the African or, as Thomas Hughes so colorfully put it, those "in whom the faith that all men are born free and equal, goes down deeper than their dinner."\textsuperscript{76}

To traditional antislavery activists, then, the Committee's agenda diverted energies from the real issue at hand in the Jamaican affair: racial prejudice. As the Committee moved away from the realm of straight philanthropy into politics, it therefore gradually lost the adherence of a portion of the antislavery bloc in Britain.\textsuperscript{77} By their fidelity to the Jamaica Committee, organizations such as the
FMAS were threatened with a loss of support. The organization found itself consistently denying accusations that it was a political body. Ultimately, the FMAS, like other abolitionist bodies in Britain tried to distance their operations, if not their sentiment, from the actions of the Jamaica Committee by decrying the party factionalism that had deflected public attention away from the essential concerns raised by the Jamaica affair:

The Jamaica question has been so hampered and perplexed by party discussion that many stand in doubt as to whether any serious effort is intended for the steady and permanent improvement of the people.

The party question, abolitionists believed, had prevented Britons from rallying to the cause:

When it is known that the friends of the Freed-men have no party aims in view, and no political influence to seek, that they are the friends of Jamaica because they are the friends of humanity, when it is seen that they have a fixed and unwavering purpose to exercise vigilance with discretion...the best of our own countrymen...will work with us.

After the British press condemned abolitionist members of the committee for associating the "black rabble of Jamaica with the white rabble of London," several key abolitionist members of the Committee resigned. Most notably, Thomas Buxton relinquished his position as chair of the Jamaica Committee.
Buxton's resignation was contentious at the time. Publicly disagreeing with Mill's strategy of prosecuting Eyre for murder on the grounds that Eyre's actions, while deplorable, were not wilfully murderous, Buxton played into the hands of Eyre's defence committee who sought any signs of dissension within the opposition. Buxton was not, however, condoning the pacification. To the contrary, he was later one of the staunchest supporters of the "full-blown parliamentary attack" upon Eyre. Among the parliamentary resolutions supported by Buxton were those deploring the severity of the rebellion's repression, calling for the punishment for the individual perpetrators of the atrocities, compensation to the families of those put to death, and for the release of those Jamaicans still in jail. Buxton would also later support the committee's attempts, to prosecute Eyre for high crimes and misdemeanors.

In subsequently explaining his actions Buxton revealed that he was perhaps a far more astute judge of the national racial temper of Britain and perhaps more aware of the bastardized use to which the rebellion was being put by the radical element of the committee:

When the Jamaica Committee decided to prosecute Mr Eyre on charge of murder, I withdrew from it...because I thought it would tend to reinstate Mr Eyre in public opinion, and have in every way a disastrous effect if an unsuccessful attempt were made to bring him to trial...
Buxton's misgivings about the fidelity of a proportion of the British public to the black cause seemed justified by early reports from British freedmen's societies that contributions to the American cause suffered somewhat due to the "prejudice against the Negroes, strengthened by the Jamaica outbreak.""83 "We admit with shame and sorrow that the minds of thousands have been perverted, and that they talk as if they had lost all natural and moral sensibility," admitted the FMAS to its American compatriots. American observers in Britain also commented about how the racial climate of Britain had changed markedly in the last few months of 1866."84

The refusal of judicial forces to punish Eyre and his henchmen, however, ultimately confirmed the rise of racism in Britain. The Jamaica Committee ultimately failed in its attempts to punish Eyre for his wrong-doings. In March 1867 civil courts dismissed their attempts to obtain a warrant for Eyre's arrest for the murder of Gordon for lack of evidence. A second attempt to obtain the warrant a year later was also denied. In June 1868 the Committee managed to take Eyre as far as the grand jury on the charge of committing "high crimes and misdemeanors" but the jury failed to indict. In the following year, urged on by the Committee, those injured during the pacification brought civil suits against Eyre. However, the Act of Indemnity, passed by the Jamaican
legislature--exempting Eyre from all financial liability incurred during the repression--saved him.

The failure of such prosecutions was met with apocalyptic dismay on the part of some foreign observers. The rebellion and British reaction to it had brought Britain into what abolitionists conceived as the "greatest discredit." §5 "The philanthropy and the Christianity of Britain suffered a sad eclipse in the events which transpired in Jamaica during the latter part of 1865," complained Henry Bleby and, he continued, "Englishmen felt the blush of shame and indignation mantling their cheeks." §6 Indeed, in a reversal of popular stereotypes, abolitionists claimed that it was the white authorities, not emancipated blacks, who were the savages in this case:

The laws, as well as the records, of Jamaica are such as should make every honest Englishman blush with shame for the savage barbarities his countrymen are capable of, when left to the exercise of their natural propensities. §7

Most importantly British reformers felt that the whole Jamaican affair had, as the Rev. William Arthur, Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society argued, greatly imperilled the "moral influence" of Britain. §8 Frederick Douglass too, speaking in 1869, bore witness to the damage that the Jamaican incident had done to British moral credibility and leadership:

230
Recently...England has become more distinguished for her sympathy and hospitality towards slaveholders than for friendship towards slaves. Gibbon wrote the decline and fall of ancient Rome, and some one might do a service to social science by tracing the causes of the decline and fall of anti-slavery sentiment in England. There are few instances in history where any nation had reached a point of philanthropy so high and commanding as England, and no nation ever fell faster or farther than she has done within the last few years. She has almost shown as much regard for the murderers of negroes in Jamaica as she was once proud to show to their emancipators and benefactors.

Douglass and other American abolitionists lamented that "her defection from our cause" meant that she was "no longer the reliable friend of the negro she once was."

In fact, however, Douglass's protestations were among only a handful of such castigations of Britain's moral character by American observers. Clearly too, British abolitionists were far more severe on their compatriots than were their American brethren. American abolitionists sought to put "the incident" behind them and, while British abolitionists were still smarting under this "blush of shame," Americans were renewing their endeavors to muster support for their own freedmen. American advocates on the ground in Britain during 1865 and 1866 indeed make little reference to the supposed change in racial climate in Britain. Sella Martin and the AMA emissaries in England and Scotland, for example, made no more than passing reference to the upheavals caused by the rebellion and the subsequent investigation. To the contrary, they reported that the
traditional sources of support that the American movement had come to rely upon—were responding in a customary manner. Indeed, campaigning seemed to be very much "business as usual." What is one to make of such a discord of opinion?

This Janus-faced attitude was in no small part due to the British abolitionist community's determination to draw the line between politics and philanthropy. As Britons had necessarily refused to embroil themselves in political reconstruction in the American South, so some refused to confuse imperial politics with humanitarianism in the aftermath of the Jamaica affair. Abjuring political interest was—as it had always been—crucial to the success of the Atlantic abolitionist community. British interest in the fate of the freedmen of Jamaica provided more fuel for the fire of pro-slavery and pro-segregationist forces in the United States. American opponents viewed British abolitionist opposition to the Jamaican government/planter interest as an extension of their opposition to the Southern (American) plantocracy. Opponents charged abolitionists with having fomented the rebellion in Jamaica and alleged that such was their plan for the Southern United States. The Freedman's Aid Society and American accomplices, opponents alleged, were engaging in a conspiracy against former slaveowners by encouraging African-Americans not to work; a strategy which had already fomented rebellion in Jamaica.
Indeed, American pro-slavery forces seized upon the Jamaican uprising as a harbinger of things to come in the United States. Conservative organs characterized the revolt as "nothing short of a widespread jacquerie," whose object was the "extermination of the white and brown inhabitants of that island."

American abolitionists, on the other hand, chose to take the Jamaican revolt as an abject lesson in the real meaning of emancipation. "Jamaica hangs before us as a warning in this hour of our national peril," Garrison warned. The American Anti-Slavery Society used the rebellion to argue against Johnson's lenient Reconstruction plan. To the AASS the lesson that the Jamaican revolt had taught abolitionists was that the rights and lives of freedmen would continually be in jeopardy if left under the guardianship of white planters:

Let Reconstruction leave the Colored race powerless and despised as now in the rebel States, and as sure as the God and avenger of that race lives, we shall, at no distant day, learn that he has still an ear for their cry and thunderbolts for their deliverance.

In Johnson's plan American antislavery societies saw a dangerous parallel to British events where freedmen were abandoned to the tender mercies of their former "tyrants." Moreover, Johnson's Reconstruction plan, American abolitionists warned, was far more harsh than British governance of Jamaica and yet "By her ungodly governing, she
[Britain] sowed the wind. She has begun to reap the whirlwind.\textsuperscript{97} The United States must avoid the same fate and thus treat African-Americans better in freedom than Jamaicans had been treated.\textsuperscript{98} The Jamaican rebellion served as a warning to abolitionists also not to abandon the cause just because slaves were freed and especially not to abandon them to the arms of their former masters.\textsuperscript{99}

The Atlantic abolitionist community thus consciously chose to move beyond the upheavels of 1865. Despite the obstacles the Jamaica rebellion placed before philanthropy in Britain, between 1865 and 1868 Britons contributed over £120,000, in both cash and goods, to various American freedman's aid organizations, a significant increase over the funds Britons had contributed in the decade prior to the outbreak of sectional hostilities. In this respect the Jamaica incident was a spur in aiding freed people in the United States. The declaration of the editor of the \textit{Freedman} provided a thoughtful incitement to those Britons sympathetic to the African-American cause when he reminded readers that

\begin{quote}
It is now clearly seen by the more thoughtful and earnest friends of the emancipated negro that the simple abolition of slavery does not complete the duty of the philanthropist in his case and ought not to exhaust his sympathies.\textsuperscript{100}
\end{quote}

The condition of the Jamaican blacks was much publicized after the events at Morant Bay, ostensibly as a summary lesson for Americans of the consequences of neglect of their
black population. Much attention was given to the Baptist Missionary report, presented to the Governor Eyre before the rebellion, as prescient of what was to come. Thus, the Jamaica affair also proved a stimulus to renewed action on behalf of the African-American freedperson. British abolitionists poured renewed vigor and cash into the campaign to avert such a disaster as had befallen Jamaica from afflicted freed blacks in the United States. And also as a way of elevating themselves to "that noble, moral platform from which [we] have fallen." 101

The degree to which Britain had really fallen from its moral pedestal is also debatable. Certainly, if the Jamaica Committee and Atlantic abolitionist organizations hoped that the prosecution of Eyre and the campaign to publicize the intolerable social problems of the Jamaican freedmen would prevent violent repression reoccurring in British protectorates, then subsequent events dashed these aspirations continuously: Amritsar, Cyprus, and Nyasaland all confirmed that "rule by terror" had become "commonplace in the imperial history" of the twentieth century. 102 On the other hand, none of these incidents occurred without staunch outrage and protest, a legacy of nineteenth century reformism that has yet to be explored by historians.

Moreover, other contemporary commentators painted a quite different picture of the events of these years and of the unbridled opposition to the planter class that Jamaica
had resurrected. Continued British support for American Northern forces and anti-slavery philanthropic endeavors confirmed this vitality. As British and American abolitionists continuously pointed out throughout the Jamaican affair, one thing that the rebellion had proved was that the planting class were not to be trusted and lay at the root of the problems experienced in Jamaica.

In the late 1860's and 1870's then, a mutual distrust of a newly disempowered plantation class bound the Atlantic movement together. Moreover, acknowledging the problems of sustaining interest in the plight of freedmen and women—especially over distance and time—many abolitionists sought to move beyond mere philanthropy to promoting self-help, a tactic that the Atlantic community believed would help to prevent a recurrence of the events of 1865 and the conditions which precipitated them. Theoretically then, the Atlantic community had learned the lessons of Jamaica. The difficulty would obviously lie in translating principle into practice.
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"OVERMUCH PHILANTHROPY IS A WEARINESS OF THE FLESH:"

FREEDMAN'S AID AFTER JAMAICA, 1865-1880

The Jamaican Rebellion ended British freedmen's aid no more decisively than the abolition of slavery in 1833 had ended British abolitionism. Though Jamaica revealed some unpleasant truths regarding the racist undercurrent on both sides of the Atlantic, the uprising was by no means the end of Anglo-American cooperation on race. Although some American and British freedmen's aid societies born before the end of the war ceased to operate, new societies were born. Moreover, the movement widened its commitment. Jamaica had taught Atlantic activists that freedmen required a sustained commitment if true emancipation was to be realized. Freedman's aid required not merely the short term commitment of a year or of years but "the labor ... of an age, and may as much occupy the attention of our children as it does our own," British abolitionist Arthur Albright wrote in 1867.1 Although some Atlantic activists balked at such an undertaking, many renewed their resolution with a new enthusiasm and in greater earnest. Indeed they widened their
efforts as the Jamaican incident persuaded activists that a broader, more far-reaching program of aid to freedmen was required. Whereas commitment to the physical relief of the freedmen remained a priority of reformers in 1866 and 1867, as it was here that immediate, tangible results could be seen, increasingly American and British abolitionists turned their attention to equipping slaves with the tools to sustain long-term independence. Freedmen's aid groups became increasingly interested in providing for the spiritual, educational, and vocational needs of ex-slaves.

In particular, the campaign focused on the educational requirements of freedmen. Such a concentration was both a deliberate, strategic decision, and a reflection of the spirit of the age. Education, western reformers thought, was both a panacea for national ills and a foundation of national strength. For freedmen's activists the promotion of freedmen's education was thus a natural step and they politically capitalized on the public's enthusiasm for this cause. Indeed, when the fruits of their donations became apparent, British activists were yet more enthused in contributing their aid.

This campaign for British aid was not as coordinated as in the ante-bellum years, however and this lack of coordination damaged the credibility of the cause. The dissolution of both American and British societies created a vacuum into which well-meaning, but inexperienced, advocates
maneuvered. Emboldened by the continuing good will that Britons showed to delegates of the freedmen's cause, Americans continued to arrive in Britain with high hopes of great remuneration. For the most part, Britons continued to fulfill those expectations. Indeed, the alleged "veil of racism" clearly did not impede the opening of pocket books. Changed circumstances, however, forced these new supplicants to devise new strategies for attracting donations and to fall back on trusted ante-bellum modes of operation. Activists revived the old evangelism of the cause and the heady emotional appeals of African-American refugees. Although those who wished to move away from the stereotype of the exslave as a helpless, passive supplicant, treated these strategies as slightly suspect, these tactics netted overall positive returns.

When financial returns from Britain did tail off at the end of the 1870's, this situation, in fact, was more a reaction to global economic problems that reduced charity across the western world than Britain's tacit acceptance of racism and the compromise that ended Reconstruction. That African-Americans continued to look to Britain beyond the 1870's as a major ally in the fight against racial injustice in the American South testified to the fact that it was practical rather than ideological impediments that curtailed such efforts.
In 1867 William Robson, an outspoken London activist wrote to William Lloyd Garrison of the perilous and pessimistic future he foresaw for Anglo-American cooperation on racial matters.

The Eyre business has openly shown the fearfully corrupt state of English feeling with regard to the rights of the black race; and we have not, alas! the faithful few to stand in the breach, and reprove the nation for its sin... Where would have been the slavery question now if such cowardice & blindness had filled the Anti-Slavery heart of America, five and thirty years ago?

The break-up of many British freedmen's organizations in the wake of the Eyre Controversy appeared to confirm this apparent fickleness. The dissolution of these organizations was, however, less due to "eloquent" and violent prejudice on the part of activists that suddenly erupted after the Jamaican affair than to the enormity of the task that confronted Atlantic activists as the Caribbean disquiet had evidenced. Goldwin Smith of the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society, for example, spoke despairingly of the future of the American freedmen at the last meeting of that society:

How, with the ineradicable difference of colour, to which fatal memories will...cling, and with the physical antipathy the existence of which it is vain to deny, can we hope for social fusion? Without social fusion, how can we hope for political equality? And without political equality, what security can there be for justice?
The scope of what still had to be done for the freedmen defeated the good intentions of many, especially small and provincial, British organizations. Many activists became disheartened because their efforts seemed unable to put even a small dent in the needs of ex-slaves.

On the other hand, some British activists abandoned the cause because they believed that African-Americans had already been more than readily provided for. The prevailing belief among the members of the Birmingham and Midland Freedmen's Aid Society was that, armed with the basic necessities of life and provided with education that American private organizations and government organizations such as the Freedmen's Bureau had established, African-Americans could and should now help themselves.  

But more than anything, historians allege, it was the sudden surge of racialist feeling, at once stimulated and revealed by the Eyre affair, that was responsible for the falling off in British support. The Eyre affair had revealed "that strong, dull, dumb, and unreasoning prejudice . . . which the Anglo-Saxon feels against all coloured races the longer he knows them, and feels most strongly against the negro," opined the London Times.  

Similar sentiments in other British newspapers, some historians have taken, to indicate the true feeling of Britons, the general public and activists, in the case of the freedman.
Such generalizations are unwarranted, however. First, newspapers such as the *Times*, who expressed such opinions, had, as has already been seen, never been a particular friend of the freedman and reflected a particular vein within English society that had always been prejudiced against African peoples. Indeed, to some people the Eyre controversy had fostered no worse racial feeling than had always been present in England, even before the Civil War and at the height of Anglo-American cooperation on race. The typical Englishman, the *Spectator* argued for example, was "Blinded by a prejudice against colour which in its strength and permanence is to cool reasoners scarcely intelligible" and in this, English sentiment had not changed in over a generation.\(^7\) There had always been color prejudice in Britain; there always would be color prejudice in Britain. Undoubtedly, of those British activists who left the field after the Jamaica affair, some left the movement for manifestly racial reasons. But such prejudice was, firstly, not monolithic in Britain and secondly was not sole, or even primary, reason for the flagging of the Atlantic freedmen's movement.

On the contrary, in 1867 J. C. Holbrook of the AMA, John Sella Martin's successor as agent to Great Britain wrote,"I find a great field here needing to be worked for the freedmen's cause."\(^8\) Holbrook clearly saw an untapped reservoir of positive feeling for the freedman in Britain and
one that he consistently wrote his mentors would reap great
benefits to the cause. The comments of this activist would
appear to belie the contention a negative racial
consciousness totally overcame Britain in the post-civil war
period and that it therefore impeded and then collapsed any
further cooperation between Britain and America on the racial
question.

Holbrook's observations in fact pointed to a long term
failing of both the abolitionist and the freedmen's movement:
a lack of initiative on the part of American activists.
American leadership was essential to the movement. Without
it Britons lacked crucial information about the American
racial situation and direction in their activities. Moreover, if Britons were to go ahead and act unilaterally
such aid would be rebuffed by the South and other Americans
as the "interferences" of the "meddling" and "morally
dogmatic."

Two problems in this regard beset British aid after the
Jamaica incident. Firstly, British enthusiasts received
mixed messages from Americans in the wake of the Jamaican
affair. Secondly, and understandably, Southerners sent very
clear messages to Britons that interference in Reconstruction
was neither desired nor necessary. Moreover, the belief that
African-American needs were essentially satiated and that
African-Americans themselves should cater for their further
needs was also actively encouraged by American activists,
such as J. Miller McKim, who claimed that nothing more than pity would be gained from leaving the freedman as an object of benevolence for much longer. Such pity, McKim and others viewed as deadly to African-American self-determination.10 Frederick Douglass was one of those of a similar opinion:

> I have my doubts about these Freedmen's Societies. They may be a necessity of the hour and as such may be commended; but I fear everything looking to their permanence. The negro needs justice more than pity; liberty more than old clothes; rights more than training to enjoy them...In so far as these special efforts shall furnish an apology for excluding us from the general schemes of civilization so multitudinous in our country they will be an injury to the colored race. They will serve to keep up the very prejudices, which it is so desirable to banish from the country.11

Even the great emancipator, William Lloyd Garrison, in Britain to receive the formal accolades heaped upon him by an admiring British reform community, informed the British public that the need for British aid was now past.12 In an ironic twist these appeals merged with assertions of white Southerners who, especially by 1868, were earnestly protesting against any further British help for the freedmen.13 This front of opposition to British involvement produced a quandary for many British activists. Many clearly struggled with future commitment and not because they too were infected with the disease of racism but for precisely the opposite reason. Though clearly believing that not everything that could be done for the freedmen had been done, British activists retired from the field fearing that
continued interference might foster dependency and unwilling
to act without the leadership and tacit approval of their
American brethren.

Moreover, in tying up their efforts, Britons were only
following American example and advice. "The tide of
enthusiasm [in the United States] . . . is fast ebbing" wrote
a member of the American Missionary Society. The end of
the Civil War coincided with a waning in the sense of urgency
that had underpinned American contributions to the
reconstruction of freedmen's lives. Donations from
northerners tailed off and many freedmen's organizations
reined in their efforts or simply disbanded. By the mid
1870's only the AMA, the American Baptist Home Mission
Society, the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist
Episcopal Church, and the Committee on Missions to Freedmen
of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. were still actively
operating in the South. The largest organization, the
American Freedmen's Union Commission disbanded in 1869 in the
wake of factionalism. Many American activists had thus
abandoned the cause and hence British aid. It is hardly
surprising, therefore, that many British activists also
deserted the cause.

Although many freedmen's organizations ceased to operate
on both sides of the Atlantic between 1865 and 1868,
freedmen's aid was not a dead cause. Though few new
organizations were born, the movement continued to live on,
albeit in a more fractured manner. The story of freedmen's aid after the Jamaica affair is not so much one of organized attempts to foster support through monolithic institutions built for such a purpose, but rather a history of diffuse and diverse efforts to sustain popular sympathy through a variety of related and sympathetic agencies.

This significant change in the character of support has meant that the extent of the Atlantic connection has proven more difficult to pin down. Indeed, the Atlantic movement after 1865 became very dispersed as freedmen's organizations closed down their operations. But that did not mean that Britons stopped contributing to the freedmen's cause and that all American organizations gave up on Britain as a potential source of support. And, as usual, the way America went was the way Great Britain went.

After 1865 the freedmen's movement in the U.S. was similarly fractured between non-sectarian organizations that were confined largely to New England and in particular the Boston area, and organizations with an avowedly evangelical agenda. The former were not nearly as active in attracting British support. Two factors made northern freedmen's aid efforts less attractive to Britons: the fragmented, liberal, nonsectarian nature of northern societies and the lack of a heritage of support in Britain. In contrast, the evangelical wing of the movement had long established reputations in Britain that stretched back, in some cases, more than thirty
years. Foremost among the latter organizations was the American Missionary Association but there were many other Protestant sects that sent emissaries to Britain. The evangelical wing of the movement worked largely through its sister denominations in Britain. Largely, eschewing the organization of formal British societies, Protestant emissaries worked through the pulpits and the charitable and missionary organizations of British churches. Throughout the late 1860's and into the 1870's these groups maintained much more than a token contact with Great Britain. Moreover, British donors were of considerable importance to the success of these organizations. Without their financial and moral contributions many American efforts would have simply disappeared.

The Campaign

The consensus among Atlantic abolitionists in the wake of emancipation was that African-American survival depended upon one essential building block: education. Although freedmen's aid continued to contribute to food drives, clothing banks, and furnishing freedmen with immediate relief, increasingly the primary concern of the Atlantic movement shifted to the promotion not merely of literacy but of a through-going, comprehensive education for ex-slaves. Such an objective proved the most long-lived in the Atlantic reform movement. Satisfied that African-Americans had been
furnished with the immediate necessities, Atlantic activists now turned to furnishing African-Americans with what they thought was the key to long-term survival and success. The campaign for freedman's education sustained itself well into the next decade, surviving the economic panic of the 1870's supported largely through the combined efforts of missionary organizations and abolitionists, not only in the United States and Britain, but across mainland Europe also.

That the campaign of freedmen's education continued was also due to the spirit of the age. Education was felt to be the "panacea" for African-American life just as it was felt to be essential for the vitality of the British empire. The pre-occupation with education was understandable. Mid-Victorians demonstrated a growing interest in the instruction of all those Britons who desired it for, they reasoned, it was through the education of the individual that the British empire could remain strong. Education was essential for freedmen for the same reasons: it was the "great root from which true freedom grows." Freedmen needed to be educated so that they could fully enjoy their political rights and so that they could guard against being reenlisted into a system of serfdom. The Ladies Negroe's Friend Association of London, for example, stated that:

*What is now wanted is, that . . . [the freedmen] shall be educated, so as to fit them for the duties of citizenship; and, though it may even be years before they obtain their full and equal rights, I feel sure that we cannot aid them better in this*
matter than by furnishing them with those educational advantages which have hitherto been so studiously denied them.\(^{19}\)

Ignoring black education was dangerous not only to the future of the freedmen but to the nation at large. Only by avoiding the perils of neo-slavery, Britons believed, could the wounds between the North and South be healed. Education of the freedman was the lynchpin of social stability and order in the South. Without education, the freedom of African-Americans might be used to the detriment not only of themselves but the nation as a whole.\(^{20}\) Activists supported education for freedmen, therefore, as an "important element" in the national welfare.\(^{21}\)

The impetus for black education, of course, predated the Civil War. But the War turned the impetus into a crusade. Between 1860 and 1870 more than one thousand schools were established by and for emancipated slaves. The Freedman's Bureau, in particular, was important in establishing many and various types of educational facilities: day schools, night schools, Sunday schools, industrial and liberal art's colleges. But its dissolution in 1869 left the task in the hands of northern religious and philanthropic agencies and missionary organizations. An estimated fifty such organizations contributed to the effort to promote educational access for freedmen in the South, and it was these private initiatives that became the main artery for Anglo-American cooperation.
In Britain, as in the U.S., the major barrier that reformers had to overcome was the popular prejudice that Africans could not and did not want to learn. In 1867 the London *Times* picked up on reports in U.S. Democratic papers and inopportune speeches by members of government reconstruction agencies, such as the Freedmen's Bureau, which painted a negative picture of the post-bellum freedman in this regard. One of the most damaging reports published in the *Times* came from the lips of a Freedmen's Bureau official, a Major Lawrence, who described southern freedmen as "ignorant, degraded, indolent, sensual, false, far below what I had supposed." American activists had to dextrously "spin" such comments to their own advantage. J. Miller McKim, for example, in response to anxious British letters regarding Lawrence's comments wrote back:

Of course the blacks are to a degree just what Major Lawrence represents them; and just what anyone of common sense must a priori know them to be. Among the least of slavery's evils are the manacles which it fastens on the limbs and the stripes which it inflicts on the backs of its victims. Our "zeal" against it & in behalf of its injured subjects is kindled by the fact that its iron enters the soul--darkens the mind--fills the intellect--perverts the affections--choke the aspirations--and does everything it can toward making the black man in fact what it has made him in law: a chattel...The victims of the slave-system are "degraded"; therefore it is that we labor to lift them up.

That Britons accepted that the degrading impact of slavery on the intellect was impermanent and thus wholeheartedly
promoted freedmen's education reveals that not all mid-Victorians had internalized the "new racism" of the mid-nineteenth century. Indeed, far from accepting the inability of Africans to learn and to develop intellectually, British reformers were greatly impressed with the desire and the ability of African-Americans to learn:

The Negro is very teachable . . . Education will not be lost upon him. It is our duty to do all in our power to place the lamp of learning in his hands. The Freedmen only require to be educated to make excellent citizens.

Britons who toured the South after the Civil War wrote of the ardor of African-Americans for instruction. African-Americans, they noted, "beg harder for a school than for food or clothing...Of the capacity of the negro to receive and use education...there can be no doubt." Moreover, many British abolitionists acknowledged that freedmen had an intellectual capacity that went beyond the "soft" liberal arts--poetry, music, and popular literature--to which even some Atlantic abolitionists believed African-Americans were limited. The FMAS for example, took great pains to publicize that African-Americans were not only adept but perhaps superior mathematicians. Abolitionists may have tended to exaggerate the appetite of freedmen for education, but as American historians have noted, the zeal with which freedmen pursued educational goals astonished even antagonistic white southerners.
The promotion of freedmen's education proved to be a fractious issue, however, for both American and British activists. Freedmen's education was a multi-faceted effort. During Reconstruction over fifty sectarian and non-sectarian organizations joined together with government agencies, such as the Freedmen's Bureau and independent educators, in an effort to instruct the freedmen. Although united by a general purpose the movement was fraught with every kind of division: methodological, philosophical, and pedagogical. The evangelical wing of the freedmen's aid movement—largely the coalition out of Boston and New York—and its British adherents focused their efforts on creating educational institutions that were devoted to not only promoting academic instruction and vocational and domestic skills but which were sectarian in nature and designed to promote religious training. Sectarian organizations such as the AMA, were fired in their desire for education by evangelical Protestantism. Conservative Protestant morality, they believed, was the bedrock of a firm republic and thus its values must be instilled into its most "ignorant" class, the freedmen and women of the South. Schools founded by such freedmen's aid organizations sought to instill into their pupils more than rigorous academic principles, therefore. Lesson plans included instruction in "moral training": honesty, thrift, as well as responsibility to God, country, and family. Organizations such as the AMA employed
instructors only from the evangelical organizations. There was no place for Unitarians, Rationalists, or Universalists within their organizations. In contrast, nonsectarian associations, such as the Boston Educational Commission, embraced Garrisonian secular reformism and eschewed instruction of a sectarian and evangelical nature. The two wings of the freedmen's education movement thus often worked more at odds than with a common, unifying purpose.

Beyond this, moreover, even organizations in the sectarian or non-sectarian camps could not come to an amiable working relationship. The Wesleyan Methodist, Free-Will Baptist, Dutch Reformed, and Congregationalist churches, for example, generally worked through the AMA. But other evangelical sects developed independent educational missions: the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the General Assembly's Committee on Freedmen of the Presbyterian Church. All of these organizations competed for resources and squabbled over jurisdiction and philosophy. Many of these organizations sent supplicants abroad, primarily to Britain, and the multiplicity of organizations merely promoted confusion within British activist ranks which was manifested in a vacillation in cooperation. The British public had already demonstrated their reluctance to contribute to causes that did not reflect their own specific agenda and had been burned by American "shylocks" whose
interests lay not with the freedmen, whom they purported to represent, but in self-promotion and self-aggrandizement. British donors thus tended to respond more favorably to organizations with which they were already familiar, that had a proven and generally honest track-record in Britain, and which allowed British activists an input into their activities. There was one American stand-out who met all of these criteria after 1867 and thus it proved to be by far the most successful freedmen's aid movement in Britain: the AMA.

The American Missionary Association: A Case Study of Anglo-American Cooperation

An examination of the most successful American freedmen's aid association operating in Britain during the 1860's and 1870's clearly illustrates the pitfalls and progress of Atlantic cooperation during the period.

Of all freemen's aid associations operating in Britain, the AMA was undoubtedly the most successful. On the 3rd September, 1846, the Union Mission Society, the Committee for West Indian Missions, and the Western Evangelical Mission Society combined their resources, their finances, and their personnel to form the American Missionary Association. Although not established specifically for work among African-Americans, the AMA was virtually the only American missionary agency in the 1840's and 1850's to take a stand against slavery. Its founders were churchmen whose philosophy
combined radical abolitionism with Christianity. Although a Christian organization, it shunned identification with any particular denomination and specifically rejected those who had not repudiated slavery. Congregationalists, if not in name, then in outlook and heritage, the AMA included anyone "of evangelical sentiments who professes faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who is not a slaveholder or in the practice of other immoralities." Lewis Tappan, Simeon Jocelyn, Gerritt Smith, Joshua Levitt, George Whipple and William Jackson, the early leaders of the organization, committed themselves to evangelical action as a weapon against slavery; their major piece of armament being the power of the gospel. In particular, the AMA sought to purify those churches whom they considered were upholding the "abominable institution" and for this purpose it initially used the transatlantic nature of the ministry to further this end.

Although active in evangelizing Jamaica, Africa, Hawaii, Egypt, Siam and the Sandwich Islands, its largest field of missionary endeavor was within the United States. By the late 1840's the AMA had begun to aid fugitive slaves with clothes, food, education, churches and escape from the fugitive slave law to Canada and this mission became a primary field of attention when the Civil War started.

The AMA also led the way in fielding relief as soon as the Civil War commenced. In 1861 it sent its first missionaries to Fort Monroe, Virginia and by 1868 the AMA had
532 agents in the South or in the border states. Underpinning the AMA's response to emancipation was its commitment to helping African-Americans achieve and enjoy the full meaning of emancipation:

If then, the Negro is a man and a citizen, he is entitled to the treatment of a man and a citizen, and unless he is recognized and treated as such, he cannot be safely elevated in the scale of being and it will be in vain that he is liberated...We claim that our colored brother should be treated in all respects as a man and as a citizen, by the churches, by the Government, and by the people.31

After emancipation the AMA believed that African-Americans should be free to remain in the United States, not be forced or encouraged to emigrate, and be given every opportunity to pursue equality of life. The goal of full equality, the AMA believed, could only be reached through the proper institutions of society: the church, the law, a free press and, above all, schools and colleges. The AMA helped freedmen to gain land, aided them in prosecuting their civil and political rights, established churches, and public and private education to train African-Americans to be self-sufficient. The ultimate goal of the AMA was independence for African-Americans: no race, it believed, should be permanently dependant on another for development. In this regard the AMA viewed its efforts as essential in fostering independent black leadership and this they reflected in their own organization which stood alone among the major American freedmen's organizations in its promotion of African-American
Indeed, for their time, and despite their sometimes paternalistic, and, arguably, even on occasion racist attitudes, the leaders of the AMA made greater acknowledgment of black self-determination than most of their contemporaries. Their contribution in this regard is nowhere more clearly exhibited than in the enduring contribution that they made to the development of black schools and colleges. The AMA initially concentrated on developing elementary education to deal with the illiteracy problem among newly freed African-Americans. In 1866, the AMA moved towards the establishment of normal schools and colleges within which to train black teachers. By 1876 the AMA was operating 14 unchartered normal and high schools in the south. Between 1866 and 1869 it established seven colleges in the South: Berea, Atlanta, Hampton, Talladega, Tougaloo, Straight, and Fisk. In all the AMA established more than 500 schools and colleges, largely in the South.

It was the AMA that was the longest lived partner of British freedmen's aid societies. Whereas many American organizations curtailed their overseas activities after the war, the AMA maintained its connections, capitalizing on the open field vacated by other American organizations. In its competition with the remaining American emissaries in Britain, the AMA had the upper hand. This was in part due to the historic good reputation the AMA enjoyed in Britain. Its
position at the vanguard of the abolitionist and freedmen's aid movement and as the sole missionary society to take a consistent stand against slavery had won it many adherents in Britain. Moreover, its diplomatic and at times strategic use of a sectarianism as either nominal or crucial, depending on the constituency, had widened its field of labor and established its good name not only within the major English metropolitan freedman's movement but within the more diffuse and stridently independent Scottish arena. Furthermore, the AMA's reciprocity had undeniably helped to reap a positive harvest in Britain. In 1865 and 1866, for example, the AMA contributed over £20,000 to the establishment of schools and missions among the freedmen of Jamaica. Not only was this an impressive expression of the commitment of the AMA to the promotion of world-wide benevolence but it gave the AMA emotional leverage when asking for aid for America's freedmen. Through constant advertisements of its work in this regard, the AMA reminded both Britons and competing American organizations that it had some prior claim on the benevolence of the British people.

To capitalize on the well-established good faith that the AMA had nurtured in Britain during the ante-bellum and war years, the executive committee once again dispatched John Sella Martin as their agent. From his pastorship of Bromley-by-Bow parish in London in 1861 and his extensive tour of the British Isles in 1865 Martin had built a faithful residue of
support. The AMA hoped that Martin could capitalize upon this in the aftermath of the Jamaican affair.

Martin was most reluctant to return to the fray, however, and responded very pessimistically to the news of his appointment. This reluctance made him a sometimes unreliable assessor and prophet of British support. In 1866, for example, he was writing of the futility of further campaigning in Britain. "The impetus for further British aid has all but dried up," he claimed, and suggested that his efforts would be better utilized in the U.S.

Strained relations with his co-workers after 1866 undoubtedly fostered Martin's pessimism. The AMA also dispatched Dr. William Patton, John C. Holbrook and James Thome to Britain in 1866. Unlike Martin, these AMA emissaries were all white and their presence in Britain created friction within the movement. In particular, Thome, as the white son of a slaveholder, and Martin as the illegitimate son of a slaveholder may well have had reason to feel uneasy in each other's presence. Dr William Patton, moreover, had earlier objected to serving under Martin as Secretary for Europe. Thus the AMA had not invested Martin with this office and merely accepted unofficially that he was the AMA's "principal" agent in Europe.

What amounted to inter-movement sabotage also provided the grounds for Martin's dispiritedness. In 1866 the British freedmen's aid movement was in the throes of disarray. An
internal schism between evangelical- and Garrison-oriented bodies rent the Freedmen's Aid Union Commission of Great Britain and Ireland and the commission thus seemed more concerned with internal politics than foreign largess. More importantly, the two disputes that lay at the heart of the schism worried Martin more. The Quaker dominated freedmen's aid societies that formed the core of the FAUC claimed that American freedmen no longer required the assistance of Britons. Physical needs having been satisfied, the Quakers believed that the need for intellectual enlightenment was minimal. Moreover, certain factions within Britain—the Quakers included—were increasingly disinclined to contribute to the AMA's cause because of its reported "sectarian nature." Prominent American activists encouraged Britons in both of these assumptions. In particular, the remarks of William Lloyd Garrison had a great impact on Britons. Garrison warned British activists to beware of the AMA for its agenda was stridently "ecclesiastical," by which he meant sectarian. But he did more than merely urge Britons to channel their funds elsewhere. On his tour in 1867 Garrison repeatedly informed Britons that their contributions were no longer required. Given the scope of Garrison's tour and the hefty weight of his reputation, such remonstrances had the potential to derail further Anglo-American cooperation.

William Lloyd Garrison had returned to Britain in June 1867 on a triumphant testimonial tour. Besieged by
invitations, Garrison traveled the length and breadth of England, feted by nobility, politicians, and the cream of the British reformist community. British freedmen's aid organizations fell over themselves to engage Garrison as a speaker and to heap honors on him—honors which he devoured with great relish. "The herald and the synonym of good to millions of men," raved John Bright. "A great...and noble man," lauded the Duke of Argyll. "An heroic leader" eulogized the Freedman. Garrison's praises were sung in the highest quarters of British society. And it was not merely those directly connected with the cause who wished to engage him: organizations from the whole gamut of the reformist spectrum also begged Garrison to "perform."

The scope of Garrison's labors prompted Martin to complain that he had ruined the field for AMA laborers. And the remonstrances of Garrison forced Martin into the familiar role of defender of the AMA's integrity and mission:

Mr Garrison says his Society is the largest non-ecclesiastical Freedmen's Aid Society in America. The term ecclesiastical we do not accept, because we are supported by, and employ in, our work, members of every evangelical sect. But the term "religious but non-sectarian" we can and do accept.

Interestingly, however, Martin's co-delegates--and later events--support the contention that Garrison had a very dissimilar impact on British freedmen's support. First, Martin's compatriots realized that while much of the applause
for Garrison was genuine, it did not predispose British activists to follow his counsel. The reception given to Garrison was in many ways a public relations exercise for improved Anglo-American understanding. At the public breakfast given to honor Garrison at St James's Hall on June 29, 1867 more than one speaker made reference to the need for amended relations with the U.S.

This country desires to maintain with the American people not merely relations of amity and peace; it desires to have their friendship and affection...Surely it is time to forget ancient differences--differences dating from the days of Burgoyne's retreat, or our failure before the ramps of New Orleans. 42

That the occasion was used to forward diplomatic relations is also evidenced by Earl Russell's presence at the breakfast and his request to speak. Russell had been less than lukewarm in his support of the Union during the early years of the war and had been an outspoken critic of President Lincoln. 43 Addressing Garrison as an official emissary of the U.S. government, Russell made an official apology for his actions during the Civil War:

I now acknowledge that the task which the Government of the United States had to perform was a totally different task and a much more difficult one than we had to perform when...we abolished slavery in our West India Islands...Not having that difficulty before us, I did not do justice to the efforts made by the United States; but I am now persuaded that President Lincoln did all that it was possible to do, and that we are bound to give our tribute to the excellent policy which the President and his government pursued...Let us hope
that the friendship of the United States and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland may endure unbroken and that Mr Garrison may carry with him...this reflection, that our meeting here to-day has tended to the better union of two races who ought never to be separated."

The events of the Civil War had seriously compromised Anglo-American relations. Much rebuilding of bridges had to be accomplished and the abolitionist organization was one obvious avenue for the restoration of good relations. British abolitionists also clearly saw that if the U.S. were to accept British aid and that aid was to flow unimpeded into the South then Britons must at least give the appearance of appeasement.

Such appeasement did not mean, however, that the British antislavery activists who attended Garrison's breakfast unthinkingly acted upon Garrison's advice to cease support of the freeman. Whereas some groups with a long anti-slavery heritage, such as the Quakers, quailed from further involvement with the cause, the interest taken in Garrison's accomplishments by groups outside the traditional pantheon of reform effort encouraged AMA delegates to seek new avenues of support.

Thus, despite Martin's reservations the AMA executive persuaded him to extend his tour into 1868 and he did so to good effect. In the subsequent years touring England and Scotland Martin, Thome, and their colleagues "by personal visits and bushels of trade and letters," managed to persuade
British freedman's aid organizations and the general public to "adopt" the AMA as their major beneficiary. In particular, Thome's tour of Scotland in 1868 reestablished and opened up fruitful relationships with the United Presbyterian, the Free, and the Established Churches of Scotland. As a result Britons, by the late 1860's, were contributing over twenty percent of the AMA's total receipts; per week receipts ranged from $1,000-$10,000.46

Despite its nominal sectarianism, then, a wide gamut of religious and secular organizations contributed to the AMA. In part this was also due to the AMA's scrupulous attention to the etiquette of donations. Unlike other organizations, the AMA had a sound reputation for delivering the funds to the promised destination.47 After 1866 many donations to the AMA came from churches or their affiliated organizations. This was a deliberate strategic decision on the part of Martin to target such groups. In 1866 Martin focused his attention on nonconformist churches. The Congregational Union in Great Britain was the AMA's biggest donor. The 1866 conference of the Union claimed that, in that year alone, more than three thousand pounds had been sent to the AMA for distribution.48 The Scottish Presbyterian church was also a large contributor sending some £650 in one year.49

Besides cash, spiritual aid usually came in the form of gifts of religious tracts: bibles, the gospels, and sermons.50 Spiritual gifts also took the form of the
emigration of British volunteers: teachers and preachers. But the AMA often treated offers of such support less than warmly. Although desperate for instruction, both secular and ecclesiastical, foreign teachers were too much for the South to stomach. It was bad enough that "foreign interference" came in the "obnoxious form" of English money and northern liberal "do-gooders," but British teachers were too insulting to national independence. Thus, neither the AMA, or indeed other American organizations, actively solicited such "missionaries."

After 1866 the destination of all of these contributions were the newly established colleges, normal and industrial schools the AMA feverishly established in the wake of the Civil War. From the beginning impoverishment beset these schools. The AMA had hurriedly established more schools than it could support and the constant deficit at which these schools operated severely impeded their development. The AMA constantly sought to keep the plight of these schools before the British public and reform community by inviting and sponsoring Britons to tour their facilities and see first hand the long road that freedmen's aid still had to travel in the South. In 1867, for example, the AMA invited Frederick Tomkins of the BFASS to tour the South. Documenting the atrocious conditions that freedmen had to endure, Tomkins confirmed British beliefs that the need for aid was far from over.
The response to these tours was so positive that the AMA decided to launch a new, and very extensive campaign to tap what it its agents assured it was a new British avidity for its cause. In 1869 British activists were writing to Strieby, secretary of the AMA, about the "heavy enthusiasm with which the claims of the freedmen have been advocated" and of the "enlarged liberality with which ... appeals have been responded to."53 The AMA gleaned the eagerness to be such as to warrant dispatching a new emissary in 1871.

In 1871 the AMA sent Theodore Bourne to England to focus these disparate emotions and efforts of British activists into a concrete movement. Upon arriving in Britain, the warm reception which greeted him much encouraged Bourne who wrote to Strieby that, contrary to popular American perception he found countless Britons who thought that earlier American efforts to help the freedmen had left "much undone" and that the time was now ripe for forwarding the object for which the AMA had been formed.54 Buoyed by these sentiments, Bourne readily embarked on a demanding tour of the British Isles. Much facilitated by his familiarity with the country (this was his seventh visit) and therefore armed with contacts within the major nonconformist sects, Bourne was able to tap a lucrative reservoir of support.

Bourne helped to airt this support into a new British freedmen's organization. In the first year of Bourne's
visit the secretary of the BFASS, Thomas Phillips, approached him to ask for help in focusing the sympathies of British freedmen's supporters. In response, Bourne helped to establish the Freedman's Mission Aid Society (hereafter FMAS) in 1871—although, due in part to Bourne's prevarication, not properly chartered until 1872—as the official British auxiliary to the AMA. In this status the FMAS was an attempt to depart from previous Atlantic freedmen's efforts. By establishing an auxiliary in Britain the AMA hoped not only to have a permanent arm of support for its efforts in Britain and an entre into British reformist circles but it also hoped to thus by-pass the restrictive and, at times, unsightly wrangling as one British society after another claimed the loyalty of the AMA's agents in Britain. Following the tradition of separate provincial organizations, the AMA also established a Scottish auxiliary. Founded in December 1872 this organization acted as an umbrella organization for branch auxiliaries founded at Largs, Kilmarnock, and Edinburgh.

Because of its past good history in Britain the AMA was able to enroll and more aggressively sought, the patronage of Britain's leading reformers and foremost public figures. From its inception the FMAS secured the favor of the nobility and the political elite in Britain. As president of the society, for example, the FMAS attracted the Earl of Shaftesbury. Shaftesbury was the epitome of the nineteenth
century social activist. As a member of parliament from 1826 he gradually eschewed an interest in politics and turned instead to campaigning for a number of the most popular reform causes in Victorian England. Among his innumerable causes Shaftesbury supported protective labor legislation, housing reform, improved education, curbing juvenile delinquency, and abolition. Together with the Duchess of Sutherland and the Duke of Argyll he had led the nobility in organizing ante-bellum support for the abolitionist cause in Britain. In his trans-reform activism, Shaftesbury exemplified the typical post-bellum freedmen's activist in Britain and the road that Atlantic activism would take in the late nineteenth century.

Although distracted by many other social needs, Britons did not totally abandon the cause of the freedmen after 1865. To the contrary, educational, penal, and suffrage reform—among the most urgent concerns of British reformers after 1865—dovetailed nicely with the needs of freedmen in the post-bellum South. The support of such reforms was patently not merely an in-house issue in the late nineteenth century. A cursory perusal of the membership lists of various reform societies, for example, yield the names of many key British figures active in freedmen's reform during Reconstruction and beyond. Many reformers remained committed to the whole gamut of reform issues and viewed this as being perfectly consistent. British reformers, it is
clear, perceived that they existed in a pantheon of reform that spanned the whole spectrum of causes from suffrage, to factory improvement, to freedmen's education.58

To accommodate the increasingly wide interests of the reforming classes in Britain, American freedmen's advocates sought to gain access to these societies as conduits for possible support and thus deliberately sought out leaders of the reform community such as Shaftesbury.

Other high-fliers from the realms of Britain's social and political elite that the FMAS attracted included Arthur Kinnaird, M.P., whose became treasurer of the FMAS, a doyen of reformist circles being a prominent member of major suffrage, factory, and education reform organizations. The society also engaged the talents of some of the leading clergymen of the period. Secretary of the FMAS was the Rev. Alexander King. Honorary Secretary was Rev. L. D. Bevan, LL.B., who for months prior to the formation of the society had preached in Brooklyn. These individuals gave the FMAS an introduction into the whole ambit of the British reform community.

The executive committee of the FMAS was thus a laundry list of some of the most experienced and prestigious British anti-slavery and reform activists. That they, for the most part, eagerly volunteered for service in the society testified to the desire for American leadership to tap a still enthusiastic British constituency.
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The object of the society, as articulated in its constitution, reflected both the increasing universalism of freedmen's needs that the Jamaican rebellion had revealed and the common wisdom that education was the key to solving those needs. The primary goal of the society, as the committee stated it, was "the Christian education of the African race in America, Canada, the West Indies and Africa." From bitter experience in Jamaica, Britons had learnt the consequences of emancipation without liberation. Only through the "ameliorating influences of education and religion" would ex-slaves no longer be "a source of anxiety and danger." Without these twin remedies freedmen, the society believed, could not hope to earn real freedom. Moreover, education and evangelization were not just the means of personal improvement but essential to the future stability of the nation and indeed the world. The society hoped to create not only educated men and women but "useful, enlightened, and attached defenders of the free institutions of a country, the continuance of whose welfare and prosperity appears to involve such important issues to the progress of civil and religious liberty throughout the world." Freedmen's education thus was a natural extension of reformer's work to promote the education of white Britons and Americans.

In appealing to the FMAS and British donors, the AMA conveyed the impression that British aid was more essential now than ever before, given that even many Americans had
seemingly deserted the cause. In its foundation statement the FMAS appealed to its supporters in like vein:

The important part sustained by British philanthropists in hastening the work of emancipation in America seems to have placed the privilege and responsibility of elevating the African race almost equally between the British and American people.

Such entreaties undoubtedly appealed to a certain vanity that was an undercurrent in British support for American slaves and freedmen alike, a vanity stimulated by the desire to offer counsel as a moral elder sibling. "I think Englishmen have much confidence in themselves and their own organizations" an AMA emissary stated and added that, in this regard, allowing the British to form their own auxiliary was a wise decision. Such vanity was historically obnoxious to a South who resented northern interference in their affairs and especially the "political missionaries" of organized freedmen's aid associations and would thus hardly brook foreign interference in domestic reconstruction. Thus, the FMAS carefully avoided conveying any impression of partisanship in its aid by stressing that its endeavors were entirely humanitarian and not political. The organization diplomatically, if not disingenuously, recognized that the South would aid the freedmen if it could, but had been so devastated by war as to make this impossible. In keeping with these purely humanitarian goals the society aimed to
send clothes, money, teachers and books to aid the freedmen in their recovery.

In the first two years of its existence the FMAS raised $42,000 for the AMA. Although this was a considerable sum and much money was raised through the FMAS and agents of the AMA in Britain, from the start, the work did not go smoothly. The AMA recognized early on that the British seemed unwilling to support the day to day survival of the freedmen in the south. Ennui had by now set in. The physical hardships of the freedmen, although severe, were now commonplace to Britons and did not excite the emotional sympathy of the civil war years. Britons seemed more concerned with turning out future good citizens who would support themselves. But even these donations came with strict stipulations. Indeed, Bourne's successors found that assurances that money raised would only be used to educate African-American missionaries could ensure the society of large receipts. Rev. Healy, who took over the campaign from Bourne, wrote of the long and detailed guarantees and proofs that he had to make to British donors in this regard before they would contribute to the AMA's funds. Another AMA envoy, Gustavus Pike, never an optimist, grudgingly conceded that Britain was a fruitful arena for the association's work for freedmen but added that:

If the English society should be known as the African Evangelization Society - and its agents raise money for the education of freedmen - because
they are Africans, and as such might become missionaries to Africa, or on the plea that there was greater hope of supplying missionaries for Africa from among the ex-slaves than otherwise - I think the idea might be popular. 65

Many of the contributions that Britons made came with strict instructions that the money should be used to finance scholarships for the training of black missionaries to Africa and not to supplement the general slush fund of the AMA. By the early 1870's this situation reflected a change in emphasis on the part of the AMA. Prior to 1870 the AMA had been more concerned with producing black teachers to instruct and evangelize blacks in the South. In the early 1870's, however, AMA colleges began to focus their efforts in producing black teachers for African missions. Although the AMA's main concentration had been with African-Americans, it sustained missions to Africa until 1882. 66

At the heart of the AMA's African operation was the Mendi Mission, halfway between Freetown, Sierra Leone, and Monrovia, Liberia. The Mendi Mission had been operating since 1841 under the aegis of first the Amistad Committee, the Union Missionary Society, and then finally the AMA. 67 The mission nearly went under during the Civil War as funds were cut off from the mission. But contact was resumed after the Civil War and the mission benefitted from the training that African-Americans received in AMA schools in the South and the money contributed for their education by British donors. The FMAS, in particular, supported African missions.
and channeled another $30,000 to Straight, Fisk, Tallageda, and Atlanta universities to train African-Americans for posts at Mendi and elsewhere in Africa.68

The generosity of the British persuaded the AMA executive committee that more could be achieved in Britain if they developed a more organized campaign. Thus, in 1872 the AMA decided to widen the campaign. For the first time the organization decided to use primarily freedmen themselves as advocates of their own cause. This decision grew out of several developments on both sides of the Atlantic. Using freedmen and women would help to assuage British anxiety that their donations were yielding concrete results. Moreover, understanding the British professed desire to promote African-American self-sufficiency, AMA advocates believed that freedmen and women would thus be the most effective advocates for their cause in Britain. Moreover, the most effective advocates of the African-American cause in the past had been African-Americans and the AMA obviously hoped to capitalize on the historic legacy of such advocates in Britain. In addition, in the United States raising funds had become a laborious task. As such the AMA began to decentralize its control of fund-raising and allowed colleges and schools to embark upon their own fund raising missions. The AMA endorsed such campaigns by Fisk University.69 In 1872 Joseph Healy, the onetime advance agent for the Fisk Jubilee singers advised the AMA that the current success that
the Singers were having in New England could be equaled or surpassed in Britain. In 1873 Fisk's Jubilee Singers embarked upon a grueling tour of Great Britain which, while a financial success, would also reveal inherent problems and tensions within both the AMA and the trans-Atlantic movement for racial improvement.
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CHAPTER 6

THE AMA AND THE CAMPAIGN OF THE JUBILEE SINGERS IN BRITAIN

In the fall of 1865 the Rev. Edward P. Smith, Rev. Erastus Milo Cravath, and John Ogden purchased an abandoned field hospital complex in Nashville, Tennessee. The three men had broad antislavery credentials. Smith was a field agent of the United States Christian Commission. Cravath came from a long antislavery lineage and had been active in the underground railroad during the Civil War. John Ogden was the state superintendent for education for the Tennessee Freedman's Bureau. All three were also members of the AMA. Their goal was to use the abandoned complex as a college to promote "the highest standards, not of Negro education, but of American education at its best." With the aid of General Clinton B. Fisk, a Christian soldier in charge of the Freedman's Bureau in Kentucky and Tennessee, Fisk College opened its doors on 9 January 1866 and was incorporated as Fisk University on 22 August 1867.

The initial aim of the college was to provide teachers for freedmen and women. As General Fisk pointed out:
The Association has never been foolish enough to believe that any race could be educated by missionaries of an outside race. Every race must educate itself; must provide itself with leadership.

In practice this meant that Fisk and the AMA would avowedly employ African-American teachers even though more qualified white candidates existed. In the long-run its founders wished it to become a first class college educating students for a broad spectrum of careers. But the immediate goal was to satisfy demands for rudimentary schooling. By the end of 1867 Fisk was accommodating some 1000 pupils, many of whom were receiving the most elementary of education. The first collegiate scholars were not admitted until 1870 and the school offered the same liberal arts curriculum as other colleges.

The construction of Fisk University reflected the general thirst for higher education among all Americans in the post-Civil War decades. Moreover, it was in line with the general "civilizing mission" adopted by many philanthropic organizations in the Gilded Age. While the AMA embraced this mission and technically opened its doors to all races, the organization pioneered higher education for African-Americans. Between 1866 and 1869 the AMA launched Fisk along with six other chartered institutes of higher learning aimed at black students. These institutions reflected the AMA's conviction that all types of education were necessary if African-Americans were to prosper. While
Atlanta, Straight, and Fisk Universities emphasized a liberal arts education and teacher training, other AMA colleges emphasized a more vocational and industrial curriculum. The AMA also established secondary and elementary schools as well. The AMA's belief in access to all levels of education reflected its broad concept of equality.

The speed with which the AMA moved to establish educational institutions was breathtaking. The conception and genesis of Fisk was no exception. But while such swiftly implemented projects reflected the enthusiasm and commitment of Fisk's founders, it also ensured that the institutions were in constant, and often desperate, financial need. Fisk, like other AMA colleges, could hardly rely on fees to maintain its facilities and staff: for fees were notoriously, and understandably, difficult to collect from its poverty-stricken student body. Debts for food and fuel remained unpaid; and the school buildings remained structurally inadequate and a positive health hazard to their occupants. As it stood in 1866, Fisk was little more than a rudimentary complex of cheaply and rapidly constructed buildings threatened with imminent decay. Thus, in 1866 the desperate Fisk faculty decided that they needed a systematic program of fund-raising to build a more permanent structure and to improve student facilities.

At the helm of this new fund-raising initiative was George L. White. White was a Cadiz, New York, native who had
given his life to the education and general liberation of African-Americans. An employee of the Freedman's Bureau, he had initially joined the staff of Fisk as a Sunday-School teacher. White's musical background lent his talents to other areas, however, and by 1871 he was the college's music instructor. White took the best singers from his music classes and molded them into a choir. After sufficient training, White determined to take the troupe on the road where he hoped that their "unique talents" could be usefully employed.

Both the AMA and the Fisk faculty initially had little confidence in, and much trepidation about, this enterprise. General Fisk, for example, refused to contribute a start-up fee for the choir to provide music and suitable clothing, and to pay for transport. "I feared," Fisk later confessed, that the Singers would "disgrace us all." Nevertheless, in 1866 the choir began giving small concerts in nearby Memphis and Chattanooga and later at the National Teacher's Conference in Nashville.

Initially the choir sang what they called "white man's music"; but they soon embraced the vogue of "plantation singing" which was proving financially successful among more "popular" artists of the time. The choir was so warmly and enthusiastically received everywhere it went that, in 1871, the choir embarked on a national tour. Eleven students, supervised by White and Miss Wells, principle of the American
Missionary Association in Athens, commenced an extended tour of the Midwest and Northeastern states. After three months on the road they returned to Nashville with an impressive $20,000 for the school building fund. A second three month tour soon followed. Fourteen students composed the choir and the tour raised an additional $20,000 for the Fisk building "pot." The success of these trips became quickly apparent and it was during the latter that the Fisk University administration contemplated the first British tour.

In 1873, therefore, the Fisk Jubilee Singers made their first tour of England. Seven women and four men comprised the choir. Almost all were emancipated slaves whose average age was twenty. Their tour was conducted under the auspices of White, Gustavus Pike, District Secretary of the AMA for the Middle States, and James Parnell, treasurer of Fisk University. The tour's primary aim was to raise the six thousand pounds deemed necessary to build a new hall at Fisk University. But as the tour went on, White and Pike focused increasingly on other goals.

In particular, the tour stood in the grand tradition of Atlantic abolitionism in that it sought to use the enthusiastic reception of the Jubilees in England as a lever with which to pry open the doors of racial acceptance in America. The Jubilees' goal was to "sing their way into the consciousness of two continents," as an English admirer succinctly stated it. The pecuniary and publicity
rewards, however, masked the physical and philosophical challenges the tour presented. Not only did the Singers endure real physical hardships but, in their quest to obtain the financial and critical support of Britons, the Singers had to endure serious challenges to their claims to equal humanity.

* 

The importance of the tour of the Jubilee Singers transcends their attempts to open British pocketbooks. The Jubilee Singers broadened the British public's artistic experiences as well. Their concerts introduced the spiritual to British audiences for the first time. Critics of black spirituals, however, allege that the commercialization of this art form damaged popular perceptions of the African-American community. By promoting an expressive form born in slavery, the Jubilees projected a narrow and negative stereotype of the black community. The spiritual, critics allege, thus merely reinforced the stereotype that African-Americans are forever connected with the dependency and arrested development of slave culture. If one accepts these assertions, then, by extension, the Jubilee Singer's popularization of spirituals in England must have done damage to African-American claims to equality.

An examination of the Jubilees' tour of England suggests that, on one level, the Jubilees actually challenged popular and negative stereotypes of African-Americans. The
performances of the Singers confounded Britons' expectations of the type of entertainment that African-Americans were capable of furnishing. The grueling tour, which spanned the length and breadth of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, was generally a popular and critical success. "It is the best entertainment of its kind ever brought out in London," reported the liberal Daily News.\textsuperscript{11} "The Singers were manifestly destined to take a prominent position among the most remarkable attractions of the current season" opined the Telegraph.\textsuperscript{12} "We never saw an audience more riveted, nor a more thorough heart-entertainment" waxed the Rock after the singer's initial concerts.\textsuperscript{13} Even the Times, usually reticent in its admiration of "negro art," reluctantly reported that "We cannot say that the expectations raised by these praises [advertisements] have been disappointed."\textsuperscript{14}

Clearly Britons expected the Jubilees to replicate the sort of "negro art" to which audiences has become accustomed. Many music critics indeed, saw the Jubilees' work in this light and dismissed the concerts as "typical" of the "simplicity" of "Negro music." The Tonic Sol-Fa Reporter, a popular music journal, commented that, as usual in "this type of entertainment" the language was "grotesque."\textsuperscript{15} Even Britons sympathetic to the freedman's cause clearly did not consider the performances of the Jubilees to be "high art." Lord Shaftesbury did not believe that the singing deserved critical acclaim and warned the audience that they should
not "expect artistic singing." Others found the music to be out of place. Some critics, for example, objected to the "familiarity with things sacred" in the spirituals; and the combination of scriptural text and Ethiopian minstrelsy offended some audiences also.

Nevertheless, the Jubilee Singers entranced audiences across the land. After a performance by the Jubilees in Brighton, even the worldly reviewer for the Tonic Sol-Fa Reporter told his readers that the "simple and intense sincerity" of the music had quite swept him away. Audiences across Britain found themselves similarly mesmerized and unwittingly affected by the Jubilees, openly weeping and wailing both during and after performances. Even renowned music critics, such as Colin Brown of Andersonian University, Glasgow, testified to the force of the Jubilees' performances. The power of the Singers confounded critics and laymen alike as all struggled to give reason for their overwhelming response.

This bewilderment was only to be expected. Hitherto, minstrelsy was the only face that the public, British or American, had seen of "African-American" music. On their initial tour of the Northern American states, the Singers were mistaken for minstrels and one review of the earliest American performance of the troupe was headlined "Negro Minstrelsy in Church-Novel Religious Exercise." Britons thus, unsurprisingly, were apt to make the same mistake. To
Britons minstrelsy was the only unique expression of American musical culture with which, albeit uncomfortably, they were familiar.

Minstrelsy had indeed grown out of Americans' desire to formulate expressions of their peculiarly nonpareil culture. In its inception, minstrelsy had sought to be antithetical to everything Great Britain purported to represent: it was ant-intellectual, anti-aristocratic, and anti-elitist. The most apt expression of this cultural separateness, Americans believed, was the caricature of America's African population: the "black-face." "Blacking-Up" reached the peak of its popularity in the 1840's as Americans grappled over the meaning of race and the position of African-Americans in their society and when the demand for entertainment that catered to the "middling masses" was at its height. Britons were not strangers either to this type of entertainment. In 1846-47 the Ethiopian Serenaders toured Britain. The "black-face" Serenaders represented the standard fare rendered by minstrelsy at the time. Although the acts incorporated elements of African-American culture into their performances, they grossly caricatured the reality of African-American life in mid-nineteenth century America.

Minstrels were, first and foremost, professional entertainers whose primary concern was to create acts that pleased their audiences. To achieve that end, white minstrel companies unequivocally discredited African-Americans as...
inferior. To entertain the audience the companies relied on emphasizing the "peculiarities", the "idiosyncracies", the otherness of African-Americans. African-Americans were set apart physically, mentally and culturally. African-Americans, through the lens of minstrelsy, therefore, appeared as foolish, stupid, and inherently musical. They had wool instead of hair which could not be cut but had to be filed down. They had bulging black eyeballs, flat, wide noses, gaping mouths with impossibly large lips and huge feet with flapping heels. Their favorite diets were coon and possum. They had different standards of beauty. They could not play "refined music" but preferred the banjo and fiddle music of the south. And although some minstrel shows admitted the physical torture and pain of familial separation that slavery often inflicted, they claimed that African-Americans were happier in bondage than in freedom, and that they lacked the requisite character traits to function outside of that benevolent institution of slavery. These caricatures so seduced Britons that some charged that the Ethiopian Serenaders were not really black at all.

In the 1850's these stereotypes coincided with minstrelsy's inherent nationalism in an attack on slavery's opponents. In particular, Harriet Beecher Stowe, who made several very successful tours of Great Britain, became the target for minstrelsy's ire. Sam Sandford and other minstrels lampooned her, lecturing her in the same way that
literary responses to her novel did. One black character warned the absent Stowe:

But don't come back, Aunt Harriet; in England make a fuss,
Go talk against your country, put money in your puss;
And when us happy darkies you pity in your prayer,
Oh, don't forget de WHITE SLAVES dat's starvin' ober dar!"

Many American white minstrel troupes toured Britain and by the late 1850's more than fifteen permanent minstrel companies had formed in England and become standard fare in the music hall entertainment of the day.

The cultural baggage that these troupes figuratively brought with them served to cement further popular British ideas about black inferiority during the antebellum period. After the Civil War, however, black minstrels usurped the position of white minstrels as the most authentic portrayers of both plantation life and African-American character. Over time, these black performers were able to correct such appalling misapprehensions. At first, they made only minor modifications to the white fabricated stereotype and this helped to underline the perception that African-Americans actually behaved like their caricatures.

Black minstrels were no strangers to Britons either. Some black minstrel shows had toured England in the antebellum period: Frank Johnson and his troupe even entertained Queen Victoria in 1838. But the messages British
audiences received from black minstrels up to the mid 1870's differed little from that conveyed by their "blacked-up" white counterparts. It was not unknown for African-Americans to perform "serious" music, however, and select British audiences were exposed to this. In 1854, for example, the classical soprano, Elizabeth Taylor Greenfield, known as "the Black Swan" or the "African Nightingale", toured England and performed before Queen Victoria. But as white Americans were largely unwilling to accept African-Americans as cultivated performers, Britons were not widely exposed to such musical fare. Minstrelsy thus remained the standard musical diet. The post-Civil War period opened the door for the full flowering of black minstrelsy, the stimulus for which came in part from Great Britain. In 1866 Sam Hague's Slave Troupe embarked upon an English tour. Their success in Britain paved the way for their triumph in the United States. It is interesting to note that many of these performers finally made their homes in England. The biggest stimulus for the blossoming of black minstrelsy, however, came from the lulling of fears of racial anarchy during the 1870's. Plantation references were acceptable now that African-Americans were no longer deemed a threat to Reconstruction or to whites. Coupled with the "discovery" of plantation music, the 1870's spawned a plethora of black minstrel groups who incorporated black spirituals into their acts. This musical genre proved popular with white Americans.
because in many ways it served to stress the "otherness" and therefore inherent inferiority of African-Americans.  

To Britons, the Fisk Jubilee Singers were, at least initially associated with minstrelsy. In fact, the Jubilee Singers only officially adopted their name after being mistaken for minstrels on their first tour. During their first tour of England, many imitators had appeared. Some of these imitation "Jubilees" attempted to follow in the serious vein of the Fisk Singers: the Hampton Singers, for example, embarked on tours of England and mainland Europe. Many others, however, were mere lampoons of the sincere religiosity and ardent professionalism of the university choirs. Sheppard's Colored Jubilee Singers, for example, represented themselves as having "no pretensions as to musical abilities, they being unable to read or write." Indeed, many of these "Jubilee" groups were just reconstituted minstrel troupes. The Fisk Singers' music was unlike the program presented to audiences in minstrel acts, however, a fact that British supporters tried to impress on the audience at an early stage. "Those who have only heard the burnt cork caricatures of negro minstrelsy have not the slightest conception of what it really is," remarked an English newspaper after an early concert in the tour. Other testimonials to the Jubilee's artistry declared:
At last we have a real troupe of negro minstrels in London who give us not mere burlesque singing nor grin with the dental abandon which is supposed to be peculiar to their race. At length we have the opportunity of comparing the imitation with the 'real thing', and the result is that the artificial character of the imitation becomes strikingly apparent; and whatever artistic excellencies the copy may have, nobody who hears the band of coloured vocalists now performing in England under the title 'The Jubilee Singers', will be likely to accept the songs or the singing of imitation negro minstrels as at all a faithful representation of the reality.  

And as J.B.T. Marsh, an AMA chronicler of the tour noted,

From the first the Jubilee music was more or less of a puzzle to the critics; and even among those who sympathized with their mission there was no little difference of opinion as to the artistic merit of their entertainments. Some could not understand the reason for enjoying so thoroughly as almost everyone did these simple unpretending songs.

Despite this bafflement, the Singers regularly packed the major concert halls of the nation: the Philharmonic in Liverpool, the Dome Pavilion at Brighton, and the Town Halls of Birmingham, Nottingham, Sheffield, Derby, and Newcastle. Their audiences spanned the range of society from royal princes to paupers. Receipts from individual concerts sometimes totaled over one thousand pounds, an indicator of the size of the audiences that the Singers attracted since the price of admission was sometimes as little as one shilling. Gustavus Pike, the major chronicler of the campaign, reported that on several occasions demand outstripped availability and "thousands" were turned away at
the door.\textsuperscript{29} Even allowing for exaggeration, and Pike's desire both to ingratiate himself with and to thank his English benefactors, the evidence indicates that the concerts were indeed popular. Perhaps the greatest tribute to the Jubilee's success, however, was that they found themselves the object of impersonation by minstrels across the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{30}

The Singers were popular in part because the tour utilized many of the established contacts of the trans-Atlantic reform movement, particularly religious ties. The wider trans-Atlantic "intelligentsia" clearly facilitated the tour's success. The Singers gained letters of introduction from such prominent personages as the Governor of Tennessee, Mark Twain, Henry Ward Beecher, George Stuart, George MacDonald and General John Eaton, U.S commissioner of education. These testators highly commended the activities and personages of the Singers to equally well-placed friends abroad.\textsuperscript{31}

The tour organizers thought it essential to impress the British political and religious elite to ensure the success of the tour. Most importantly Pike and White recognized from the beginning that to further the cause required the championing of the nobility. Within a few weeks of their arrival in Britain, they had obtained such patronage. The Fisk University Singers found their "patron saint" in the figure of the Earl of Shaftesbury of the FMAS.\textsuperscript{32} The Earl's
own residence in Grosvenor Square, London, was the site for the introduction of the Singers to British audiences. This "affair" did much to publicize the cause of the campaign nation-wide. The Earl invited members of the press, leading members of the clergy from throughout Britain, and, of course, his peers. Prominent among the Peers who attended were the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, individuals well known for their support of the African-American cause in slavery and emancipation. Moreover, the heir to the Duke's title had married one of the Queen Victoria's daughters thus it was the Argylls who later afforded the Singers the ultimate endorsement when they invited the Queen to hear the Singers perform at their lodge in London. Such rapid acceptance and endorsement by the British elite was the keystone to the success of the tour and a testament to the sound organizing strategy of Pike.

To British commentators such elite endorsement was astonishing. "It is remarkable," the Independent commented, "that this company of negro singers should have vaulted at once to the highest circles in the land." From these early introductions to the nobility, the Singers received staunch support from local noble families throughout their tour. This patronage gave the Singers the leverage they needed to open doors across the country. It was, as Pike said after the royal concert, as if:
the gates had been opened, and obstacles removed, with the same power by which the 'walls of Jericho fell down.' We were in a land of promise, the Queen had bidden us welcome, and it needed no pressing exhortation to inspire us to 'wait on the Lord, and to be of good courage.'

These initial concerts also sanctioned the legitimacy of the music. The AMA and British newspapers reported that Queen Victoria listened with "manifest pleasure" to "John Brown's Body", and that the Prince of Wales requested "No More Auction Block For Me". These images of sincere royal interest and enjoyment were important legitimisers to the Singers' craft.

During the remainder of the tour the Singers received the patronage not only of the aristocracy but of the wider political elite too. In city after city local dignitaries and members of Parliament patronized and chaired the concerts and religious gatherings where the Singers "appeared". In July of 1873 the Singers received the definitive sanction when they lunched and breakfasted with the Prime Minister, William Gladstone.

This was another event of enormous import. The breakfast served notice to the British that freedmen had the official support of the government. But, more importantly, Pike and his confidant Newman Hall, used this event as a lever against American prejudice. "If the Premier of the United Kingdom can invite "niggers" to sit and eat with him, cannot the common folk of America pause and ask if their
prejudices are not foolish to say the least," the AMA asked? In a letter to the New York Independent, Hall recounted the breakfast in detail. He described the clientele that had attended, and related how all seemed at ease with one another, how even the liveried footmen treated the guests with respect and courtesies equal to that received by the titled guests. He went on:

To my English readers I should apologize for writing this way. My description would be severely criticized, as giving prominence to trifling courtesies which with us are a matter of course. No one here, pretending to social refinement, would make the least distinction between the guests he might meet merely on the grounds of colour, and no one would hesitate in that account to invite to his house anyone otherwise suitable. I am told that there still exists in the United States some remnant of the old prejudice. This may be found no doubt, amongst some of the ignorant and vulgar of our own land; and so also it would not be fair to infer that such prejudice is general in America because exhibited by some low-bred, unrefined, and narrow souls. I fancy some of these at Surrey Chapel the other Sunday morning, when the Jubilee Singers did me the honour of taking a little luncheon with some of my friends at Rowland Hill's parsonage. Some Americans had come to take my hand, and I asked them to join us. But when they entered the house, and saw our negro friends sitting down to table side by side with some English ladies, they looked surprised, stood awhile at the door, and then walked away down the street!  

Such publication was not mere rhetoric either. Racism had dogged the Fisk Singers in their crusade in the United States and had created real practical problems. More than once innkeepers refused lodgings to the Singers when it became apparent that they were not the minstrel, and
therefore white, troupe that they had supposed. These episodes had been widely publicized and condemned in the British press and the latter had been at great pains to point out that no such event had hindered the progress of the Singers in the British Isles. Pike assiduously publicized this fact and the warm and enthusiastic welcome that the Singers had received across the United Kingdom. Besides the impact on the African-American community and white Americans, Pike hoped that this symbolism would become more widely appreciated and acted upon:

I have ever felt that this event was worth as much to the coloured people the world over as the campaign cost us; and after it had transpired, I knew that our mission could in no case be reckoned a failure."

Marsh concurred in this evaluation stating that:

Aside from the especial help that it might give...in their immediate work, it was felt that such attentions to a company of colored people, just out of bondage, by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, was a rebuke to the caste spirit in America that would do great good."

While the "gliterati," both political and royal, were of undoubted importance to the campaign, from the outset religious organization and conviction motivated the tour. Henry Allon, pastor of the Union Chapel in Islington was most important in this regard. It was through his connections that the Singers were welcomed into Quaker meeting houses as well as Methodist, Baptist and Unitarian chapels throughout
the country. Despite the misgivings of some British activists, overall the ties of the abolitionist community still held firm. One of the first offers for work came from Samuel Gurney, the noted Quaker abolitionist. After a performance at his home the Singers were introduced to a wide circle of Quaker "Friends" active in, and cognizant of, their reputation as leaders in the abolitionist community. These contacts aided the Singers in their general introduction to a wider British public.

Appealing to churches, however, had its drawbacks. Firstly, some chapels which offered to stage concerts would not allow the Singers to charge admission. The tour thus had to rely upon the generosity of the audience through collections held at the conclusion of the concerts. Such arrangements were detrimental to the financial success of the tour. As such, the Singers turned down many pleas from congregations to perform at their churches in favor of performances in secular concert halls. This not only allowed the Singers to receive a guaranteed minimum return from the concert but afforded greater financial returns because of their increased seating capacity.

Moreover, it allowed the Singers to overcome the denominational quarrels that had hampered fund-raising efforts in Britain and organization in the United States since the days of the early abolitionist movement. In the early part of the tour, and indeed of the whole AMA crusade
in Britain, these denominational quarrels again impeded effective activity. In particular, the Episcopalians and the Congregationalists were constantly feuding. Moreover, for many, the mode of arousing sympathy was unpalatable. Many pastors refused to cooperate on the grounds that the concerts were essentially nonreligious and appealed to the irrational and emotional, and that they smacked of cheap "sensationalism" as one pastor put it. Lastly, progress was initially slow as other domestic issues distracted the attention of the churches.

In part to sustain the support of the AMA for the Singers' campaign and in part to protect future tours, Pike concealed many of these problems from the AMA. His wish to flatter his British patrons and to sustain interest in the cause also led Pike to obscure the inherent difficulties that had beset the tour from the outset. A large and expensive retinue, which included Pike and at least half a dozen other advance agents for the tour, supported the Singers. Accommodation, transport, lodging as well as the salary of this large support group, in addition to the cost of maintaining the Singers was constantly a source of anxiety to Pike. Frequently Pike wrote that the returns from the British tour would have been greater had it not been for the cost of maintaining this retinue, which, the high cost of living in Britain compounded. In addition, George White, the musical instructor of the Singers, constantly frustrated
Pike. Not only were White's "poor nerves" and "suffering teeth", a source of irritation to Pike, but White's refusal to have more than two or three concerts a week when the demand for the Singers was overwhelming infuriated him.*^ Pike's criticism was undeserved. By even modern standards the tour was a punishing affair: it covered four countries with an estimated 250 concerts given and countless other social and charitable events attended. Without the benefits of modern transportation, medical care, and the comfort of central heating in a somewhat inhospitable climate, both the Singers and the retinue suffered physically. Many of the Singers were taken ill: Pike himself succumbed more than once to the rigors of the tour and others in the retinue grew so gravely ill as to warrant extended and expensive medical treatment. These problems drained the coffers and by the end of December 1873, despite the large revenue raised, Pike was despairing of the tour. Despite the Singers' popularity and the resulting donations, the Hall had still not been built. The governors of Fisk claimed that there was only enough cash for the construction of the basement.**

Even if Fisk did not receive all that it expected of the Singers' returns, the freedmen's cause as a whole benefitted tremendously from their efforts. The Singers proved excellent advocates of the cause of freedmen education, and as "products" themselves of that education they persuaded
many Britons to offer not only money but also their services. Despite the political capital that opponents of the freedmen's cause made out of English meddling, the AMA encouraged and provided sponsorship to Britons who wished to act as educational missionaries in the south. The AMA, however, tried to maintain strict control over such aid, especially when British donors requested positions at AMA founded colleges. Thus, they accepted offers of services from individuals, such as the Rev. David Macrae, missionary and longtime activist for the African-American cause. But they often felt themselves torn between financial need and jurisdictional sovereignty. Thus, when the Edinburgh Presbyterian Church offered to sponsor a professorship at Fisk, the AMA and the Fisk University administrators insisted upon extensive stipulations pursuant to the appointment. Not only did the Presbyterian church want to sponsor the professorship but to nominate the candidate and to stipulate what area of interest he should represent, in this case, missionary activity. Fisk declined.

The success of the Jubilee Singers also opened the door for both imitators and other American freedmen's advocates in Britain. The Hampton Singers were one of several other college groups to tour Europe. Although there was a danger of unseemly fights over constituencies, Pike believed that the Hampton tour would not jeopardize the accomplishments of the firmly established Jubilees. Indeed the Jubilees
instead stood at the vanguard of a new era in Anglo-American cooperation. The Jubilees had successfully conquered a society that had entrenched black face entertainment as a part of its culture.

The Singers' entered British life on a number of levels. Not only did they satisfy the patrician and moral concerns of the upper and political classes represented by Shaftesbury and Gladstone, but they also appealed to the British working class. The Jubilees played to mass working class audiences and inspired them to create their own choirs. For example, after a visit to the Hackney Juvenile Mission, a so-called "ragged" school, the proprietor of the mission, John Newman, formed his own choir from among the students. The Jubilees thus were pioneers in bringing African-American spirituals to the whole British public.

Pike viewed the tour as an important educational experience for the students also, a part of their "civilizing" transition from slave to free. He declared great satisfaction in the student's willingness to do their work well. He also wrote of their neatness and correct language "and this, I think, is as much as could be said of any eleven young people born out of slavery."

The Jubilees were thus exalted as role models for the African-American community. More than this, however, the AMA hoped that British treatment of the Jubilees would stand as an archetype for the American community. Reports of the
courtesies and equal treatment that were exhibited to the Singers made the press not only in Britain but in the United States and, as we have seen, this was a deliberate ploy on the part of the organizers. Their reception had confirmed that Britain remained a useful springboard from which to reach the conscience of white America. J.B.T. Marsh commented that:

In no way were they [the Singers] ever offensively reminded, through look or word-unless made by some American who was lugging his caste conceit through a European tour, or by a vagrant Englishman who had lived long enough in America to "catch" its color prejudices—that they were black.5

Marsh's account of the tour, published in 1880, was undoubtedly a work of some polemical use to the African-American cause. However, the financial support given to the Singers, which far outweighed their cultural achievements in Great Britain, confirmed the underlying sentiment of Marsh's assessment. Marsh and other racial commentators viewed the tour as indispensable in the fight against discrimination within their own nation. The trustees of Fisk indeed passed committee resolutions stating that the amount of prejudice that had perished as a result of the music heard on this tour was uncountable and that the music had persuaded many of the brotherhood of men. Marsh went further:

It was owing not a little to their triumphant success as singers, and to the stay of the distinguished attentions they received from the people of highest rank and culture both in American
and Great Britain, that the prejudice against color, the hateful heritage of slavery, which was so prevalent and so powerful as to make those insults common in their first year's work, was so broken down that they were quite infrequent in their travels three years afterwards. People who would not sit in the same church-pew with a negro, under the magic of their song were able to get new light on questions of social equality.*

As a result of their trip to England it was easier for the Singers to organize tours when they returned to the United States. And as a result of their efforts, the organizers of the tour considered that the fight against prejudice had been successful:

No one can estimate the vast amount of prejudice against the race which has perished under the spell of their marvelous music. Wherever they have gone they have proclaimed to the hearts of men in a most effective way, and with unanswerable logic, the brotherhood of the race.**

The 1873 tour thus introduced black spirituals to Britain, many of which entered into everyday British repertoire. They returned in 1875 and again in 1884 and raised a further thirty thousand pounds on each occasion. After these tours, two members of the group even decided to make Britain their permanent residence. Edmund Watkins studied music in London and Isaac P. Dickerson studied theology and started evangelistic mission work in France.** A third, Thomas Rutling left Fisk after seven and a half years and went to England in 1890 after a tour of the continent. A fourth, Frederick J. Loudin joined the Pan-African conference in 1900.
and with his wife, served on the executive committee. This attested to the more receptive racial climate in Britain as compared to the Singers' homeland.

For the man largely responsible for organizing the tour and chaperoning the students, Gustavus Pike, the tour was merely a side-line to the "real Work" to be done. Although dutiful in his role as tour organizer, Pike was always convinced that his real mission lay elsewhere. He wished to get on with the "real work" of evangelizing Africans or Southern Blacks. Pike had sacrificed a great deal to tour with the Singers: he was separated from his family for years, remaining after the Singers had returned to the United States as the AMA agent in Britain. The personal financial cost of the tour had forced him to mortgage his house and the length of the tour and the unfriendly British climate had resulted in several physical lapses. His resulting, albeit perhaps understandable, lack of commitment to the AMA rather hampered its cause after the departure of the Singers. Sympathy remained for the cause that the Singers represented, but, as O. H. White pointed out, "the English people are slow to move" and needed some gentle American persuasion. This Pike was disinclined, or too exhausted, to give and although there was some sympathy for the establishment of a Woman's Board of Missions in England, as an auxiliary to the AMA, the movement lost some momentum.
Pike was eventually replaced by fresh blood: Rev. O.K. White. He and his family were sent to England to sustain the hearty momentum of the previous years. Mrs White was charged with getting the Women's Board off the ground. Unfortunately, this initiative was handicapped from the outset. Again the climate allegedly took its toll. Mrs White soon fell ill and had to retire to the continent to recuperate, thus leaving unfulfilled her duties. White was left to carry on alone while his wife enjoyed the spas of Switzerland.

To maintain the impulse of the movement White arranged for another tour of the Jubilee Singers during 1876-1877. He had begun to reawaken people's interests by working through the revival movement of Dwight Moody and Ira Sankey and had had some success here. The Singers performed unpaid at the popular revival meetings that Sankey and Moody held in the East End of London. As a result of their aid, Moody and several friends contributed five hundred and twenty five pounds to Fisk.

Despite continued patronage by the noble and political elite, however, the timing was unpropitious. Other humanitarian causes had arisen to distract Britons, namely the problems of the Bulgarians and later also the Chinese famine. The British poured much money and sympathy into these new calamities, claiming that saving lives had to take priority over education. Moreover, financial problems
plagued the second tour. In 1877 the depression which had devastated the United States smote Great Britain. As a result, the Jubilee Singers and the cause as a whole suffered. Then in 1878, a banking collapse rocked Scotland, traditionally an area of strong support for the AMA.

But more than these political and economic hurdles, the legacy of the first tour could not be overcome. Many Britons felt that the AMA and the Jubilee had returned too soon. As a result, at least initially, as White wrote "...there was little interest and no enthusiasm for the object of our mission." Moreover, other groups of performers were taking advantage of the early success of the Singers, even to the extent of using the Jubilee Singers' name to sell their own tour, a fact not appreciated by some Britons! Other groups were less than honest regarding their causes. In 1876, for example, the Wilmington Jubilee Singers of New York City arrived in Great Britain. Organized by Harry York they toured Britain under the pretense of raising funds for a Normal School in Wilmington, North Carolina. Once established in Britain the singers were "discovered" by Samuel Hague, a white entrepreneur and proprietor of the Hague Minstrel Company of St. James Hall, Liverpool. The Wilmington Singers rode on the success of the Jubilee in a less than subtle manner by blatantly copying their posters and programs.
By 1876, as a result of such overkill and misrepresentation, AMA funds were alarmingly depleted, and although the Singers' second tour of the United Kingdom still met with noted success and retained the momentum of interest in the cause of the southern freedmen, the tour did not help the mission of the AMA. On the second tour White complained that the ground had been badly burned over in the pursuit for scholarships and this "left no constituency for regular contributions for the society." In sponsoring not only the Fisk Singers, but other university groups, and in addition dispatching regular AMA European agents to Britain, the AMA had unthinkingly cut its nose to spite its face.

In addition the AMA, as other organizations before it, began to be plagued with the scourge of "misdirected" funds. Some of this bordered on "criminal" but otherwise was really a product of the financial difficulties of the first tour. Healy and the AMA, for example, had promised that a proportion of the funds raised from the first tour would be used to finance the education of black missionaries to Africa. When the financial costs and mismanagement of the first Jubilee tour thwarted these requests, donors were less than eager to contribute more aid. Moreover, money raised by other singing troupes that was supposedly earmarked for the AMA was sometimes "appropriated" for the individual college. The payment of the Singers for their services
compounded such rumors of financial mismanagement. At the beginning of the tour, Pike, in an additional emotional appeal to the public, had proclaimed that the Singers were "unselfishly and voluntarily" donating their time and energy to build the Hall. Towards the end of the tour, this was patently a disingenuous falsehood. Pike was allowing the Singers to take the proceeds from a series of benefit concerts which provided the Singers with about $500 each. Moreover, these concerts were a bigger financial success than any of the previous concerts. They were also a great critical success, the press asserting that they were superior to the regular performances.  

The rot set in at the top during the second tour. Healy himself, the tour's manager, was the target for many of the accusations alleging financial mismanagement. Both donors and AMA committee members charged that Healy had misused the funds that he had raised, appropriating them for his own college, Straight University, New Orleans. Further, even when Healy had avowedly used the Singers to raise money for Straight, not all the money had actually reached New Orleans. Healy had also taken money from the general AMA fund, earmarked for the purchase of land for freedmen in North Carolina. One of the most serious charges, in the sense that it had potentially the most damaging effect on subsequent campaigns, was the contention that Healy had appropriated money pledged by Rev. Black of Glasgow, one of
the most influential churchmen in that city, to the Lovedale school in South Africa. In 1878 the principal of the school, Mr Stewart, was in Scotland and made this known to O.H. White who was campaigning there at the time on behalf of the AMA. Stewart's threat to make this public threatened to destroy the groundwork that White had painstakingly laid after other charges of financial mismanagement had already surfaced.  

Whether these allegations were true or false, inefficient accounting in the AMA Chicago office, through which all donations had to pass, exacerbated affairs. Although no charges of financial chicanery were ever substantiated, rumors jeopardized the success of the AMA and the Singers' second tour in Britain. Throughout the tour irate curates bombarded White, demanding to know the exact destination of their donations. AMA activists knew exactly where to lay the blame for such harassment. "I am exceedingly tired" White wrote in 1878, "of the fact that Dr. Healy seemed to act so often on his own responsibility." Donors in Britain even went as far as threatening the AMA with law suits to reclaim the money pledged. Such was the antagonism that, even in Scotland, traditionally a very fertile ground, White could not make progress. Over the next few months White, as he put it, "fought a great fight" in Scotland. Through his assurances, and the work of other AMA activists who joined him, some confidence was re-injected into the movement: the AMA collected $10,000 for scholarships
in six months. White was also able to spread his work through his official capacity as AMA delegate to the Missionary Conference, held in London in the fall of 1878. By the fall of 1878 interest in the Jubilees had revived to the extent that White tried to persuade the Singers to end their less than successful tour of Germany and return to England.

By late 1878, then, the fortunes of the Singers had revived somewhat and the AMA fell back on the time-tested methods for rousing British support. While many Britons were induced to contribute to the freedmen's cause throughout the 1860's and 1870's because it was fashionable, to accredit such shallow motivations to even the majority of contributors to the Singers' fundraising campaign is unfair. It is clear that Britons perceived themselves as inheritors of the proud anti-slavery tradition that spanned back to Wilberforce. "The name of Wilberforce is held as sacred in consequence of his labors for emancipation as the names of great reformers." Indeed, it was this legacy that the AMA and other organizations continued to invoke to promote further continuing support for the cause. American organizations continued to remind Britons of the collective role that they had played in the propagation of slavery. "I am sure we all rejoice in the freedom which has been given to the slave," remarked Shaftesbury on the occasion of a grand concert given by the Jubilee Singers in 1874 at Castle Wemyss,
Above all, however, AMA activists and other American freedmen's advocates in Britain found that linking their campaigns to the evangelization of Africa was the sure-fire method for success. American advocates capitalized on the intense interest that Stanley's discoveries had stimulated in Africa. Americans thus increasingly solicited donations for African-American missionary training rather than for the relief and general education of the southern black population. AMA and non-sectarian colleges scrambled to organize schemes for African evangelization and to link their schools to that cause in any way possible. In 1876, for example, Pike formed the Society for the Evangelization of Africa at Fisk University. The Society aimed to raise money to support an AMA African missionary. To this cause Britons made large contributions. In 1877 the foundations were laid at Fisk for the building of another hall, financed by British donations, to be named Livingstone Missionary Hall. The British Aid Society was largely responsible for channeling such funds to the school for this project. The first fruits of the campaign to get African-American missionaries from Fisk came in March of 1878 when four ex-slaves from Fisk
University stopped off in Liverpool to thank their sponsors on their way to the west coast of Africa.  

*  

British contributions to the AMA, whether for African missions or for freedmen, were essential to the financial solvency of the organization before 1888. Domestically, by the mid-1870's only a handful of American Congregational churches and independent supporters contributed to the AMA on a regular basis. British donations were thus crucial in allowing the AMA to continue its mission through the 1870's. By extension, British monies were also of central importance to sustaining the viability of the entire American freedmen's aid campaign. The AMA was the single largest non-governmental contributor to the freedmen's cause before 1890 and therefore, much of the money invested in southern black education came from British sources. British money was especially important in sustaining the cause through the depression which started in 1873 and thus provided a much needed fillip to a movement in the doldrums allowing it to sustain itself into a new period of affluence and interest in the 1880's.

The financial contributions that British donors made to the freedmen's cause in the wake of the Jamaican affair revealed that racism had not totally collapsed the Atlantic movement. The waning of support mirrored similar problems within the United States itself. It also reflected
Britain's—and America's—growing obsession with the evangelization of Africa, a concern which was a double-edged sword for freedmen's needs, providing them on the one hand with educational opportunities but on the other circumscribing the limits of those opportunities. British focus on Africa would only intensify in the next decade. However, racial sentiment also showed particular vitality in Britain as the birth of new freedmen's organizations and the popularity of the AMA's efforts revealed. That Britain remained a fecund ground for American activism the continued efforts of American activists to involve Britons in domestic racial arrangements in the 1880's would reveal. Moreover, the involvement would move beyond the avowed apolitical provision of direct relief and education, and embroil Britons in the murky tentacles of the sexual and gendered politics of Jim Crow America.
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Though the role of women in both the British and American antislavery crusade has only recently become a focus for historians, this interest has firmly moved women from the margins of the abolitionist crusade to its center. In line with general histories of the abolitionist and freedmen's aid crusades, however, these recent gender studies abruptly curtail their examinations of women's activism in the early 1860's. By then, these studies argue, women's interest--like men's--in the plight of American freedmen had flagged. Conservative women, whose sense of moral duty underpinned their anti-slavery activism, turned their attention towards other great social evils: factory safety, prostitution, Veneral Disease, and temperance reform. Radical women, who had come to liken black slavery with a "slavery of sex," began to translate this gender consciousness into activism to redress that inferiority at home. Current scholarship, therefore, presupposes that women, like their male counterparts, deserted the cause in droves, thus effectively
killing the Atlantic freedmen's aid movement by the late 1860's.

On the contrary, women's freedmen's aid continued, albeit in a rather diluted manner, until the end of the century and beyond. Moreover, women's support of American freedmen and worldwide antislavery in fact became crucial to the survival of the Atlantic movement in the period between 1870 and 1900. Neither conservative nor radical women ever completely abandoned the cause and neither did their interests completely diverge into competing reform movements. Instead, by the 1880's, the Atlantic freedmen's crusade had become highly "feminized": the most prolific and public Atlantic activists in these decades were women. As the old generation of Atlantic activists retired or died off a new, more radical cadre became the voice of Anglo-American race reform activism. Despite William Lloyd Garrison's public disavowal of the need for further British aid to the freedmen's cause, this new cadre overwhelmingly claimed a Garrisonian heritage. Such a discrepancy between the American "General" and his British "troops" was understandable given the historic lack of coordination and synchronization between British Garrisonians and their American counterparts.

The increasingly liberal domestic political climate—as evidenced by the Liberal's strong showing in political contests in the late nineteenth century and their support for
universal male suffrage and then women's right to vote--increased the visibility of radical British women within the Atlantic movement. The struggle for freedmen's civil rights thus took place against the backdrop of the Liberal struggle over the Reform Bill and a general trend towards the democratization of domestic politics. The struggle of radical women in Britain proved a natural corollary to the struggle for democracy in the United States. African-American activists therefore expected, and found, sympathy for their plight in Britain.

The paradox of late nineteenth century Britain, however, and a paradox American reformers sometimes chose to ignore, was that while Liberal demands sought to democratize England at home, the administration of the British Empire proceeded in a most undemocratic direction. The introduction of martial law in the Boer War and the Amritsar massacre illustrate the policy of terror and repression of native peoples abroad that sustained itself well into the twentieth century. The innate belief in "Anglo-Saxon" superiority that justified the treatment of such subject peoples was also the tie that bound Great Britain and the United States closer together in the late nineteenth century as America mirrored Britain's own imperial adventures. Indeed, Anglo-Saxonism is used interchangeably as a synonym of "Atlantic culture" by historians of this period.
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But the radical women and men of the Atlantic movement illustrate what is an unrecognised dimension of "Atlantic culture." While the "special relationship" between Great Britain and the United States was united politically by a belief in the racial superiority of the white race, die-hard abolitionists and their descendants represented the counter-culture of that special relationship: the social underside that valued liberty more than law, order, and constitutionalism. Though a minority in Britain, this counter-culture proved at times just as vocal, just as passionate, and just as valuable in sustaining American claims of fair treatment of minority peoples as did the mainstream. This counter-culture in the late nineteenth century proved of great value to a similar counter-culture in the United States. For African-Americans, Great Britain remained a viable, if not important, resource for promoting civil rights in the United States: Britain still remained the locus of democracy. Moreover, the most vocal demands for democracy in late nineteenth century Britain came from women.

As the gender of the Atlantic movement began to change in the late nineteenth century, so the complexion of the movement also shifted. White American activists began to abandon freedman's aid as the philosophy and practice of Jim Crowism took hold both in the South and the North. Into this vacuum African-American led and staffed societies emerged. Within these organizations, however, debates raged regarding
the desirability of encouraging white and foreign aid, a debate that ultimately splintered the African-American community in the 1880's and 1890's thus calling the whole existence of the Atlantic movement into question.

On the other hand, parallel changes within freedmen's activism in the United States encouraged the continuation of Atlantic cooperation. At the vanguard of the American freedmen's crusade from the 1880's were, for the first time, several prominent African-American women. While their male counterparts were debating and rejecting the desirability of white aid, American women, black and white alike, were caught up in trans-national feminized movements that widened their orbit of awareness and highlighted the universal nature of injustice. In particular, causes such as temperance and suffrage reform surmounted national boundaries, simultaneously promoted in states on both sides of the Atlantic. Strengthened by the technological advances of the late nineteenth century, American issues became informed by activism in Britain and vice versa. These movements provided the opportunity for both British and American women to inject questions of racial equality into discussions of drinking, world peace, and women's right to vote. Female race activists thus found a broader, albeit less concentrated, platform for their concerns.

Ultimately, although women's efforts to address American racial injustice in an Atlantic context did not cease with
the turn of the century, attempts to form new American organizations to fight racial injustice, both at home and world wide, overshadowed their hard work. Nevertheless, for nearly four decades after the Civil War a group of strong, opinionated, and committed women carried the Atlantic movement forward on their backs and in the process went some way towards bridging the racial gap with gender identification.

Women, Abolitionism, and the Civil War

When the history of the anti-slavery cause shall be written, women will occupy a large space in its pages; for the cause of the slave has been peculiarly women's cause. Women had always been abolitionists. British women had supported the first campaigns in the 1780's to abolish the slave trade and then the nineteenth century movement to abolish slavery itself. American women too had been instrumental in sustaining the antebellum movement to abolish slavery since its earliest inception. Women's antislavery activities on both sides of the Atlantic were part of general female involvement in a myriad of reform causes that swept both nations before the Civil War. In many ways united by this activism, women who were involved in the abolitionist movement managed to bridge the Atlantic and form their own sub-community within the wider Atlantic abolitionist world. The Civil War cemented this community and thus provided the
building blocks for other trans-Atlantic currents of reform in the post-war period.

The character of women's anti-slavery activism up to the Civil War—focused as it was upon promoting material, spiritual, and educational support—also allowed women to catapult themselves into positions of high visibility, if not leadership, within the freedmen's aid movement. This experience gave women the confidence, experience, and expertise to position themselves for expanded spheres of reform activism in the late nineteenth century, including, of course, the fight for their own "emancipation." More immediately, however, women's experience during the Civil War and the emancipation of American slaves changed the character of the trans-Atlantic abolitionist community for the rest of the century.

The feminization of the Atlantic community began even before the fighting broke out. As tensions escalated in the 1850's women on both sides of the Atlantic stepped into the spotlight as commentators on the North/South conflict. Among the most virulent critics of British inactivity during the 1850's and 1860's were American women. Associates of Frederick Douglass, in particular, used his good reputation in Britain to appeal to British women to take the initiative. Garrisonian women as well continued to lobby for British support. The Rochester Ladies Antislavery Society, for example, pleaded with female associates across the Atlantic
to send aid and to persuade the British government to abandon its ambivalent attitude to the South. This was just one of many such appeals that female anti-slavery organizations in the U.S. tendered to their British counterparts.\(^5\)

Efforts to arouse British sentiment were also undertaken by prominent individual women and their efforts had perhaps the greatest impact on British support for the freedmen. Hannah Tracy Cutler, a Massachusetts abolitionist, for example, made a name for herself by openly criticizing the British government through a series of letters to the British Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston. Sarah Parker Remond, the foremost African-American critic, spent the duration of the war in Britain berating the public for their tacit support of the Confederacy, and doing everything within her power to combat the initial somnambulance of the British abolitionist movement.\(^6\)

The woman whose work received most publicity, however, was Harriet Beecher Stowe. Her publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was an immediate hit with British female abolitionists.\(^7\) As a result a number of them, under the aegis of the Duchess of Sutherland, penned an address to female abolitionists in America calling for an immediate end to slavery. The Stafford House Address, or "An Affectionate and Christian Address of Many Thousands of Women of Great Britain and Ireland to Their Sisters, the Women of the United States of America," was signed by over half a million women
and sent to Stowe. Stowe trumpeted the address as "a singular monument to an international expression of a moral idea." Although the address brought vilification down upon both Stowe and British abolitionists from the conservative American press, within the reformist Atlantic community it catapulted Stowe to a revered position. During the fifteen years following the publication of Uncle Tom's Cabin a cadre of British women quite literally worshipped Stowe and capitalized upon the widespread success of her novel. The Edinburgh Ladies Emancipation Society collected fourteen hundred pounds from people who had read the novel and the success of "Uncle Tom's Penny Offering", as the organization called their donation, was indicative of the broad appeal that Stowe had, even outside the traditional ranks of antislavery activists. Cognizant of her ante-bellum success, when the Civil War began Stowe believed that she was in a unique position to undermine British sympathy for the Confederacy. In 1861 she wrote an open letter to Earl Shaftesbury criticizing British ambivalence and calling on Britons to support the North in what was, in her words, a "war against slavery." This letter stirred up a vipers nest of criticism, not just from pro-slavery organs on both sides of the Atlantic, but from some Atlantic abolitionists who believed that Stowe had mis-characterized the war and exaggerated the threat to Britain's interests implicit in the country's support of the South. Undaunted, Stowe persevered
with her criticisms and publicly denounced prominent British politicians, reformers, and abolitionists in a series of letters to various organs of the British press.\textsuperscript{11} Her most famous diatribe came in 1863, in her reply to the Stafford House address.\textsuperscript{12} Stowe called upon British women to support the side in the war which was bent on restoring the Union to the state intended by the founding fathers: a Union without slavery. It also criticized British women for failing to live up to the promise engendered in the Stafford House Address and bemoaned their failure to embrace the gallant sentiment of the earlier address:

Sisters of England, think it not strange, if we bring back the words of your letter, not in bitterness, but in deepest sadness and lay them at your door. We say to you, Sisters, you have spoken well; we have heard you; we have heeded; we have striven in the cause, even unto death...Sisters, what have you done, and what do you mean to do?\textsuperscript{13}

The criticism of, arguably, America's foremost spokesperson on slavery at the time galvanized British women into action. Her reply received wide publicity in Britain and it inspired British women to establish their own freedmen's organizations.\textsuperscript{14} But it also threw both American and British women onto the defensive. British women defended their long antislavery heritage but they also retorted that their failure to act more concertedly in the cause of the slave was as much an American failing, and not simply a British shortcoming. The fractured nature of the American
cause and the organizational infighting that it engendered, British women claimed, had damaged the credibility of the abolitionist movement, had hindered British ability to organize, and had also deprived British women of the leadership that they felt was necessary. In line with the claims of most mainstream anti-slavery societies in Britain when confronted with the same charges, the "Ladies" endeavored to separate themselves from the broad pro-Southern gamut of British opinion and to reassure American trust in the steadfast nature of their opposition to the hated regime.

Stowe's address and the issue of the Emancipation Proclamation with which it coincided, signaled a turning point in British involvement in the American conflict. Other tracts published by women, most of which focused on the dehumanizing impact of slavery on slave and master alike, gave impetus to this about face. Of these, Francis Ann Kemble's Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839 caused the most stir. Kemble, a popular British actress, had married a prosperous Philadelphian plantation owner, Pierce Mease Butler. Butler's rice plantations in Darien, Georgia, employed over 700 slaves. Kemble, however, only discovered the source of her husband's wealth after her wedding. This revelation and her subsequent visit to her husband's Georgia plantations in 1838 and 1839 precipitated a protracted and bitter divorce and child custody contest,
resolved in 1849, and the publication in 1863 of the journals she wrote while in residence at the plantations.\textsuperscript{18}

These journals became essential reading for any dyed-in-the-wool Atlantic abolitionist. Her diary concentrated particularly on the human suffering of slaves and emotive events such as family separation, squalid living conditions, punishment, and wrenching death scenes in what passed for the medical facilities on the plantation. In particular, however, Kemble vividly portrayed the condition of female slaves and it was this focus on women that proved important on many different levels to the abolitionist and freedmen's campaign. Firstly, it earned Kemble a reputation as an expert on the issue of female slavery and her journal was used as evidence in the American Freedmen's Inquiry Commission's investigation into slavery. The report of the commission eventually led to the chartering of the Freedmen's Bureau.\textsuperscript{19} Secondly, Kemble's bold and uncompromising confessions elevated her to the status of role model for women on both sides of the Atlantic. Her most public and avowed influence was upon Elizabeth Cady Stanton who called upon American women to emulate Kemble's example, and subsequently formed the Women's National Loyal League, a female antislavery society, in May 1863.\textsuperscript{20}

Within the United Kingdom, the most effective female American advocate was Sarah Remond. Sarah, along with her brother Charles, were lecturing agents for the American Anti-
Slavery Society and lectured almost exclusively in the western states before the mid 1850's. However, in 1858 Sarah departed for Britain, as a sometime agent for the American Antislavery Society. During the early 1860's, Remond worked closely with the London Emancipation Society, the major British society still working to abolish American slavery. Her impeccable references from prominent American abolitionists such as Parker Pillsbury and William Lloyd Garrison gained her an entry into British reform society and as a result she shared, and was welcomed on, the platform with some of Britain's foremost abolitionists.

During her sojourn in Britain her foremost patron was Mrs. Anne Taylor, the wife of one of Britain's foremost Liberal M.P.'s and a woman who herself fervently embraced many of the popular liberal concerns of the day. Anne Taylor introduced Remond to her wide circle of friends and contacts and, as a result, Sarah was seen at the most important social and political occasions in London where she proved to be an intelligent and engaging participant. Her lecturing engagements too were always well attended and popular occasions and she raised significant sums for the American Anti-Slavery Society. Remond was particularly effective as an "honest" narrator of the injustices of slavery. Indeed, a member of the Bristol abolitionists wrote:

I doubt whether we ever had amongst us a more efficient pleader for the Cause. Miss Remond's identification by complexion with those for whom
she appeals, and being herself a victim of the cruel prejudice against color, especially qualify her for this work. 45

This "identification by complexion" confused some Britons into presupposing that Remond was also an ex-slave which speaks perhaps to either ignorance, prejudice, or, more charitably, perhaps the familiarity which Britons had with fugitive slaves in Britain. Despite these misunderstandings—or perhaps because of them—Remond made headlines in Britain, eulogized as a Joan of Arc figure, a soubriquet that interestingly was later resurrected to describe another African-American champion of the cause, Ida B. Wells Barnett.

The entreaties of Stowe, Kemble, and Remond did not derive their appeal merely from race, however. The common denominator which set their pleas apart from other abolitionist appeals was their descriptions of the plight of female slaves. "Women are the worst victims of the slave power," Remond claimed in an appeal to the women of Manchester. 46 Kemble agreed: "In considering the whole condition of the people on this plantation," she wrote of her husband's rice plantations in Georgia, "it appears to me that the principal hardships fall to the lot of the women." 47 In their appeals to both Britons and Americans the female activists graphically sought to prove such an assertion. Kemble and Remond, like other abolitionists, described in stark terms the manner in which slaves were captured, sold, worked, raised their children, and died. But the fact that
their subjects were predominantly women set them apart from other activists and provoked greater outrage especially among women. British and American abolitionists alike responded with greatest outrage to the exploitation of pregnant women and mothers, who, according to Kemble, were expected to perform field work as if they were young hearty girls of fifteen instead of women who had delivered six or seven babies. Images of women forced to perform backbreaking hoeing, pregnant women burning stubble, families rendered asunder by thoughtless Southern planters in the name of profit, and women whose backs were broken by work and constant childbearing lingered long in the minds of British women.

These female abolitionists also focused on subjects that male abolitionists were wary of touching. Remond and Kemble, in particular, drew British women's attention by their references to the sexual exploitation of black women. Both attempted to draw women's attention to the operation of a sexual double standard in the South as an example of the general hypocrisy inherent in the Southern plantation system. Despite popular prejudices that asserted African-Americans were inferior in every manner, Kemble recorded:

this very disagreeable peculiarity does not prevent Southern women from hanging their infants at the breast of negresses, nor almost every planter's wife and daughter from having one or more little pet blacks bleeting like puppy-dogs in their very bedchamber, nor almost every planter
from admitting one or several of his female slaves to the still closer intimacy of his bed.  

Moreover, Kemble pointed out the inherent hypocrisy of the planters themselves in the regard to miscegenation:

> Mr— speaks as if there were a natural repugnance in all whites to any alliance with the black race; and yet it is notorious, that almost every Southern planter has a family more or less numerous of illegitimate colored children. Most certainly, few people would like to assert that such connections are formed because it is the interest of these planters to increase the number of their human property. That such connections exist commonly is a sufficient proof that they are not abhorrent to nature.

Moreover, Kemble's stories of women who fled or were punished for resisting the sexual overtures of their masters sought to dispel the Southern myth that black women were willing participants in such liaisons. Such stories of sexual exploitation were made all the more stark by the fact that such abuse was recognized and tolerated by Kemble's own husband, the plantation owner. Through their descriptions of the large mulatto population in the South both Kemble and Remond brought home to the Atlantic community of women the impact that slavery had upon the sexual vulnerability of women.

Kemble's recollections of life on her husband's plantation particularly resonated with women on both sides of the Atlantic and indeed, when the volume was published, abolitionists publicized it as a work specifically targeted
at female sympathizers.\textsuperscript{34} Women found many things to identify with in both Kemble's work and life. Kemble's involvement with the women on the Georgia plantation led her to a bifurcated view of herself and her relations to her female slaves. This bifurcated view grew largely out of the guilt that dogged Kemble as a privileged white woman and wife of a slave owner:

What piteous existences, to be sure! I do wonder, as I walk among them, well fed, well clothed, young, strong, idle, doing nothing but ride and drive about all day, a woman, a creature like themselves, who have borne children too, what sort of feeling they have toward me. I wonder it is not one of murderous hate— that they should lie here almost dying with unrepaired labor for me.\textsuperscript{35}

Kemble was thus acutely aware that her class not only insulated her from the sort of abuse that black female slaves suffered but that it also made her actively complicit in it, and it was this sense of guilt that was undoubtedly shared by many women within the Atlantic community. On the one hand then, this abuse divided black and white women into victims and perpetrators.

On the other hand, these experiences also led women to claim sorority with black slaves. Kemble was also cognizant of some shared sisterhood between herself and her slaves. "I had to cry out for them, for us," she expostulated at a point in her journal where the plight of the Butler plantation female slaves was beyond forbearance.\textsuperscript{36} Through her failure to persuade her husband to address the complaints of his
slaves and her own inability to intercede more actively on their behalf, Kemble realized what tied her and her black female slaves together. Male authority denied women a voice in either case—the refusal of Pierce Butler to hear the grievances of his charges and his refusal to listen to his wife's pleading on their behalf.

This shared impotency in the face of male authority was a theme also developed in stark terms by Sarah Remond on her lecture tours. Black female slaves, she asserted, could not "protect themselves from the licentiousness which met them on every hand" and "could not protect their honour from the tyrant."37 Faced both with a lack of regard for "womanhood" and with a Southern population, as Remond put it, "as low in the scale of morals as it was possible to conceive," women were helpless victims of male slaveholding oppression.38 Kemble's experiences showed British women, if they did not already know, that male authority was the bane of white women's existence as well. Kemble's husband exercised his male bailiwick and denied Kemble permission to publish her journal or any antislavery tract. The publication of Kemble's *Journal* was thus not only a call for the abolition of slavery and the emancipation of black women but it also stood as a symbolic call for white women's liberation. Elizabeth Cady Stanton viewed it as such in her attempts to forge antislavery organizations with an avowedly feminist perspective during the Civil War.
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Remond echoed this belief in common sisterhood through her appeals to British women:

If English women and English wives knew the unspeakable horrors to which their sex were exposed on southern plantations, they would freight every westward gale with the voice of their moral indignation, and demand for the black woman the protection and rights enjoyed by the whites.33

Remond's attempts to enlighten British women on the true condition of female slaves achieved the ends she desired. But, in contrast to Shirley Yee's assertion that Remond believed that the sexual and reproductive exploitation of slave women is what set them apart from white women, British women do seem to have seen in her and Kemble's descriptions of such exploitation a point of comparison. Such comparisons motivated their sympathies and encouraged British abolitionists, such as Mrs. Walter Ashton of Warrington, to feel "proud" to acknowledge Remond "as a sister."40

Claims that British women should deliver aid to American female slaves on the grounds of sisterhood were used not only by women. The male-dominated Freedmen's Aid Society of Great Britain in 1865, for example, reminded British women of the Stafford House Address of a decade before and the response of American women to it as proof of the sororal link between white and black women as well as the duty of British women to continue their efforts on behalf of their newly freed sisters:
Women of England! Only a few years have elapsed since you transmitted an address to your American sisters signed by half a million names, from the most exalted ladies of the land to the humblest cottager. This address called upon American women to use their utmost influence to terminate slavery, with its cruelty, injustice, and crime. They have nobly responded to your call. They have given up their fathers, their sons, and their husbands to fight the battle of liberty, and the slave is free! You are now called upon to render that liberty a blessing. You cannot turn a deaf ear to this appeal. You dare not. As you pleaded for the liberty of your sisters in slavery, you are now pledged for their elevation.

Invoking the ties of "sisterhood" to promote aid to freed slaves was problematic, however. Sisterhood implied a commonality of values, shared ideas, and mutually agreed upon standards. However, the drawing-rooms of "Buckingham Villas" in metropolitan Bristol, or the elegant parlors of "Stall Street" in regal Bath were a world away from the mosquito-infested squalid backwater dwellings of Darien, Georgia, or the tobacco plantations of Kentucky. How were the products of these environments able to fuse a common identity?

The answer was that, on the one hand the fusion of a common identity was one-sided. It was the result of the efforts of the white, largely middle-class, cadre of antislavery women to "uplift" female slaves and freedwomen to a standard they themselves had constructed. The Rochester Ladies Anti-Slavery Society, for example, in its appeal for British women's aid, argued that among other things that freedwomen needed were to be taught "womanly virtue...and
desirable habits...Christian graces...and social virtues." Such attributes were benchmarks of middle-class white standards of womanhood. They reflected the nineteenth century conception that women be above all "nurturing mothers and gentle companions and housekeepers for their husbands." This simplistic portrait belies the myriad tasks that women had to perform to live up to that job description.

The realities that lay behind such expectations were manifestly reflected in Kemble's narrative of slave life on her husband's plantations and what was necessary to improve the lot of female slaves. Although Kemble recognized at some level that slavery was the root cause of slaves' conditions—from poor clothing, to inadequate housing and hygiene, to child-rearing and leisure habits, this could not always restrain her upbringing and heritage from precipitating her exasperation at the slave's ignorance of "polite" behavior and "accepted" social standards. For example, despite the exertions of long days of manual labor and habitual punishment, both of which were manifest to Kemble and horrified her, she endeavored constantly to persuade her "charges" to live up to "accepted" standards of behavior and conduct. On returning to the house after an agonizing morning spent comforting women whose infirmities were the result of punishment, inadequate nutrition, long days of back-breaking labor, and multiple births and miscarriages in
what passed for the plantation's infirmary, Kemble could not
help but chasti[e] young girls on the plantation for playing
loudly and "romping with each other, laughing and shouting
like wild things" and wasting their time in "idle riot"
instead of tidying their quarters. "[I] told them that it
was a shame for any woman to live in so dirty a place and so
beastly a condition:"

They said they had seen buckree (white) women's
houses just as dirty, and they could not be
expected to be cleaner than white women. I then
told them that the only difference between
themselves and buckree women was, that the latter
were generally better informed, and, for that
reason alone, it was more disgraceful for them to
be disorderly and dirty."

Kemble's constant complaints about the "idleness" of female
slaves when not at work reflects the typical Victorian
middle-class stress on sobriety and hard-work, staples of the
prevailing white notions of fit behavior for women. It is
not surprising, therefore, that the female slave with whom
Kemble most identified was a young mother called Psyche,
whose chief virtue Kemble remarked was in keeping her two
children as "clean and tidy...as herself."

Even black female abolitionists were subject to the
desire on the part of both American and British female
abolitionists to preserve standards of womanhood. The
American Anti-Slavery Society, for example, always took great
pains in its testimonials of Sarah Remond to mention her
"ladylike" appearance and conduct. The anti-slavery press
of Britain too, stressed the very "feminine" nature of Remond.48

Psyche, however, illustrated for Kemble and other British observers precisely the common ground upon which black and white women could stand. That Psyche and her children were to be sold away at the whim of Pierce Butler paralleled Kemble's own impotency as a married woman subject to the authority of her husband. Faced with the possible break-up of Psyche's family, Kemble rued the fact that if only she had not married, she could have purchased their freedom from the proceeds of her own career.49 However, subject to her husband's authority, just as Psyche was, Kemble was unable to do this. This is what bound black slaves and white antislavery women together, at least in the minds of white activists. Moreover, black activists, such as Remond, and later activists like Wells and Frances Harper, realized that to be accepted as legitimate advocates in British society, one had to not only "play the part" but convince one's audience of one's full humanity.

It is irrefutable that, within certain circles of Atlantic abolitionism, the relationship between slave and white woman was, as one historian has argued, "maternalistic." In this one-sided relationship women bestowed the "blessings of freedom, Christianity, and western civilization" on enslaved sisters. This did not presuppose, however, that black female slaves were either incapable of
their own emancipation or that such action was not celebrated.\textsuperscript{50} To the contrary, tales of dramatic escapes by female slaves were stock in trade for American freedmen's advocates in Britain. Moreover, those who were taking their own salvation into their own hands, as we have seen, were always the most sought after and widely supported emissaries in Britain. Ellen Craft, sometime advocate in Britain, flaunting gender and racial norms, had fled slavery disguised as the white master of her husband, and as a result was a favorite with the British. The public flocked to Remond's lectures in part due to her stirring tales of daring female flights to freedom as typified by Margaret Garner and her family who fled from Kentucky to Cincinnati.\textsuperscript{51} Another Cincinnati bound escapee, Liza, in \textit{Uncle Tom's Cabin}, became a popular icon in Britain. African-American female slaves who took their own salvation into their own hands were thus lionized by British women. This popularity does not deserve to be dismissed as merely the obvious result of the Victorian appreciation for sentimental literature. Rather some women undoubtedly saw in their own unilateral efforts to address the problems of female slaves a less dramatic way of exercising a limited degree of autonomy.

In the same way British women were wowed by the efforts of free women like Remond who were articulate, strong, and independently minded and who, through their actions, represented the emerging "new woman" of late nineteenth
century feminism. Remond had always combined her anti-slavery activism with feminism. From being a delegate to the National Women's Rights Convention in 1858 in the United States, to her studies at Bedford College for Ladies in England, to her medical training as a physician in Florence, Italy, Remond's life could have been a template for lives of the new feminists of the late nineteenth century.

The belief in sisterhood on the part of many British female activists was also important in focusing at least a portion of the British movement's interest on women. Male dominated national societies tended to portray the slave or the ex-slave in male terms. The most popular imagery of the day, for example, in Atlantic abolitionist culture, depicted a male figure, chained, kneeling hands raised in supplication, pleading to the white community, "Am I not a Man and a brother?" Even in appealing to women to aid their counterparts in bondage, societies habitually used rhetoric that depicted the object of such aid as male.

Female abolitionists within their own societies or auxiliaries of male societies changed this picture, feminized the supplicant, and brought female slaves to the front and center of their efforts. While the male dominated executives of the national freedmen's aid societies concentrated on improving the lot of the generic slave or freed-man, women's committees focused more upon the plight of women and children.
Indeed, during the 1860's it was women who emerged as the staunchest supporters of the freedmen and women of the American South. Historically women's organizations, rather than men's, had always been concerned with more than the mere abolition of slavery. Such groups had also devoted a great deal of time and energy to providing general relief as well as educational and spiritual aid to African-Americans. In the wake of the Civil War such groups, enmeshed as they were in the web of British evangelicalism, viewed their mission as unchanged: to elevate the unfortunate through financial, moral, and religious means.

Men's organizations, on the other hand, who were less accustomed to supplying such aid, many times simply disbanded or turned the full force of their attention to fighting the institution of slavery elsewhere. Moreover, the tardiness with which male organizations turned to freedmen's aid was a reflection of the gendered character of charity. In some quarters activities associated with rendering aid to the freedmen were not "manly." Thus women's abolitionist organizations, most notably in Birmingham, Bristol, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, did not disband but merely refocused their activities on what had always been an integral part of their endeavors: relief. Women's societies were, therefore, the first British organizations to respond to the needs of the freedmen. New British women's organizations were also born, most notably the Ladies' London Emancipation Society.
which was founded in March 1863 and had over 200 members nationwide.\textsuperscript{55} Eliza Wigham, who became secretary of this society, paid a major role in re-injecting vigor into the British movement. It was the publication of her history of anti-slavery in the United States, in 1863, that helped to remind Britons of the debt of support that they owed their American counterparts.\textsuperscript{56} Moreover, it was British women who prompted the establishment of the first national British freedmen's aid society.\textsuperscript{57}

Gradually, however, the formation of new national, male-led organizations overshadowed the activities of the female-led and-staffed societies. In 1865, for example, the newly formed Freedmen's Aid Society called upon British women to rally to the cause as though they had been idle for the last decade instead of being at the vanguard of the freedmen's aid movement!\textsuperscript{58} But although, once again, women were not permitted to share in the executive activities of any of the new freedmen's aid societies such as the Birmingham and Midland, the LES, NFAU, or the BAFFAS, they nevertheless played a critical role in the maintenance and success of such organizations.

Women's committees were established on all of the major freedmen's aid societies and while the male dominated executive committees of the national organizations concentrated on planning and overall strategy, women's committees did the leg work. While the executive committees
engaged nationally known speakers and sponsored tours by fellow American reformers, women's committees trolled churches, bazaars, and the streets raising funds for the freedmen. To promote support, women utilized similar methods to those they had adopted during the ante-bellum anti-slavery crusade. Women sponsored clothing drives, they threw bazaars, and organized sewing circles. Bazaars, although not as widespread as in the anti-bellum years, were still a fruitful source of cash and those held in Harrogate, Manchester, and Birmingham raised over three hundred pounds for the freedmen despite the male led BFASS reporting to Douglass that plans for such events were being canceled for lack of interest. Sewing circles appeared nationwide with over 100 operating in Bristol alone by the conclusion of 1865.

Women organized clothing drives in almost every major metropolitan area. Bristol was sending over ten thousand garments per month to the South by the end of 1865. The value of women in such efforts is evident upon examining the receipts of British freedmen's aid societies during the 1860's and 1870's. The receipts of the FMAS for November and December 1865, for example, reveal that of the seventy two fund-raising secretaries, fifty were women. Receipts from American societies reveal similar patterns. American Missionary Association receipts from Great Britain during the 1860's regularly reveal that much of the estimated twenty
thousand pounds channeled to that society from British donors was collected or contributed by women. In addition, of the individual personal donations—contributions ranging from one pound to fifty, no less than two-thirds came from single British women. This perhaps suggests that some British women had had at least internalized the intrinsic link in Kemble's sentiment that "a great means of good" could result from not being legally dependent upon a male partner.

As well as providing immediate relief for freedmen and women, British women's committees were also the first to provide actively for the long-term security of ex-slaves. Already by 1863 female antislavery activists in Britain were soliciting donations for the education of freedmen. This grew out of British women's long support of education for African women and girls. As far back as 1833 British Ladies' organizations had decided to turn their attention towards education after slavery in the British Empire was abolished. Thus it was a natural progression for many women to support American freedmen's education upon emancipation on the United States.

Within women's groups as opposed to men's organizations, therefore, there was much more continuity both of approach and effort in regard to black slaves. Thus, it is not surprising that when the major British and American freedmen's aid societies were disbanding in the late 1860's women's organizations continued. For example, the Bristol
and Clifton Ladies Emancipation Society continued to raise funds for American freedmen into the 1890's and the Birmingham Ladies' Association remained active in freedmen's affairs until 1919 when it finally disbanded. Outside of the BFASS and the APS, the Birmingham Ladies' Association was the longest lived institution of the Atlantic abolitionist movement.

These continuities continued to influence a new generation of women's attitudes to the American freedmen into the last two decades of the nineteenth century. In particular, women's interest in female servitude and the freedwoman brought the issue of sexual exploitation of women to the forefront of public consciousness. In the 1870's many abolitionist organizations in Britain translated this concern into campaigns against the white female slave trade and the Contagious Diseases Act. Such issues also remained active concerns within the Atlantic freedmen's community. Although the community was much reduced, issues of sexuality and women's expression of it reemerged in the 1880's and 1890's and revived British involvement in the cause of Civil Rights in the American South.

A Continuing Concern: The Survival of Women's Activism.

Interest among British women in the freedmen's future showed renewed signs of vitality into the 1880's and 1890's and it
was in the final two decades of the nineteenth century that the cause of African-American freedmen moved from the periphery of British interest once again. British women's support and American women's activism were crucial in reinvigorating British interest in the freedman's cause.

Central to the British effort to sustain support for African-American freedmen and women in the last two decades of the nineteenth century was "The Society for the Recognition of the Brotherhood of Man." (SRBM). Formed in 1888 this society's self-proclaimed interest was to "the interests of colored races." Although precise membership figures are hard to calculate, the organization had branch auxiliaries in cities that were traditional centers of activism in the freedmen's cause, namely: Edinburgh, Glasgow, Bristol, and Birmingham. Membership figures never revealed the extent of the success of the abolitionist movement anyway. As with many abolitionist and freedmen's organizations in whose steps the SRBM trod, the society's aim was to encourage widespread public support for the cause and not official membership in the society. Nevertheless, at its height the SRBM was distributing 10,000 copies of its newsletter in Britain and in the U.S. which is one indication of its reach, if not its appeal.

The SRBM also illustrates the continuing importance of women to the Atlantic movement. Instrumental in the foundation of the SRBM were the Edinburgh and Darlington
clique of female abolitionists, most notably Eliza Wigham, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, and Mary Estlin. All of these women had a long antislavery heritage. Indeed contemporaries lionized Wigham and Estlin as the "two main props of the anti-slavery enterprise in Great Britain." Wigham and Estlin in particular were archetypes of the radical women active in the abolitionist crusade who were still loyal to the cause into the latter nineteenth century.

Both women shared similar family backgrounds, emanating from the small cadre of families that had dominated the modest but vocal Garrisonian movement in Britain. Both also had a long antislavery lineage. Eliza Wigham (1820-1899) of the Edinburgh Emancipation Society was the daughter of a staunch Quaker family and had been brought up amid an atmosphere of general social activism. Her father, John Wigham III, was a minister for the Society of Friends, a supporter of a wide variety of philanthropic and benevolent causes, and an active member of the network of trans-Atlantic Quaker anti-slavery families. Her stepmother was a member of the famed antislavery Smeal family of Glasgow, and Secretary of the Glasgow Ladies Emancipation Society. Eliza's sister, Mary, married Joshua Edmundson of the celebrated Dublin antislavery family. Another branch of the Wigham family married into the Richardson clan, also longtime activists in the antislavery crusade. Mary Estlin (1820-1902) also came from a proud anti-slavery heritage. The Estlin's of Bristol
had long been active in the cause. Her father, Dr. John Bishop Estlin, a noted eye surgeon, was a leading supporter of Garrison, a Unitarian who had been converted to the cause through his acquaintance with Samuel May in 1843.

Both women were also extremely strong-minded, tough individualists. Mary vigorously supported her father's own peculiar brand of Garrisonianism and was successful in promoting it throughout the west country in the face of the anti-Garrisonian national organization, the BFASS. She formed the Bristol and Clifton Ladies Anti-Slavery Society, independent of both the BFASS and indeed the American movement. She also propagandized consistently on the position of the Garrisonian movement on the question and conducted an extensive correspondence with leading American Garrisonians.

Eliza Wigham, also manifestly a woman of firm convictions, outspokenly supported the Garrisonian wing of the movement even in the face of her father's, and consequently the Edinburgh Emancipation Society's, defection to the BFASS. She was one of the first to bring publicly the British government and people to task for their tacit support of the Confederacy at the commencement of the war and was an outspoken and convincing defendant of the North. After 1863 she was at the vanguard of the campaign to increase British commitment to the freedmen. Both women were also actively engaged in causes other than freedmen's aid. Wigham was
active in the peace movement, vice-president of the Scottish Women's Christian Temperance Union, an activist in the women's rights crusade, organizer of a penny savings bank and a mothers' meeting for the poor, she also helped to run a home for destitute young girls. Wigham's activism in such causes was well known and celebrated. Her obituary, for example, recorded that "the Temperance, Peace, Women's Suffrage and every other philanthropic movement received her assistance...and to all in distress she was never a failing friend."

The SRBM was more than a new home for old abolitionist crusaders, however. The legacy of the abolitionist movement continued to live on in a new generation of female activists. Although the SRBM was replete with the names of the abolitionist crusade's brightest and best, at the organization's vanguard, and indeed the founding members of the society, were two young women who were hardly old enough to have participated in the abolitionist crusade: Catherine Impey, founder and later Secretary of the SRBM and editor of its newsletter, and Elizabeth Fyvie Mayo.

Impey and Mayo were typical of the second generation of women who spearheaded the Atlantic campaign into a new era: women not active in Atlantic ante-bellum abolitionism but nonetheless tied to it through blood and heritage, fervently interested in the cause of all humanity and not the narrow interests of a single class, race, or gender, and
internationalist in perspective. Both women sprung from staunch Garrisonian families. Catherine Impey (1847-1923) was a Quaker who remained single and devoted her life to many philanthropic causes including urban reform, suffrage, and temperance. Her introduction to the racial problems of the Gilded Age American South was archetypical for a late Victorian Briton. In 1878 she visited Boston as a delegate to the International Conference of the Temperance Order of Good Templars and it is here that unnamed American freedmen's activists introduced her to an issue that was to become her life's work.

In 1888 Impey translated this concern into an organized movement: the SRBM. The central goal of this organization, as she later stated it, was to investigate the problems of caste worldwide:

We hope, little by little to give some insight into the evils of Caste as it prevails in countries where our white race habitually ostracizes those who are even partially descended from darker races;...It is pitiful to see how by this system of caste the careers of many of our fellow creatures are straitened, their civilization and growth in civilization checked, their most honorable aspirations thwarted, their liberties in a thousand ways abridged...It is our belief that all arbitrary distinctions based on differences of social rank, are 'contrary to the mind of Christ'... We are never to lose sight of the man himself, our brother, who dwells within, and whom if we would do him justice, 'we must measure not by his flesh but by his life.'

To combat this problem the organization relied largely on the tried and trusted methods of the old abolitionist movement:
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to publicize the injustices perpetrated upon Africans and to provide a platform, particularly for black authors and activists, to present their claim to the white public. Their case would be directed to the white and largely already sympathetic public of Britain but it was felt that using the traditional arena of trans-Atlantic culture, the myriad of organizations that stretched their organizational tentacles across "The Pond", that awareness could be foisted upon and be brought to bear upon a recalcitrant white public overseas.\(^2\)

Although the "Brotherhood of Man" was an all encompassing term—indeed it also meant that women should not be discriminated against on the grounds of their sex—and the SRBM was avowedly committed to pursuing the course of black freedom everywhere, it was acknowledged from the outset that the American racial situation would be afforded the most scrutiny. "To our thinking" Catherine Impey wrote, "caste is nowhere more conspicuously--more painfully--out of harmony with the spirit of the age than in America."\(^3\) Undoubtedly this was due to Impey's introduction to the realities of African-American life on her visit to Boston, and indeed the general antislavery climate in which she had been raised. But this belief also was also due to the influence of Frederick Douglass, in Briton's minds perhaps the most famous abolitionist. Impey, indeed, seems to have revered Douglass, and clearly felt that he had given Britons a special mission
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to aid the cause of racial justice. Impey was fond, for example, of quoting Douglass's disarming comments about the lack of racism in Britain, emanating from his first tour of the island in 1847:

Everything is so different here from what I have been accustomed to in the United States. No insults to encounter—no prejudice to encounter, but all is smooth—I am treated as a man and equal brother. My color instead of being a barrier to social equality—is not thought of as such.  

Douglass was held in high regard particularly north of the English border. The "Lion of Scotland", as he was affectionately and proudly nicknamed, retained connections with the major Scottish abolitionist and freedmen's aid societies throughout his life and he even considered settling permanently in Edinburgh. Douglass was a personal friend of Catherine Impey who visited the old reformer in 1890. That meeting had a profound impact upon the revival of organized support for emancipated African-Americans. In particular it was his credo that man should treat each man with universal "broadness" and "levelness" exercising no "personal preferences" on the grounds of race, that the SRBM most fervently embraced.  

The belief in "broadness" translated into a wide organizational base for the SRBM. From its inception the society was firmly grounded in the Atlantic community. Moreover, this was a community not just of "racial specialists" but of representatives from the whole gamut of
trans-Atlantic causes, from churchmen, to missionaries, to temperance activists, to suffragists, to advocates of the numerous other benevolent causes that were so popular on both sides of the Atlantic in the late nineteenth century. Furthermore, the organization's desire to encourage both Euro and African-American supporters to patronize their organization complemented this "broadness." In 1888, for example, the SRBM counted among its American associates numerous representatives from the American abolitionist community including William Wells Brown and Henry Highland Garnet, prominent African-American businessmen, members of the black press such as T. Thomas Fortune, and scholars like Professor J.P. Shorter of Wilberforce University. In addition the organization had special ties to the African Methodist Episcopal Church--Rev. Benjamin T. Tanner, editor of the A.M.E Church Review, Rev. B. F. Lee, editor of the Christian Recorder and pastor in the A.M.E Church, Rev. James N. Townsend, Traveling Secretary of the Foreign Missions of the A.M.E Church, as well as Bishops J. J. Moore and J. Hood—were all regular visitors to Britain under the auspices of the organization. 76

Added to this the SRBM also had special ties with women's and temperance organizations through Frances Harper, the National Superintendent of Colored Work of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and through Fanny Jackson-Coppin, the President of the Institute of Colored Youth in
Philadelphia. The organization's integration in the Atlantic reform community even extended down to the local church level. In addition, the SRBM counted within its membership visible British members of the Atlantic reform community: Mary Carpenter, Josephine Butler, Mary Priestman, Margaret Tanner and Helen Bright Clark were all founder members of the SRBM.  

The presence of these doyens of the British reform movement in the SRBM highlights the confluence of race reform with other reform activities in Britain after the Civil War. Josephine Butler, Margaret Tanner, Mary Priestman, and Helen Bright Clark were all active in the movement to repeal the Contagious Diseases Act and members of the Ladies National Association. Mary Carpenter was a noted penal reformer. Indeed, many women of the SRBM had myriad reformist loyalties which they brought, or through which they were brought, to the freedmen's cause. Josephine Butler, for example, although best known for her work in the anti-prostitution campaign and her establishment of the Ladies' National Association (LNA), received her philanthropic zeal from her anti-slavery heritage. Butler's father was John Grey, a leading liberal politician and strong supporter of the anti-slavery movement. Other members of the SRBM who had heretofore had primarily identified themselves as abolitionists--such as Elizabeth Pease Nichol, Mary Estlin, and Eliza Wigham--also became members of the LNA, in addition
to the suffrage, and women's education movements after the war. Indeed the abolitionist movement had a great impact on the LNA. Josephine Butler was fond of quoting Garrison's dictum that "when the necessary revolution in the minds of the people is completed, that in the institutions of the country will follow as the day follows the night." And the hotbeds of LNA support were Bristol and London, two of the strongest organizing areas for women's anti-slavery.  

This "broadness" served many purposes. Like all organizations the SRBM understood the value of name and anxiously sought to attract the most prominent members of the Atlantic reform community to its ranks. More than the cachet that famous reformers gave the SRBM, these activists served as an entre into other reform movements. Despite a surviving baseline of enthusiasm for freedmen's aid in Britain, the SRBM and other organizations knew that the golden days of antislavery were over. Circumstances had always forced abolitionist organizations to seek coalitions across reform boundaries and in the 1880's such alliances were ever more important to both the survival of racial organizations and for the prospect of keeping American racial problems constantly in the public eye. Leading reformers who put their name to SRBM testimonials, were doing more than lending prestige. Butler and company were active members of the organization, contributing funds, loaning time and talent to the furtherance of racial justice. They also placed the
SRBM's goals on the agenda of their primary causes and thus injected matters of race into discussions of drinking, prostitution, and the like especially when the racial credentials of their American sister organizations were called into question. In particular, this "broadness" it was hoped would help to mobilize white American women in the cause of racial reform, a deficiency that English women found seriously lacking:

What strikes me as a serious lack in the defence of the negro in America is that among the whites no woman as yet appears. Until some brave women take up again the cause of liberty and humanity, like the heroic band who were the strength of the anti-slavery movement, we shall not be able to feel that the cause has yet entered the hearts and homes of the people.  

Finally, American contacts provided British activists with information about all aspects of the African-American community. From the business arena, to the university, to the local Southern black community, the SRBM had come to appreciate the realities of life in Jim Crow America. The activities and public pronouncements of the SRBM illustrate that the organization had a clearer and better informed picture of the racial status quo in the United States than historians have given British organizations credit for.

Besides relying upon Americans to furnish the organization with information, the SRBM itself also sponsored large-scale "fact-finding" tours of the United States and encouraged readers who had visited the country to report
their observations through the medium of the society's newspaper. In this way the society received a multidimensional picture of life in America. Most articles described and deplored the atrocious racial situation in the South and the most manifest injustices of the ever intensifying Jim Crow system. Mary Ann Allen, the widow of the famous Dublin abolitionist Richard Allen, described vividly her stay in the South and the discrimination accorded to her as a white advocate of African-American rights. Stephen Storey, M.P. for Sunderland, described the discrimination in the public transportation system in the South, while Anna Gardener, an English Anti-Slavery worker in the United States, wrote of the gradual disfranchisement of African-Americans.

These fact-finding missions confirmed the establishment of a Jim Crow South, which as one observer commented were "only to be expected". But they also vividly described for the first time in Britain the system of caste as it existed in the North. John Stuart, editor of the Isle of Wight Express traveled to the United States in 1886 and went no further south than Washington, D.C. and no further west than Detroit yet, he claimed, noted discrimination in every aspect of life. In particular, he was struck how no black citizen was registered in any of the Quaker hotels in all the cities he visited.
The SRBM realized early on that the race question was not just a southern question, but rather that it was an "American" question. Many of those who visited the United States further commented that even normally liberal Englishmen and women who visited the country soon had their thinking corrupted or "Americanized". Hannah Joseph Sturge, President of the Birmingham Ladies' Negro's Friends Society and a frequent visitor to the United States, commented that whether they visited North or South:

European tourists and others visiting America and other parts, catch the habit of thinking and speaking with contempt of this gentle and interesting and kindly national people. 86

The SRBM was particularly anxious to disseminate this knowledge among the wider British public and thus to undermine the strangle-hold that the American white press had upon public and press perceptions within the British Isles. On several occasions editorials and letters that appeared in the organ's journal were picked up and published in national newspapers. In 1889 the conservative London Daily News published a short article that asserted that "negro social difficulty in the Southern States is almost at a vanishing point." 87 Impey wrote to the Manchester Guardian to refute this state of affairs at great length. The SRBM's concern in this case did more than merely bring attention to the agenda of a fringe group: it had a concrete impact upon the dissemination of knowledge among Britons regarding the caste
system in America. By July 23, 1889 the Daily News was reporting widely upon discrimination against African-Americans not only in the South but in the North.

Publicizing the injustices of the American caste system was but one goal of the SRBM. Like abolitionists before them, the SRBM remained convinced of the value of the emotional support to those suffering oppression in the United States. One of the purposes of the organization, Impey wrote in 1888, was:

> to awaken in the breasts of others some of that aching sense of wounded love that should stir a brother's or a sister's heart, in view of the shameless cruelty under which the most defenceless of God's family on earth are being helplessly crushed. Our money they do not need, though they are poor, nor our patronage, nor cheap condescension. The one great cure for their present ills is the warm outpouring of love - full brotherly love, and that just and fair spirit of neighbourliness, which shall with hearty goodwill give place to them according to merit.

With hindsight, Impey's words seem to smack of the crass sentimentalism that inundated late Victorian Britain, a sentimentalism that superficially seemed to emphasize the impotence of African-Americans in the face of oppression. The SRBM's apparent sentimentality, however, was merely the natural manifestation of a literary form prevalent in late Victorian society and not merely another indication of British paternalism. Correspondence from African-Americans inundated the SRBM thus underscoring the importance of this seemingly trite emotionalism. Dr. Nathan F. Mossell of
Philadelphia, for example, wrote on behalf of his community that:

Your paper, Anti-Caste, has given me great comfort. We are a hopeful people, but, at this present writing, after a winter of butchery in the solid south with an indifferent north, we feel like giving up hope in this land. May God bless you in the good work."

The SRBM's efforts were most heartily endorsed by their greatest supporter, Frederick Douglass. Douglass had backed the organization from its inception, giving it his official and public blessing by actively aiding in its fund-raising drives, providing capital for the publication of its journal, Anti-Caste, and through disseminating copies of it throughout the United States. Douglass remained convinced that it was necessary to bring outside moral pressure to bear upon the American government and society as whole. "Anything you can do" he wrote to Impey:

to expose this foul spirit and enlighten the moral sentiment of your countrymen on this subject excites our gratitude and increases our hopes of a better future."

As a slave, he claimed, he knew firsthand how encouraging and essential to the spirit of the oppressed the work of outsiders was. In 1841 he recalled that his first awareness of the anti-slavery movement as a slave came from reading about Adams' petition to end slavery in Washington D.C. This, he alleged, gave him hope and spurred him to action.
(peaceful, of course) and such knowledge led to the activism of other slaves.  

Indeed, it was Douglass of all Euro- and African-American activists, who exerted the greatest influence over the SRBM. And in adopting Douglass's credo, the SRBM proved that it had moved beyond the paternalism that had characterized so many Atlantic abolitionist organizations. The SRBM made a head on attack on the system of caste in the United States, both North and South, and in all aspects of society. The SRBM, for example, adopted Douglass's stance upon segregation and the importance of education. The organization raised and contributed funds for all types of education, industrial and liberal arts alike, and argued against both forced and voluntary segregation in such institutes and across the board. "No race was ever advanced by the route of isolation" declared the SRBM in arguing against the viability of black only clubs. The SRBM, like Douglass, was especially scornful of those very organizations designed to aid African-Americans in which not a single African-American man or woman was employed and was equally derisive of similar organizations who employed African-Americans merely as assistants. Most importantly the SRBM actually attempted to distance itself from factions of its own antislavery heritage by attacking Atlantic abolitionists who had not involved the slave and then the freedman in discussions and actions related to his own life and
liberation. The most eminent of these attacks came in 1890 when the SRBM publicly denounced Lyman Abbott and other prominent white Atlantic abolitionists who were convened at the National Anti-Slavery conference in New York to discuss the fate of American minorities. The SRBM roasted the conference for failing to invite a single representative from "minority" groups.

The SRBM did not reserve their attacks for abolitionists alone. Clearly, nothing would change if those fighting for African-American equal rights did not set an example by integrating their organizations but change was required across the board. Members of the SRBM fought for racial inclusiveness in all of the multitudinous reform groups in which they were involved. In particular, women of the SRBM made an attempt to bring the influence of the British women's movement to bear on its American counterpart by encouraging British suffragists to condemn the suffrage movement in the United States for trying to force African-American women into separate organizations. The SRBM took every opportunity it could to lead by example as well. Britons publicized the fact that their religious and social organizations made no distinction as to color. This was evident in the free mingling of American and British white Methodists and black Methodist Churches at the Pan-Methodist Conference in London held in 1895.
The SRBM never assumed that English agitation would wholly solve the problem of racial injustice, however. English agitation was merely a stop-gap measure until voices could be roused on the other side of the Atlantic. After all, British efforts had their practical limits:

The glaring scandal of society-sanctioned murders, in the eyes of the civilized world, may suffice to put down the negro-lynchings; but unless the heart of America itself be roused against its own two centuries of injustice, the injustice will only hide in the subtler forms, which the eye of the foreigner may with more difficulty penetrate.

In the late nineteenth century, the SRBM argued, there was no collective protest, "no nucleus of a movement" against the prevailing racial status quo within the United States. "If a beginning cannot be made there, it must be made in England, with a view of hastening the birth of a sound conviction and movement in America." Thus the SRBM perceived itself to be a crucial building block for the foundation of racial protest and civil rights action within America.

One area in which the SRBM felt it could achieve something tangible, however, was in the arena of racial violence and certainly the most emotive issue and the one which struck at the basic core of American morality and juxtaposed it unfavorably with supposed British morality was lynching.
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CHAPTER 8

A DOOR IN THE STONE WALL OF SILENCE: IDA B. WELLS AND THE ANTI-LYNCHING CRUSADE IN BRITAIN

The history of lynching in America predates the nineteenth century. During the Revolutionary War patriots employed it as a means by which to dispatch Tories. It was in the nineteenth century, however, that lynching reached its apogee as an unofficial but popular means of imposing law and order. Although incidents of its use could be found throughout the United States, it was most commonly utilized in rural areas of the South. There both blacks and whites became its victims. Vigilante mobs used lynching against anyone suspected of posing a threat to the Southern social fabric. But more frequently in the ante-bellum South, slave owners used lynching to prevent and to punish those engaged in slave rebellions. It was from the Civil War onwards, however, that lynching beleaguered the American South and adopted racial overtones. During the Civil War and Reconstruction, vigilante violence against blacks became an indisputable part of the Southern "counter-revolution" and by
1877 had become a part of Southern judicial and social culture.

Lynching reached its height after Reconstruction, however. Between 1880 and 1900 the Tuskegee Institute estimated that an average 188 people per year became victims of such ritualized murder. The perpetrators of these crimes acted usually with impunity and with no fear of legal retribution as popular opinion largely justified these atrocities on the grounds of lynching being just revenge for violations of "white womanhood": the raping of white women by African-American men. Southern apologists for lynching regarded the rape of a white woman as "the most terrible crime on the face of this earth." This "Southern obsession with rape" as the most heinous crime was grounded in a mix of white perceptions of appropriate sexual behavior, opposition to any attempt on the part of blacks to attain social equality, and a belief in the innate savagery of the black male. In reality, only a third of those lynched were even accused, let alone convicted, of this crime. Nevertheless, the myth became widely propagated and used in defense of such barbaric actions.

In the 1880's African-American communities at all levels in the United States responded to this increase in mob activity. At a national level civil rights leaders such as Frederick Douglass, black politicians such as Blanche K. Bruce and John Mercer Langston, as well as church leaders
such as Bishop James Alexander Shorter of the AME church, all attempted to marshal community and public opinion against the endemic problem of racial violence in the South. Some deliberately and publicly eschewed white aid but others, like Douglass, called for an interracial effort to curb racial hostility.

Those who rallied to the cause included Ida B Wells. At first an advocate of black self-help and an adherent of Fortune's attempts to address the problem of racial violence from within the black community, practical considerations persuaded Wells to convoke white aid and anger in support of anti-lynching. It was the pursuit of such assistance that led her to Britain. As a result of the British campaign Ida B. Wells became the predominant voice in the anti-lynching campaign of the 1890's as well as one of the leading figures within the nascent African-American civil rights movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

That Wells was able to use Britain as a springboard to launch herself to national prominence was, in part, a product of the authenticity of her appeal. Britons' desires to see their money well and properly spent, their fear of being conned by the unscrupulous and the counterfeit, and their preference for "the real McCoy", meant that Britons responded favorably to Wells as they had done to previous African-American campaigners. Wells also had unimpeachable credentials and had, of course, experienced the full impact
of Jim Crowism personally. Born in Holly Springs, Mississippi in 1862, Ida B Wells knew at first hand the stark inequalities of the Southern system of racial oppression and discrimination. She had been the victim of the double standard of sexuality in the South when efforts to keep her family together after the death of her parents led her to seek the aid of a wealthy white benefactor. This move merely yielded her the unkind soubriquets usually reserved for prostitutes.

Wells was also the victim of the growing system of segregation in the South. Dragged from a railroad coach for refusing to move to the designated black car, she displayed throughout the humiliating ordeal the tenacity that would be required to combat the Southern racial system head on. Well's teeth severely lacerated the conductor's hands forcing him to seek the aid of three other men to remove her from the car. Convinced that her rights had been violated, Wells stormed back to Memphis and consulted a black lawyer. At only twenty-one this was the first public demonstration of the conviction that characterized her whole life.

After establishing a reputation as a journalist and taking on a senior role at the New York Age under T. Thomas Fortune, Wells embarked upon a tumultuous full scale assault against the Southern racial system and, in particular, one odious aspect of the extra-legal methods employed to repress the black population--lynching. Personal experience, in
part, motivated her campaign. In March 1892 she received news that a mob had lynched three African-American men in Memphis. Upon closer investigation she discovered that one of the victims was a personal friend—a mail carrier, Thomas Moss. The other two victims had been Moss's business partners in a small grocery store: Colin McDowell and William Stewart. The three had been attempting to defend their grocery store from a white mob. They had been dragged from their store, tied up and shot in the head. McDowell had been treated particularly brutally: before death, his eyes had been gouged out and his face viciously mutilated. Enraged by this very personal attack, Wells published several articles dealing with the particulars of the case and with racial violence in the South in general. It is with these early pieces that Wells's career as an anti-lynching crusader blossomed.

At first she urged economic sanctions against the wider white community. But she quickly came to the conclusion that justice for the black man in Memphis was not to be had and instead she advised that African-Americans move west in search of a more sympathetic environment. Wells, too, decided to leave Memphis where, after the publication of these articles, she feared for her life. She accepted a post with the New York Age and continued her campaign under the wings of T. Thomas Fortune. Here she published a number of articles detailing the atrocities that she had witnessed.
lately in the South and reprinted them in pamphlet form. *Southern Horrors* sold 10,000 copies and marked the beginning of Wells' career as the premier anti-lynching activist.

Her campaign against lynching attracted severe criticism and smarting personal attacks from both whites and African-Americans as she threw accusations at both Northerners and Southerners, whites and blacks, and members of both parties. She saved much of her vitriol for the white press whom she deemed responsible for spreading stereotypes of the lascivious black male rapist. The consensus of the white press was thus that mob rule was only retribution for the violation of white Southern womanhood. The majority of those lynched, they claimed, had been guilty of rape. Wells rebutted that not one third had been accused of such a crime. Further, she asserted, that where sexual contact between African-American and white were an issue, these acts had been entirely consensual, an assertion totally unpalatable to the white Southern audience. Moreover, she argued, the indifference of the national government, the silence of religious groups, and the betrayal of the Republican party had all allowed mob rule to take a grip in the Southern states. The only way to shake these political and religious organizations out of their torpor, she believed, was to conduct a grass-roots campaign to arouse public sentiment. This was a belief that others within the African-American community rapidly came to share. T. Thomas Fortune and his
African-American League as well as Bishop Henry Turner and the A.M.E Equal Rights Council of 1893 also endeavored to oppose this most barbarous of injustices by appeals to the public conscience and moral suasion both within and without the South. It was Wells however, who would emerge as the foremost voice against lynching in the 1890's.

Her career, up to the point that she embarked on her first British tour, made her particularly appealing to a British audience. She answered all of the criteria that the British reform community and public sought in an advocate. She was intelligent, well-educated, articulate, strong-minded, and black. Moreover, Ida B. Wells undoubtedly capitalized on her gender. Reform movements in Britain, as in the United States, were increasingly attracting women to their ranks and women's activism in all fields of reform—not just suffrage—was expanding markedly. The late nineteenth century, contemporaries on both sides of the Atlantic claimed, was a "woman's era." Besides being active in anti-lynching, Ida B. Wells had promoted women's activism in other areas in the United States. Wells was just the sort of woman to appeal to similarly minded women in the Great Britain.

In addition, Wells was independent in that she was not affiliated with any organization in the United States. In this Wells followed in the tradition of some of the most successful African-American emissaries to Britain. Delany, Remond, the Crafts, and William Wells Brown had all eschewed
identification with a formal organization during the abolitionist period and had done very well in Britain. Undoubtedly, the most popular American advocate in Britain was Douglass whose popularity was not dented a bit—on the contrary it was positively advanced—by his public breaking with Garrisonianism. Wells' refusal to join an organization has often been cited by both activists and historians as a cause of her inability to sustain her anti-lynching campaign. In Britain, however, her institutional independence was an asset as it had been to her predecessors. As the AMA had realized, British donors did not like advocates to be shackled by institutional constraints and, indeed, many American advocates found it intolerable to be saddled with operational directives from three thousand miles away. Flexibility was a prerequisite for successful campaigning abroad. The "lonely warrior," as Thomas Holt describes her, was better placed to make friends in Britain than those who were backed by the encumbering apparatus of institution affiliation.

The evidence confirms that it was actually British initiative that led to Well's two tours in 1893 and 1894. Indeed, early in her career Wells rejected strategies to motivate the conscience of white Americans in favor of those that would hit their pocketbooks. Appeals to "the white man's pocket [have] ever been more effectual than all the appeals ever made to his conscience," she wrote. In
addition, in those early days Wells was a firm advocate of black self-help.\textsuperscript{11}

However, her British campaigns changed her mind and she came to view white aid as not necessarily antithetical to self-help. African-Americans, she later claimed, could help themselves by harnessing the support, good opinion, and moral indignation of whites abroad to use as weapons in the fight against repression at home. Moreover, by 1892 Well's campaign to stimulate American sympathy was waning and thus she seized upon an invitation to take her message abroad. In 1892 Catherine Impey and Elizabeth Fyvie Mayo approached Wells in Philadelphia where the anti-lynching activist, under the aegis of elite black club women, had embarked upon a lecture tour of the Northeastern states. Such a tour had not been a total success, however, despite support by Josephine Ruffin's newly formed Women's Era Club. Thus, the interest exhibited by Mayo and Impey provided Wells with an alternative strategy for combating northern disbelief and inaction.

The SRBM were already well aware of the prevalence of racial violence. Since 1891, the Black Women's Club of Cambridge, Massachusetts, had been faithfully mailing the society newspaper reports of racial atrocities.\textsuperscript{12} Reports in English newspapers regarding the Texas lynchings in 1888 had also elicited interest among the British public in the subject. Since then, in \textit{Anti-Caste} and other British
publications, these brutal atrocities had been graphically documented. There was, however, as in the US, a great deal of skepticism regarding the reliability of such reports. British non-conformist churches indignantly refused to believe that their American counterparts would have failed to speak out against such barbarities if there was any veracity to the rumors. Moreover, Britons, like many Americans, believed that sexual assaults on white women were the main reason for such extra-legal executions of justice and therefore, if not excusing this violation of institutionalized law and order, were at least ambivalent to it. Many Britons, Well's later wrote:

had imagined that since emancipation Negroes were in the enjoyment of all their rights. It is true they had read of lynchings and while they thought them dreadful had accepted the general belief that it was for terrible crimes perpetrated by Negro men upon white women. I read the account of that poor woman who was boxed up in the barrel into which nails had been driven and rolled down hill in Texas, and asked if that lynching could be excused on the same ground."

Impey and Mayo thus approached Wells with the intent of introducing the British public to the irrefutable facts. To Wells, after the intransigence of the American white public, especially in the north, Mayo and Impey's invitation seemed "like an open door in a stone wall." The British white press, Wells decided, would be the medium through which she would at last reach the American public.
Wells undertook two tours to England in 1893 and 1894. Her initial tour was really a tentative expedition and her contacts were almost exclusively confined to the north of England and to Scotland. Both of these areas had remained hotbeds of abolitionism and freedmen's aid from the 1830's onwards. Her second tour was more extensive and—judging by the amount of negative press she received for it in the American South, figuring, as Wells did that all press was good press for the cause—the more successful. Both tours outraged southern opinion as Wells immediately found a warm reception not only in Scotland but across the whole breadth of England as well.

Indeed, the time was opportune for such a visit. It was "fashionable" to receive African-Americans. "It is good to be dyed black if you come up to London," proclaimed the New York Herald, "for Negro love is filling all ranks from Prince Albert and the Queen, down to the poorest subjects." And there remained a widespread belief in the pantheon of reform that had to be carried on to the present day. Sir Edward Russell declared that Britons had "an honorable pre-eminence in this matter of the war of the races which entitled them to speak on the subject of the colored race wherever their liberties were interfered with" and that even though slavery had passed away it had left behind violations of civil rights and therefore the British "might fair step in the arena again
to see if she could not yet accomplish something for the good old cause."

During the first tour Wells delivered some 102 lectures. Her strategy was two-fold. Firstly, and most simply, she wished to convince the British that the dearth of reporting of lynchings in the American press did not indicate that such a phenomenon was not widespread. Secondly, Wells sought to dispel that myth of the black man as rapist and therefore the supposed rationale for such horrific persecution of African-American men at the hands of the mobs.

Through Impey's Quaker connections Wells was able to publicize and affirm the nature of the atrocities perpetrated against the African-American community in the United States. Wells spoke to church groups, with audiences sometimes as large as two thousand in Huntley, Kirkliston, Glasgow and Edinburgh, as well as the major cities in England including Newcastle, Manchester and London.

Well's initial tour was widely publicized and for the most part warmly welcomed in Britain. Even the London Times, always conservative and vacillating in its support of African-American rights, commented that "the conscience of England was shocked" by the revelations made during Well's campaign.

The increased awareness inspired Wells to return in 1894 convinced that the United States could not afford to ignore the opinions of a society which, in her words, was both
morally and spiritually superior. This cultural chauvinism and the belief that Britain was "the moral force to drive the saviour's chariot" was a legacy resurrected from antislavery arguments. It would prove, throughout the whole campaign, to be both a sore in the side of the crusade and a benefit. In the 1890's it added more fuel to the Southern press as they scorned Wells and the force of British public opinion: "As to the force of English public opinion - Bah!" commented the Memphis Commercial Appeal in one of its more articulate moments. But Well's lecture tour at least had the positive effect of initiating dialogue on the subject of lynching and of raising it to the level of general public consciousness in the United States. Indeed, after her first tour the New York Age reported that the South had "paid more attention to the British press during the last ninety days than they have given the matter since 1876."

The second tour in 1894 further enhanced this dialogue. Wells arranged for her tour to be covered and sponsored by the Chicago Inter-Ocean. Through their publication, stories of her tour were disseminated to other news organs within the United States. Her return to England was not under the most convivial of circumstances, however. During her absence major rifts had developed in the SRBM. Disagreement arose over whether aid to African-Americans should take precedence in the Society's program. Some members believed that charity should begin at home, with aid to blacks in Jamaica and in
Britain's African colonies. Prevailing sentiment, however, persuaded the society to concentrate its energies upon American problems and Well's visit cemented this focus. 25

Furthermore, the leadership of the organization became unglued. A personal dispute between Catherine Impey and Isabelle Mayo which had occurred after Well's 1894 visit, constantly threatened to tear the organization apart. Isabelle Mayo, maybe in a fit of pique and jealousy, accused Impey of making "advances unbecoming of a lady" towards one Dr. George Ferdinands, an Indian, while he was a guest in her house. 26 Certainly stepping outside the boundaries of polite, or at least accepted, female behavior for that period, Impey had apparently sent Dr Ferdinands a note in which she professed her love and proposed marriage. Mayo believed that this was an abuse of trust and complained that Impey would continue to abuse her position as head of the SRBM and harass men under her care. Mayo, "a stern, upright Calvinistic Scotchwoman," demanded that Impey resign and cease her editorial duties on the organ's newspaper, Anti-Caste. 27 When Impey refused, Mayo publicly accused her of being a "nymphomaniac" and of using the organization purely as a way of meeting men!

The incident splintered the movement. Impey refused to resign and Mayo disappeared, taking with her a small cadre of members whose personal ethics could not condone or forgive Impey's actions. Wells too, undoubtedly lost some support by
sticking with Impey. In the circumstances, though, she could hardly do otherwise. Wells, in defense of her support of Impey, argued that the SRBM secretary had remained a faithful friend of African-Americans for years and had contributed much time, money, and effort in that cause and thus she could hardly desert her now.

The case was also an instructive parallel to American events. Wells had, radically, argued that far from black rape of white females in the South being a justification for lynching, what worried most people was that such unions were mutually consented to and often initiated by white women themselves. For some of Mayo’s supporters the objection to Impey’s actions lay in their disapproval of Impey’s advances to a “colored gentleman.” Certainly Well’s association with Impey during the subsequent tour did not benefit her in certain quarters and provides testimony of how limited the willingness of some Britons was to confront racism and social prohibitions against miscegenation.

In spite of these set-backs Well’s second tour was successful, at least if measured as a publicity drive. This success was in no small part due to the continuation of Atlantic community networking. The paltry sponsorship provided by the Chicago Inter-Ocean was insufficient to provide adequately for the duration of the tour but Wells was able to overcome her financial problems by relying on the sustenance provided by the Liverpool ministry of Reverend
Aked. Aked was a Quaker minister, an itinerant preacher, with the largest non-conformist congregation outside London. He was also an activist in the trans-Atlantic ministry which had grown out of Liverpool during difficult circumstances in the ante-bellum years. Recent visits to the United States had already acquainted him with the atrocities being perpetrated against African-Americans in the name of justice. In Boston, where he had been the guest of Mrs Henry Ward Beecher, he had been outraged by the lynching of the Ray sisters in Texas and particularly the indifference of the legal system to these killings. Then, on a trip to the World's Fair in 1893, he had again witnessed the injustice of vigilantism when a Kentucky mob executed C.J. Miller, a perfectly innocent man, in a case of mistaken identity. An acquaintance of Impey, Aked and his wife became ardent supporters of Well's crusade and he and his congregation sponsored her tour for the duration. For six months Wells made his Liverpool residence her base for lecturing tours.

In Liverpool it was evident that other, older abolitionist links still prevailed and these provided a forum for Wells and her campaign. Wells spoke in the historic church of James Martineau, a famous English Unitarian minister, and William Henry Channing, American abolitionist and Unitarian minister, whose congregation were avowedly proud of their abolitionist heritage.
Nonconformist congregations were the bedrock of her campaign as again American churches were reluctant to condemn lynching and like the abolitionists Wells hoped to induce British sister institutions to bring pressure to bear. To this end she spoke in Manchester to the joint meeting of the Society of Friends, Unitarians, Methodists and Congregationalists and persuaded the Bishop of Manchester to issue a public condemnation of lynching. Similar religious gatherings in Southport, Bristol (where she spoke twenty times) and London cultivated a background of support with audiences that numbered in the thousands. Perhaps one of Wells' most significant achievements was in lobbying the National Baptist Union, at their yearly conference in May, into accepting a resolution condemning lynching and urging positive trans-Atlantic support in the issue. What that support was to consist of, however, was never specified and other religious groups were not as accommodating. The Unitarian conference of Ministers, for example, refused to endorse an anti-lynching resolution, stating that it was a "terrible misrepresentation to say that the press and pulpit of the South support lynching."\(^\text{30}\)

Well's contact with both the reformist core and periphery in England was much more extensive on this tour. In London, for example, she was the guest of honor at the Pioneer Club whose president was Annie Besant.\(^\text{31}\) She also spoke at the Ideal Club whose members included Percy Bunting,
the editor of the *Contemporary Review*, a periodical which would become the de facto voice of the anti-lynching crusade and subsequently the NAACP in Britain.\textsuperscript{32}

She also managed to ingratiate herself with leading political figures of the time. More than once she was invited to dine at the House of Commons, while the Pioneer Club was virtually an annex for political non-conformists. She was also the guest of Keir Hardie who interviewed her for his paper, *The Labour Leader*.\textsuperscript{33} This community, which was to become the core of the nascent Labour Party, was already developing more universalist notions regarding the nature of race struggle and the inequities of the blossoming imperial system. Hardie, Besant, Byles (M.P for Bradford) and Edmund Robertson (M.P and Civil Lord of the Admiralty.) whom she met at the House of Commons, were all opposed to British policies in Zanzibar and the Sudan and would later all vote in protest of British actions in the Boer War. Wells also liaised with politicians now elevated to peerages, who had taken seminal roles in abolition campaigns. Most notable of these was Sir Joseph Pease whose family’s activism spanned the entire pantheon of African American protest from slavery through civil rights.\textsuperscript{34} Though it was obviously difficult for the British government to intervene, the Commons meetings did result in official letters of protest to T.F. Bayard, United States ambassador to Britain.\textsuperscript{35}
Wells also induced old British abolitionist societies to take a stand on the new issues confronting freedmen. The Aborigines Protection Society passed a resolution condemning lynching as did the BFASS who also organized the British Anti-lynching Committee (BAC). Among many of the prominent members of this committee were the Duke of Argyll, nephew of the Queen, and American ex-patriots including Moncure Conway and Harriet Stanton Blatch. Reverend Aked and Bunting were part of the executive which was completed by Florence Balgarnie, secretary and later founder member of the amalgamated BFASS and APS.

Indeed, Balgarnie typifies the trans-Atlantic community of those years. She was also active in the British Women's Temperance Association (BWTA), active on the Women's Signal and various other suffrage journals, and in the women's movement. But while her career emphasizes the importance of inter-organizational links in stimulating support and communication in the anti-lynching crusade it also exemplifies the tensions inherent between these movements.

In 1894 Frances Willard, leader of the Women's Christian Temperance Unions, was in Britain for the British Women's Temperance Association conference. Willard had been in Britain for the previous two years endeavoring to coordinate activities with the BWTA. In this she was carrying on a generation long tradition of trans-Atlantic cooperation. The WCTU had retained close relationships with the British
Temperance movement and in particular the BWTA. Before 1876 the temperance movement in Britain was overwhelmingly the preserve of men. In 1876, however, this began to change, largely as a result of the activities of the American temperance crusader, Eliza Stewart, who embarked on a tour of Great Britain in that year determined to inspire activism on the part of her British sisters. This women did and through their activism put temperance onto the political agenda in the late nineteenth century. The Liberal Party, who drew a lot of female adherents, adopted it along with other social issues as central to its campaign of social renewal. Stewart's tour also indirectly led to the foundation of the BWTA.

Through the SRBM, many of whose members were also temperance advocates, Wells gained an interview with the President of the BWTA, Lady Isabelle Somerset, in 1894. Wells also hoped that the BWTA would add to the voice of reformist Britain and its message to America by adopting an anti-lynching resolution at its upcoming meeting. In particular, Wells hoped to embarrass the WCTU and especially its leader Frances Willard who, in Wells' eyes, had never been more than ambivalent when it came to promoting civil rights and indeed was outright racist on the question of lynching. The WCTU in theory had supported the membership of African-American women in both mixed and segregated locals. But even in the North, segregation had been the norm and as
Jim Crow took hold in the late 1890's the number of integrated locals dropped. Whether as a matter of policy or involuntary segregation, the WCTU leadership and body welcomed such segregation, as it was thought that too much racial integration would endanger the central purpose of the WCTU--the prohibition of injurious spirituous alcohol. Moreover, few African-American women held positions of power within the organization.

To Wells and to many others Willard was the WCTU and thus the organization reflected her ambivalence on racial matters. Wells went further, however, in labeling Willard and the WCTU an accomplice to lynching. Frances Willard, as a guest of Lady Somerset, and had been feted by the British reformist press who hailed her as "The Uncrowned Queen of American Democracy" and although Wells claimed she at first demurred in disabusing the British public of this notion, Well's temperament would not allow her to be silent for long. As a fellow American traveler, Well's opinion of Willard was naturally sought. When Wells informed her audiences that the only statement she had known Willard to make on lynching condoned it, she set a fire under a cauldron of controversy that had always surrounded the racial feelings of Willard and the WCTU.

The dispute erupted into a public debate. Wells, to prove to the British that Willard had indeed said what she claimed, bought a copy of the New York Voice with her to
Britain, in which Willard apparently condoned lynching, and had it reprinted in *Fraternity*. This act greatly antagonized Willard's patron in Britain, Lady Somerset, who vowed that if the article appeared in print then Wells would never find an audience in Britain again. *Fraternity*, however, went out to its subscribers as usual and the interview with Willard was subsequently picked up by the British dailies.

Wells' now open attack on Willard meant that the biggest issue at the 1894 BWTU conference was the anti-lynching resolution. The British Anti-lynching Committee (BAC), many of whose members belonged to the BWTU, embroiled itself in the fracas. British Anti-Lynching Committee representatives accused Willard and her organization of being not merely an advocate of segregation, but an apologist for lynching. Willard defended her position and that of the WCTU by disclaiming responsibility for the decisions of local chapters of the organization and by arguing that organizing locals on the basis of race gave black women more autonomy. Moreover, she argued, the WCTU was far more progressive than similar American reform institutions in affording black women the opportunity to operate in positions of power. The SRBM delegates shot back that although the WCTU may not have actively "sought" to draw the lines of color within their organization, they had "allowed them to be established," and this was reprehensible.39
Both sides had defensible positions. The WCTU was organized on the principle that the locals within states had the right to manage their own internal affairs. But, as the editor of Anti-Caste pointed out, the governments of such states were quite "untrustworthy." Thus, inactivity on the part of the WCTU executive had allowed segregated locals to emerge and had thus tacitly supported such a development by failing to legislate against it. As such, the SRBM claimed, the WCTU had shunned its duty of protecting the lives of its citizens and allowed its "colored sisters to be defrauded of membership." In the WCTU's defense it was one of the few American reform organizations to appoint black women to the executive. However, up to 1894, as Florence Balgarnie pointed out, only one black woman had ever reached a position of power within the WCTU, Frances Harper, the Superintendent of Colored Work.

The criticisms of English activists were more harsh than even African-American contemporaries. Even though Frederick Douglass criticized Frances Willard as a "temporizer" on the race issue, he admitted that Willard was fighting an impossible battle in trying to please the anti-lynching crusaders and the South.

Douglass's defense of Willard suggested to American reformers that Britons could not thoroughly appreciate the complexity of race, politics and reform in the Union. British reformers however, could only see the "personal
humiliation" and the affront to Christian principles that such segregation represented and convinced that, as they put it, the moral verve and conscience of both the North and South was benumbed, pressure to reform had to come from outside, from English protest. Undaunted, the SRBM sustained their pressure on the BWTA. Led by Florence Balgarnie, and in an attempt to prevent irrevocable splits in their organization, the BWTA ultimately issued a statement condemning lynching.41

However strained the cross-currents of reform were, Well's visit promoted a rich ground-swell of support for the anti-lynching crusade. Wells spoke fondly of her visit to England. She believed that the publicity given to lynching in Britain directly impacted American attitudes regarding such atrocities.42 In particular the populations' seeming disregard for the color line enhanced the general level of support for the crusade:

To a colored person who had been reared in the peculiar atmosphere which obtains only in free America it is like being born in another world, to be welcomed among persons of the highest order of intellectual and social culture as if one were one of themselves.43

Whether this acceptance was indicative of widespread popular support or support of other forms of racial inequities is debatable. The Times, while expressing its abhorrence of lynching, did not translate this into a general affirmation of support for equal educational, voting or housing rights,
for example. The editor's main objection to lynching was economic:

Its existence is a serious obstacle to the success of the South in industry; for even now negro labor, which means at best inefficient labor, must be largely relied on there, and its efficiency must be still further diminished by spasmodic terrorism. 414

But the *Times* was almost alone among the nationally circulating press in its lukewarm and qualified abhorrence of lynching.

It is clear that the British felt that Americans were not doing enough to redress the system of racial imbalance and were little more than apathetic on the lynching issue. Richard Acland Armstrong, pastor of the Hope Street church, wrote to the *Christian Register* urging Unitarians to bestir themselves on this issue for the sake of the nation:

What are you doing, men and women of Boston? Are you so busy laying wreaths on the tombs of Channing and of Parker, of brave John Brown and your immortal Garrison, that you have no time to heed the seizure of untried men and women, their execution with every device and torture, and acquiescence of all the guardians of the law, the instilling into the boys and girls of the United States of the lust of cruelty and callousness to murder. 415

But such criticisms and the assertion of moral, spiritual and cultural supremacy, even paternalism, struck an independence chord in the hearts of many Americans. Governor O'Farrell of Virginia wrote in the *New York World*, for example:
Things have come to a pretty pass in this country when we are to have a lot of English moralists sticking their noses into our internal affairs. It is the quite essence (sic) of brass and impudence.\

To some it surpassed mere "brass and impudence" and was the essence of hypocrisy. The Anti-lynching committee's program of pressure through public letters to Southern governors left the British open to charges that they ought to order their own house before attempting to sort out the world's problems. In a letter of 1894 from Florence Balgarnie to the Governor of Alabama the Anti-lynching committee questioned the right of a nation to call itself civilized when lynchers could act with impunity and inhumanity was tacitly protected by law.

In reply the governor's aide countered that no outsider could hope to understand the complexity of the "color problem." More importantly, however, how would the monarch and her ministers respond if American citizens publicly voiced their protest and demanded inquiries regarding the cruelty of the eviction laws in Ireland, the oppression of natives in Egypt or India, or the laxity in the administration of justice and the protection of life, property, or morals anywhere in the British Empire. On these grounds the Governor questioned the right of Britain to set itself up as "an international moral tribunal." The Southern press and even black supporters used these assertions to accuse Wells of a lack of patriotism. Wells replied that the African-American regretted that he must
reveal these atrocities to the world but it would be unpatriotic for the nation to exist under a cloak of lies and injustices and "defy the contempt of civilization."{

Wells clearly believed that there thus was a direct link between the decline of lynching and British criticism:

The Christian, moral and social forces of Great Britain had nobly responded to our appeal, and caused the whole civilized world to acknowledge that it was the duty of civilized nations to exert moral force against the evil lynching.54

Many old guard abolitionists supported her in this belief. William Lloyd Garrison in 1894 acknowledged the debt that African-Americans owed to English abolitionists and, in a reversal of his prevailing opinion since the Civil War, argued, in the face of criticism, that Wells' tours were amply justified by the asylum that many of the disaffected of the day found in London.50 Even if the precedent had not been there, he asserted, the validity of her tours had been vindicated by the response of the American public:

The value of her English mission is justified by events. She found deaf ears for her complaints in the United States. Spoken from the vantage ground of London, her faintest whisper goes like an arrow to its mark. No nation, however despotic or savage, is impervious to the good opinion of the world. The very denunciation of foreign criticism by the South demonstrates its potency. Today the South listens, a year ago it did not ... Already a most encouraging change of opinion is manifest.51

The Anti-lynching committee of Chicago, Illinois, endorsed Garrison's assessment. In a letter to the Anti-lynching
committee of Britain he went so far as to say that had Britain not responded then lynching would not be recognized anywhere as a crime against humanity. Catherine Impey asserted that this proved the usefulness of outside protest:

The old objection that 'British protests won't avail with independent Yankees' &c., meets us less frequently since it has been recognized that Miss Ida Wells's voice has been better heard in America from the platform of Exeter Hall, than from any American platform that was previously open to her. It has been recognized now, that where a whole nation is under the spell of such a sentiment, the awakening must come from outside.

How accurate these assessments truly were is a matter for debate. Later assessments portrayed Wells' campaigns as being the crest of a wave that soon plummeted on the shores of censure and British introversion. Undoubtedly much of such assessment is based upon the failure of Britons to more actively follow up Well's tour. The Anti-lynching committee, whose membership list read like a "Who's Who" of liberal activists in Britain had apparently agreed to undertake a fact-finding tour of the South to ascertain exact statistics of lynchings and to lobby Southern state governments for anti-lynching legislation. However, for uncertain reasons, this tour never materialized. The New York Times in fact scorned that the only weapon of the committee would be to inform the lynchers that their actions would "incur the displeasure of the British public" about which the residents
of Texas cared little. This failure persuaded many of the "futility of further work in England."  

That Wells' tour was not a total success in changing British public opinion is evident from the British popular press reaction of the day. In particular, she failed to eradicate the notion that all lynchings were a result of black males raping white women. This is evident from the editorial reaction to the correspondence between the Anti-lynching committee and the governor of Alabama. The Times endorsed the reaction of the Governor, dismissing the committee as "the usual bunch of dissenters" and commenting that while it abhorred lynching the "negro does something to justify such differential treatment by the frequency and atrocity of his outrages on white women."  

Even black Americans were both doubtful of the benefits of Wells' tour and leery of British involvement. Among black ante-bellum abolitionists there had been a strong movement to restate their cultural and political identity. Now Wells was seeking the assistance from the class of white liberals that she exhibited a latent hostility toward at home. Grappling with this intellectual dilemma led many African-Americans to spurn Wells' example and to jeopardize the accumulated support of these years.

Wells' achievements were thus underrated. Wells was only one person and yet, for a while, she put lynching into the headlines, the bylines, and editorials on both sides of
While American commentators may have complained that the British follow-up to Well's tour was disappointing, there is little evidence that American activists tried to sustain the momentum either.

* 

Though Well's anti-lynching tour was the last major tour by an American activist before the turn of the century, Americans still continued to canvas British public opinion. The SRBM sponsored other African-American female advocates in their various endeavors in Britain. For example, upon the recommendation of Frederick Douglass, the SRBM financed the visit of Hallie Quinn Brown in 1895 and 1896 as a fund-raiser for Wilberforce University. An African-American activist, Brown followed in the wake of the good opinion formed in the British public consciousness by Wells and returned to the United States with three hundred pounds for the college. British activists and the public too still believed that they had a central role to play in the domestic racial arrangements of the United States and Britons continued to channel money to African-American educational foundations in particular.

Wells' lecture tours illustrate several distinct patterns in the Atlantic movement for freedmen's aid in the late nineteenth century. Firstly, members of the original anti-slavery crusade in Britain still dominated the new British Anti-lynching organizations and thus provided
important continuities with the early nineteenth century movement. Besides blood, one of these continuities was the avowedly evangelical nature of reformers, at least on the British side of the water. The underlying moral imperative behind anti-lynching, like other campaigns in which women found themselves involved in the late nineteenth century, echoed the motivations of an earlier era. Anglo-American cooperation still rested on the common Christian duty to banish wickedness. Thus the bedrock of both Well's support and the general support for the cause remained those non-conformist churches that had sought to bring pressure to bear upon their American cousins during the ante-bellum period. Wells and other American reformers could thus still rely upon existing trans-Atlantic organizations and infra-structures for international co-ordination.

Secondly, the multi-reform activism of leading British anti-slavery women illustrates that the culture of British Anti-lynching and antislavery both grew out of, and fed into, the broad spectrum of reform in late nineteenth century Britain. For Atlantic women, in particular, the anti-slavery movement had raised gender consciousness about their own second class status and thus intellectually contributed to the women's rights movement. More than this, however, women's activism in one crusade had furnished the tools with which to contribute to others. The overlapping membership
between freedmen's aid societies and activism in temperance, peace, VD and various other reform movements underline this.

Thirdly, Well's tour marks the end of one stage in the Atlantic movement: after the turn of the century the Atlantic movement took on a different complexion. British supporters had hitherto relied upon American leadership to guide their contributions. Moreover, most British supporters--Garrisonian or not--believed that British aid was only a temporary solution to the problem of American racial injustices. When Americans, black and white, thus finally began to organize their own civil rights organizations to address racial inequities, British supporters took this as a signal to scale back their efforts. At the same time, however, Britain was to become the forum for a world widening interest not just in the fate of the American freedpersons but of African peoples throughout the world. As the new century dawned British interest in, and indeed exploitation of, Africa and Africans made Britain a focal point in the development of Pan-Africanism.
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The same spirit which inspired that noble host, represented in the names of Granville Sharp, William Wilberforce, Thomas Buxton and William Clarkson to work for the liberation of our fathers and forefathers, will continue to inflate the lives of the present generation for the achievement of like, if not greater, heroism for Christ and humanity.

In late July 1900, 33 black delegates from Africa, the West Indies, Canada, the United States and Britain met in London at the first Pan-African Conference. The convention was the first occasion when people of African origin had met together formally to discuss their respective problems. Of the 33 delegates, there were eleven from the United States, the most notable of whom were W. E. B. Du Bois and Alexander Walters, bishop and president of the National Afro-American Council. Du Bois's involvement at this conference previewed his lifelong commitment to Pan-Africanism. Curiously, however, Du Bois failed to mention his involvement in the conference until forty-seven years after the event. Nevertheless, historians have viewed this conference as the beginning of an important development in African-American activism: the first
real attempt to give organizational structure to Pan-Africanism. Building on the international nature of the slave trade, centuries of natural curiosity by African-Americans about their origins, and the new imperialism which had drawn world-wide attention to the status of African peoples, African-Americans began to place their own oppression in a universal context during the nineteenth century. By 1900, the growth of a small African-American intellectual class, the participation of African-Americans in missionary activities, and the popularization of back to Africa movements all precipitated the development of an institutional Pan-African movement.

While Pan-Africanism is symbolic of a transformation in African-American organizational outlook, it is also evidence of a transition within the Atlantic movement. Pan Africanism's implicit relegation of white philanthropy to a secondary role meant that the Atlantic reform community had to reevaluate itself. What was to be the place of white American and British reformers in this new initiative if any? The very existence of the Atlantic movement seemed threatened. Pan-Africanism did not destroy the Atlantic movement, however, but rather modified its focus, structure, and composition. Indeed, the development of Pan-Africanism is testimony to the enduring nature of the Atlantic movement. The new imperialism of the late nineteenth century that fostered racist Anglo-Saxonism also promoted sharp critiques
of colonialism and anti-imperialistic movements on both sides of the Atlantic. Pan-Africanism thus became a natural home for such dissenters, thereby perpetuating the Atlantic connection.

But Pan-Africanism proved a double-edged sword. In the long run, by placing racial oppression in a universal context, it reoriented British reformer's efforts towards their own colonies and Africa in general, thereby diluting the direct attention paid to the struggles of African-Americans.

* Pan-Africanism is a somewhat nebulous concept to define and attempts to do so have precipitated heated debate. Scholars and activists have variously defined Pan-Africanism as: "the attempts by African peoples to link up their struggles for their mutual benefit;" "ideas which have stressed or sought the cultural and political independence of Africa;" "intellectual and political movements among Africans and Afro-Americans who regard or have regarded Africans and people of African descent as homogeneous;" and "the intention of the Divine Mind towards Africa." The genesis of the concept on various continents and at different times has further complicated understanding of the expression. Historians have thus interpreted Pan-Africanism as being
manifest by anything from a concrete political movement expressed through organizational forms, to something that, in the words of W. E. B. Du Bois, is as amorphous as a vision or a dream.⁶

Pan-Africanism has undoubtedly proven easier to trace as an institutional development than as an idea. However, historians generally mark the genesis of the Pan-African idea with the birth of the trans-atlantic slave trade. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the idea took concrete form in the revolutions of Haiti, Jamaica, and Surinam.⁷ In America, historians have traced Pan-Africanism’s ancestry to black emigration desires in the 1780’s.⁸ Indeed, up through the nineteenth century "proto Pan-Africanism" in America focused largely on back-to-Africa movements. From Paul Cuffee to Martin Delany, African-Americans expressed their interest and support for Africa in various emigration schemes.⁹

The "exodus fever" that beset America in the wake of Reconstruction stimulated increased interest in emigration to Africa, especially among working-class African-Americans.¹⁰ Faced with growing political disenfranchisement, economic discrimination, and racial violence, Africa appeared as a haven for the southern working-class African-American community. Before 1900, however, many African-Americans outside of the working-class generally disdained emigration as a solution. Frederick Douglass was not alone when he
declared, for example, that Africa was to him an alien land. Two hundred and fifty years residence in the United States made America home, he claimed, no matter how uncomfortable racism made one in that home. The solution to American racism lay, he and other black intellectuals argued, not in running away from it, but from combating it on its own turf.

But although Africa may have seemed an "alien land" for many of the black middle-class intelligentsia of the late nineteenth century, it was not a land devoid of interest. The plethora of nineteenth century literary magazines and societies, for example, reveal the growing interest of the black middle-classes with Africa after the Civil War. Excluded from white literary organizations, African-Americans and sympathetic whites organized alternate societies. Such societies were the major brokers of information about Africa in the mid to late nineteenth century. These associations became forums for discussion of the history and literary traditions of African societies and by welcoming spokespeople from both African and African-American societies fostered a tangible racial kinship.

Missionary activities also sparked interest in Africa. White missionary churches had sent few black missionaries to Africa before the Civil War. After Reconstruction, however, white and black churches evidenced increased interest in committing African-Americans to the evangelization of Africa. The Black Baptist Foreign
Mission Convention, the Methodist Protestant Church, the AMEZ, and the Foreign Missionary Board of the Presbyterian Church all sent African-American emissaries to Liberia in the nineteenth century, for example.

The growth of black missionary activity in Africa after Reconstruction reflected a growing belief within the African-American, and indeed wider white, reform community that African-Americans should play a role not only in the moral and spiritual progress of Africa but also in its commercial and political development. Individuals such as Frederick Douglass and Alexander Crummell, for example, called for not only the spiritual uplift of Africa but its commercial development also. These sentiments made them the acknowledged allies of European imperialism. Indeed, particularly before 1880, black leaders endorsed Europe's "civilizing mission" in Africa believing that it was the destiny of Europeans and American blacks to "redeem" Africa and to stimulate its growth.

After 1880, however, African-American support became more qualified. The "Scramble for Africa" of the last two decades of the century on one level still had African-American support. But increasingly African-Americans began to express discontent with European imperialism. In the eyes of American blacks, the "civilizing mission" of European powers began to emerge as a mere cloak for exploitation and discrimination of African peoples. Thus, though many
African-Americans still believed in the need for racial uplift and believed that European imperialism might help promote this goal, they also believed that African-Americans should intervene and provide a moral guide for European colonial ventures. The role of African-Americans then, they themselves believed, was to be an ameliorative force in the uplift of Africa.

Black and white American reformers could not agree on whether commercial investment, missionary activity, or even emigration could provide this ameliorative force, however. The Congress on Africa in 1895 clearly revealed these divisions. Sponsored by the Stewart Missionary Foundation, the Congress on Africa is generally considered by historians to be one of the earliest organizational expressions of Pan-Africanism.\textsuperscript{15} Arranged to coincide with the Atlanta Exposition of that year, one of the goals of the conference was to heighten awareness of African issues among the general public. More than that, however, the underlying direction of the conference was to promote African-American work in Africa. Officially, such work was to be largely evangelical. White and black participants in the conference repeatedly pointed out the need for, and indeed the duty of, African-Americans to evangelize their African brothers. Other participants, however, notably the black press, supported the economic involvement of black Americans as a means of lessening the exploitative impact of European colonialism.
Thus by calling for a cessation to the exploitation of Africa, by promoting evangelical and commercial intervention by African-Americans, and by sharing stories of oppression, with African participants, the congress exhibited many of the ingredients of Pan-Africanism.

On the other side of the Atlantic, meanwhile, there were similar developments. The scramble for Africa, the British government's retrogression from the more liberal colonial racial policies of earlier years, and upheavals in British Africa, provided the milieu within which Pan-Africanism could develop. Black African exiles and political leaders, mingled with black West Indian visitors and African students in London. The capital thus became the focus for the exchange of nascent Pan-African ideas and provided the institutional support for their expression. Elsewhere around the British Isles political events in Africa stimulated black West Indians, Britons, and Africans to form cultural and literary societies similar to those of their American compatriots. These organizations served as cells for the development of Pan-Africanism in Britain.

Pan-Africanism's general but qualified endorsement of imperialist ventures meant that, at this early stage at least, whites remained prominent participants in Pan-African activities on both sides of the Atlantic. The sponsor of the African Congress in 1895, the Stewart Missionary Foundation, for example, was led by William Fletcher Stewart. Stewart
was a white Methodist from Ohio whose family had an historic concern for African-American welfare. Organized in concert with the Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Georgia, the Foundation's goal was to train African-Americans in the evangelizing of black Africans. The Congress attracted some of the prominent African-Americans of the period: Alexander Crummell, Bishop Henry McNeil Turner, and T Thomas Fortune. There were representatives from various black African communities who delivered papers on the politics, history and economic development of various African states. But the Congress was still clearly a racially mixed affair and its organizers proudly billed the event as "the most distinguished gathering of learned men of both colors that has ever assembled together within the history of the South." 

The tone of the conference certainly reflected nascent Pan-African sentiment. The Congress made public acknowledgement of the kinship between African-Americans and black Africans and their parallel struggles for liberation. But discussion of the manner in which the two continents could unite their efforts for liberation reveals the influence of their white supporters. The language of the conference, and indeed the Foundation at large, embraced the paternalism that had so colored Atlantic interest in black America and Africa in previous decades. The Foundation's raison d'être was to use those who had been the beneficiaries
of racial uplift by whites in the United States, to be the "uplifters" of those "left behind in the darkness of Africa." Black participants at the Congress actively espoused this role for themselves in Africa. Edward Wilmot Blyden, for example, considered that the role of African-Americans in Africa was the "duty" of a "superior" civilization to help an "inferior" one.

In England, similar efforts were afoot at the close of the nineteenth century to establish an organization for fostering Pan-African awareness. As in the United States, early efforts were largely interracial affairs that relied upon the work and sympathies of white philanthropists and abolitionists. Pan-Africanist institutional efforts here stretched back to the ante-bellum period. Martin Delany's attempts to raise British support for emigration in the 1850's, for example, can be seen as an early manifestation of Pan-Africanism. Delany's campaign in Britain, as we have seen, depended on white support. The African Aid Society, which he helped to establish in 1860, was a typical British abolitionist organization, staffed by the leading white abolitionists of the day with only nominal black membership.

Delany's emigrationist efforts, however, also spawned a parallel organization that had a less paternalistic and more incipient Pan-Africanist tenor to it. The initiative came again from a white reformer, Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, a founder of the British Aborigines Protection Society. Hodgkin's
goal, however, was not to establish an organization through which white reformers could channel their philanthropy, but rather to create an association in which Africans, West Indians, and African-Americans would play the major roles. The Native African Association's avowed goal was the economic, political, and social development of Africa. Unfortunately, of its activities little is known and it seems to have disappeared by 1861. But the organization appears to have been the forerunner of the most serious Pan-African effort yet to take place on British soil: the African Association (AA) which would launch Pan-Africanism as a viable and serious force in the twentieth century.

The most important British based Pan-African Association of the late nineteenth century was the brainchild of Henry Sylvester Williams. A native of Trinidad, Williams had studied law in London and had established ties with African students and other African ex-patriots living at the heart of the British Empire. He also had extensive ties to the white abolitionist and freedman's aid communities in Britain. Williams seems to have seized upon the earlier initiatives of Thomas Hodgkin and the Aborigines Protection society and in tandem with this organization formed the African Association in 1897. This Association's aims mirrored those of the NAA and were avowedly Pan-African in nature. The association's constitution called upon its members to:

encourage a feeling of unity: to facilitate friendly intercourse among Africans in general; to
promote and protect the interests of all subjects claiming African descent, wholly or in part, in British colonies and other places, especially in Africa, by circulating accurate information on all subjects effecting their rights and privileges as subjects of the British Empire and by direct appeals to the Imperial and local governments. 26

This association was a deliberate attempt to step away from the white paternalism of old. The leadership was entirely African and West Indian and the organization restricted full membership to Africans, West Indians, and African-Americans. The Association was neither ready nor in a position to completely cast off its ties to the wider white community, however. "Honorary" memberships were reserved for whites and the Association relied upon the patronage not only of the Aborigines Protection Society but also other British reform societies. 27

Moreover, the growth of anti-imperialist thinking in Britain promoted additional white support. By the turn of the century, as Paul Rich has demonstrated, popular enthusiasm for the aggressive expansionism of the 1880's and 1890's waned. The reemergence of liberalism after the Boer War led to increased interest in the race question in Africa and "Victorian" ideas on race began to shift away from the white supremacist jingoism of mid-century and towards an acceptance of cultural relativism. 28 This coincidence of liberal politics and Pan-Africanism can clearly be seen in the African Association. It was partly at the urging of the Liberal party, for example, that the African Association
became a lobbying group intent upon revising parliamentary policy regarding Africa. It was this task that motivated the Association's convening of the first Pan-African Conference in London in 1900.29

London was not a random selection for the site of the conference. As the center of the British Empire it was an obvious symbolic choice. As the primary residence of the convener Henry Sylvester Williams, it was also a convenient venue. But, as importantly, London had the reform heritage on which practically and rhetorically the early Pan-African movement could draw.

Though the British government drew sharp criticism at the conference for its toleration of discriminatory practices by English colonizing companies and expeditions, and though the emphasis of the conference was on African leadership in solving "African problems," the conference did not totally dissuade or devalue white aid. Indeed, the major American figures at the conference--Du Bois and Bishop Alexander Walters--enthusiastically invoked the reform heritage of Britain as did the conference at large, in a concluding vote of thanks to Britain for its aid in abolishing slavery in the West Indies, Africa, Brazil, and the United States. The conference singled out the English Quakers in particular for their contribution to the antislavery and freedman's cause, and, furthermore, called upon English reformers to continue their efforts.30
On one level, then, the conference demonstrates the continuity in the Atlantic relationship. A goal of the conference was to once again force Britain to stand at the vanguard of enlightened racial arrangements and nudge her into the role of moral leader. By invoking the legacy of Wilberforce and Sharp and other old icons of British racial liberalism, Du Bois and the Pan-Africanists were embracing the tactics of the abolitionist and freedman's aid movement and acknowledging the junior role that America still played in the moral partnership between Britain and the United States. Underlying the tenor of the conference was still the belief that British leadership could foment change in America. Britons were now being called upon to provide that leadership through a reform of racial practices in Africa. And this plea underlined one of the central tenets of Pan-Africanism: that by placing the struggle of African-Americans in a universal context, then the amelioration of racial oppression for one group would naturally lead to the amelioration of racial oppression for the other.

Such a belief at the beginning of the nineteenth century therefore led African-Americans to a limited support of beneficent imperialism. However, the support of the conference participants for imperialism has perhaps been overstated by historians. The conference delivered a message that was much more than a "moderate, trusting appeal for an imperialism that lived up to its highest pieties." While
many participants conceded the need for some form of "tutelage" from European powers in the immediate future, over the long term the Pan-African conference was the harbinger of disquiet in Africa. Benito Sylvain, Aide de Camp to Emperor Menelik of Abyssinia, for example, asserted that blacks everywhere had proven themselves worthy of freedom and of an equal share in the profits made by colonizing powers but warned that "no human power could stop the African natives in their social and political development." More prescient, however, was Du Bois's famous address "To The Nations of the World" delivered at the close of the conference. Besides his prophetic statement that the problem of the new century would be the problem of the color line, Du Bois warned of the consequences of imperialism:

The modern world must needs remember that in this age...the millions of black men in Africa, America, and the Islands of the Sea, not to speak of the brown and yellow myriads elsewhere, are bound to have a great influence upon the world in the future, by reason of sheer numbers and physical contact. If now the world of culture bends itself towards giving Negroes and other dark men the largest and broadest opportunity for education and self-development, then this contact and influence is bound to have a beneficial effect upon the world and hasten human progress. But if, by reason of carelessness, prejudice, greed and injustice, the black world is to be exploited and ravished and degraded, the results must be deplorable, if not fatal.

Du Bois continued by calling for the right of self-government for African states to be established as soon as practicable. Thus, although the conference's over-arching plea was to
improve the treatment of African peoples by colonizing powers, its message was also, in the long term, to promote racial equality and accept the independence of African states.

Most importantly, however, the conference stands as a watershed in the Atlantic movement because of the way it shaped how future activism would be organized. Despite the traditional appeals to English reformers and the British government to institute reform, white and black participants at the conference acknowledged that a new era in the transatlantic relationship was now dawning. While the conference confidently predicted that their "good friends in England" would blend their voices with those of the conference participants to bring righteousness and justice to the world's relations with African peoples, the conference made it clear that from hence forth, Africans were to be the leaders of their own liberation. On the one hand this coincided with the paternalistic hopes of some of the white supporters of the conference. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, who was invited to give the keynote speech at the conference stressed that:

they [the public] were well aware that the future of every race must be in the hands of that race itself...and did not want the period of tutelage to be unduly prolonged, and they desired that the result of the tutelage should be wise, judicious, kindly and tending to the ultimate development of native races.
But it also meshed with desires of African and African-American activists as well. The official delegates and leading participants of the conference were black. Whites attended but were largely confined to the role of spectators. And only those of black African heritage were invited to become members of the first Pan-African Association which grew out of this conference. Where Atlantic connections continued then, it would be largely African-Americans and other black Africans within the diaspora that maintained them.

For the first two decades of the twentieth century the individual who, more than any other individual maintained these contacts was W. E. B. Du Bois. Instrumental in the success of that first Pan-African conference and of course the father of Pan-African sentiment after World War One, Du Bois perhaps best epitomizes both the continuities within the Atlantic movement and its new direction. By the beginning of the twentieth century Du Bois had emerged as the leading opponent of the gradualist position symbolized by Booker T. Washington. His establishment of the Niagara Movement in 1905 and then the NAACP in 1909 symbolized the transition from Washington's broadly accommodatonist approach to protest. Moreover, it spelt the movement's evolution towards organized protest. As America descended into a morass of discrimination in the late nineteenth century, it became abundantly clear to some Americans that the spasmodic and
largely uncoordinated efforts to promote racial equity were failing. As a result the attempts to rouse British public sympathy in the 1880's had been limited. Once again, Britain was not receiving any clear message from the U.S. By the 1890's, however, the very public clash of two different approaches to racial improvement ignited the reform arena on both sides of the Atlantic.

Historians have well documented the dispute between Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois. Less well documented is the manner in which this dispute spilled over into the English reform world. Booker T. Washington had been no more than tangentially interested in gaining British support. Evidence suggests that he made no concerted efforts to raise money for his enterprises in England although some English monies appear to have made their way to Tuskegee. However, the contact he did have with Britain was not through the reform community. Instead it was through a man whom a more clear-sighted friend of Washington's described as a man who "would not hesitate to advise the curtailment of the American Negroes' privileges in every way possible"! Sir Harry Johnston, African explorer, colonial administrator, and an investor in a venture to seize and exploit Liberia's wealth, visited Washington at Tuskegee in 1908. Subsequently, Johnston published eulogizing testaments to Washington's endeavors that were only a thin veil for his white supremacy. Johnston pandered to Washington's ego and it took some time...
before the "Wizard" was able to distance himself from a man who was essentially a paternal white supremacist.

Two years later Washington more firmly—and perhaps more wisely—cemented his ties to British reformers. In late 1910 Washington embarked on a tour of Europe. The ostensible purpose of this visit was to study the poorer classes of Europe and to compare their position to that of African-Americans. In August of 1910 Washington was in London and it was here that the firestorm started. In London he was the guest of the leader of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society (ASAPS). In comments made to the ASAPS and in various newspaper interviews, Washington painted a rosy view of African-American life in the South.

There is progress, both moral and material, to report in the condition of the negro, and there is also an improvement in the relations between the two races...The racial bar is fast disappearing in business in the South.

Washington also complained that Europe's view of American race relations was one-sided:

All the worst things...are recorded, but hardly any of the best things. If there is a lynching all the world knows about it next day, but if the coloured people build a college, establish a bank, or a store, or erect houses for themselves, nothing is known about it except in the community.

Washington had obviously come to the conclusion that African-Americans were materially at least better off than the vast majority of European "peasants" and that "in the Southern
States of America, the negro has a better chance than in almost any country in the world for his labor.” The APS feted Washington with introductions to the glitterati in London society and honored him with a celebratory breakfast.

While the APS lapped up Washington’s comments, they provoked great ire among others in the American reform community. John Milholland, prominent reformer and co-founder of the NAACP, was in Britain to promote his own reform agenda. Having established cursory contacts with the APS, they invited him to the celebratory breakfast for Washington. Milholland refused and then embarked upon a campaign to disabuse the ASAPS and the British public of the picture painted by Washington of the racial arrangements in the United States. The result was a best an impolite and at worst a vicious campaign of back-biting. Milholland’s immediate action was to circulate a letter among the British abolitionist societies and the national press in which he castigated Washington’s position as self-elected defender of the race. To the contrary, he claimed:

Dr. Washington stands for the inadequate education of his Race, and tacitly accepts the shameful violation of the Constitutional rights of the Afro-American.

Washington returned to the United States in October 1910 to find that African-American leaders, including Du Bois, had written an open manifesto "To the People of Great Britain and Europe" outlining their views of the "realities" of life for
African-Americans in minute detail. Milholland's connections with the reform community in Britain resulted in a broad and public circulation of the letter.

The NAACP then began to embark on a full-scale battle for the hearts and minds of the British reform community. In 1911 the NAACP sponsored a delegation to the Universal Races Congress held in London in July of that year. Milholland, Du Bois, Mary White Ovington, another co-founder of the NAACP, William A. Sinclair, NAACP members and the field secretary of the Constitution League all attended. Du Bois intended to arrive ahead of the rest of the delegation and to try and undo some of the damage Washington had caused in the British reform community by endeavoring to secure interviews with the societies to which Washington had spoken. In general Du Bois found British reform societies open to his endeavors. Reform societies were on the whole unaware and many unconcerned with the points of dispute between Washington and Du Bois and rather more concerned, as they expressed it, with being informed regarding the racial situation in America. As in previous decades, the opposition that Du Bois faced came largely from American travellers or ex-patriots in London. The prestigious and influential Lyceum Club, for example, engaged in a knock-down, dragged out battle between the British members and the members of the club's American Circle who wanted to refuse an invitation to the "crank and faddist" Du Bois. Du Bois had to make
certain assurances to the Aborigines Protection Society as well. The APS threatened not to attend the Universal Races Conference unless Du Bois refrained from attacking Washington. Whether Du Bois made such assurances to the APS is unknown but Du Bois spoke at the headquarters of that society. Du Bois did not, however, refrain from attacking Washington. The Universal Races Congress of 1911 thus became a public forum for his disagreements with Washington.

The Universal Races Congress was the main reason for Du Bois's visit to England in 1911 and he appears to have held out high hopes for it. "We doubt," he wrote in December 1910, "if the twentieth century will bring forth a greater idea than the first Universal Races Congress." Although not essentially Pan-African, the conference did give hope that an increasingly enlightened discussion of race was possible. The goal of the Congress was to "discuss the larger racial issues in the light of modern knowledge and modern conscience, with a view to encouraging a good understanding, friendly feelings and co-operation among all races and nations." As such it was a step away from the practical humanitarianism traditionally favored by British anti-slavery bodies. While not a Pan-African movement, the conference did manifest a temporary alliance between liberals and Pan-Africanists with its acceptance of cultural relativism and its promotion of general information regarding racial problems in Africa, the Caribbean, and America. To
Du Bois it appeared at the time to open a new chapter in race relations. He lionized the conference as "a great day for humanity...it accomplished wonders" and most importantly "it secured the co-operation of many of the leading people of the world" in a "full fair frontal attack on the nastiest modern survival of ancient barbarism."\(^5\)

And so it seemed in the immediate post-conference period. The Conference made serious plans to establish "Inter-Racial Bureaus" in countries around the world. The participants planned future conferences in Honolulu in 1913 and Paris in 1915. They organized members to collect records detailing the achievements of native societies and successful stories of "racial uplift."\(^5\) Ultimately, however, these were false hopes. The conferences failed to materialize because of lack of funds and the optimism of the congress's participants was dashed by the onslaught of World War One.

The conference did yield concrete results for the American civil rights crusade, however. Du Bois certainly seized on the conference as an avenue for the promotion of universal cooperation on civil rights and for persuading colonial powers to ameliorate their racial policies. But it is also clear that, protestations to the contrary, he also used it as an opportunity to fight the battle with Washington. In his paper to the conference "The Negro Race in the United States of America" Du Bois made an all-out
assault on the "unthinking Negro population" who were so damaging to the race.

More and more in the last twenty years the business men's solution of the race problem had been the development of the resources of the South. Conincident with the rise of this policy came the prominence of Mr. Booker T. Washington. Mr. Washington was convinced that race prejudice in America was so strong and the economic position of the freeman's sons so weak that the Negro must give up or postpone his ambitions for full citizenship and bend all his energies to industrial efficiency and the accumulation of wealth.58

Not everyone accepted Washington's position, however, claimed Du Bois. Many Americans, he went on, regarded Washington's position as a "dangerous compromise" that would merely encourage racial prejudice.59 Fortunately, he continued there was a "counter-movement of intelligent men" who were opposed to the purely economic solution of the race problem.60

Du Bois and Milholland appeared as concerned about British public opinion as their predecessors. Their feverish attempts to mobilize British opinion in favor of immediatism versus accommodation reveal that the good opinion and support of Britain still mattered to American reformers. And perhaps now more than ever. The "Appeal to Europe," signed by thirty-two leaders of the black community, painted in broad, uncompromising terms, the difficulties of living life in America if you were black and made an unflinching plea for continued European support:
Against this dominant tendency, strong and brave Americans, white and black, are fighting, but they need, and need sadly, the moral support of England...for this crusade for the recognition of manhood.  

Such an appeal raised the sort of ire that appeals to Europe had piqued in the ante-bellum period. The Southern press lambasted the appeal as "treasonable incendiaryism." But abandoned by political allies at the end of Reconstruction, marginalized by American reform institutions following their own agendas and concerns, and bombarded by growing discrimination, disfranchisement, and violence, African-Americans needed allies. With American reformers distracted or disinterested, the opinion of the "civilized" world was needed to impact the "most calloused American conscience."  

Du Bois's support from the APS does not appear to have diminished as a result of his attack on Washington. The journal of the APS gave equal time and lack of editorial comment to the visits of both Washington and Du Bois. This was perhaps typical of British organizations's wishes not to get more involved than was necessary in American reformist quarrels.  

In the wake of the controversy, however, the APS transferred its loyalties to Du Bois. It was with Du Bois's help that the organization established a public library in London solely devoted to general education on the race question. It was with Du Bois's help that the ASAPS planned to send members to investigate the American racial
situation in 1917 and establish what Britons could do to help. Indeed, there is no indication that any British reform societies maintained connections with Washington after 1911.

Britain's support of Du Bois stood in the tradition of British support for the immediatism of the Garrisonian antebellum crusade. Du Bois's call for active and immediate protest coincided with the British reform movement's historic goal-oriented action. Du Bois's use of Britain as a moral yardstick through which to measure American racial progress and to pressure Americans into further action was also true to the Atlantic tradition of using Britain as a moral lever. Du Bois and the NAACP continued to do this up to and during the First World War.

But in the first two decades of the twentieth century America was only part of the outlet for that British immediatism. From 1900 an international initiative to universalize racial reform swept British reform institutions along with it. British reformers present at the Conference in 1911 made elaborate plans to establish international organizations to promote racial justice. Supporters enthusiastically planned further conferences on the race issue. Attendees at the Universal Races Congress made ambitious plans to set up International bureaus for the promotion of inter-racial cooperation in every participating state.
Within the white reform community in Britain, Pan-Africanism had a two-fold effect. First, it reoriented British reform organizations towards ameliorating racial conditions within Africa. Stimulated in part by criticisms of the new Pan-African organizations and conferences, and by the knowledge that perhaps reform was more readily achievable within their own Empire than within a foreign sovereign state, British reformers yet again decided to try and put their own house in order first. Organizations such as the ASAPS turned their attention to providing practical and immediate relief to Africans and to lobbying the British government to reconsider their colonial policies. The ASAPS, always interested in Africa, redoubled its efforts around the turn of the century as a watchdog of colonial activities towards native peoples. It conducted active campaigns in Rhodesia, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, British East Africa, the Sudan, the Congo Free State, Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Lagos among others.

Second, Pan-Africanism acted as a magnet to anti-imperial sentiment in Britain. Pan-Africanism found many supporters among members of the British Liberal Party who suggested that Pan-Africanists endeavor to get their members constituencies representing African colonies and the West Indies. Pan-Africanism then funneled British interest back toward her dependent colonies and Africa in particular. Those who retained the keenest interest in African-American
affairs were black Britons active in Pan-African associations. Within the United States a level of interest in African affairs was maintained by the black press in particular and early civil rights organizations such as the Niagara Movement and the NAACP and the personage of W. E. B. Du Bois.  

But the grandiose plans of Pan-African movements came to naught, however. Financial problems beset the respective movements as they had beleaguered all humanitarian endeavors. But it was the Great War, of course, that brought an end to the giddy optimism that had characterized the Pan-African and international racial cooperation movements of the early twentieth century. The War was obviously a physical barrier to humanitarian cooperation. But more importantly the conflict proved a damning indictment of notions of Western superiority.

At the same time, however, the Great War served as a catalyst for the development of a renewed black racial consciousness, both in the United States and elsewhere around the world. African peoples looked on while the great powers of western Europe were bloodily belying notions of Anglo-Saxon superiority. "It was not Germany that lost the World War," Oswald Spengler wrote, "the West lost it when it lost the respect of the colored race." While a cloud of disillusionment settled over Europe in the wake of World War One, however, the war ignited black activism across the
board. Most importantly for the Atlantic movement, the war shattered Europe's moral authority.

A new black consciousness thus arose that, on the surface, denigrated the values of Europe. In place of this moral stanchion, African-Americans found new organizational strength within their own community. From the renewed Pan-Africanism of Du Bois, to the nationalism of Garvey, to the celebration of race in the Harlem Renaissance, African-Americans discarded Victorian ideas of racial "uplift" from above that had been at the heart of the Atlantic movement. Slowly, white Europeans too abandoned those principles that had anchored the Atlantic crusade in an essentially paternalistic relationship. Building on the pre-war interest and sympathy with Africa, white European sympathizers increasingly focused their attention on the Pan-African movement and on lobbying other international bodies for the economic and social improvement of African states.74

The post-war decades thus promised a new meaning to the "Atlantic relationship." The Anglo-American tradition of the nineteenth century metamorphasized into a broader coalition that spanned the entire Atlantic world. That compact was underdeveloped as yet, but the Anglo-American movement had provided the possibility of greater things to come. In the words of Du Bois the Atlantic movement had kept an idea alive and "some day...the importance of these early steps will be recognized."75
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CONCLUSION

The history of the Atlantic crusade for the abolition of African-American slavery and the promotion of black civil rights spans the entire nineteenth century. Although the trans-Atlantic currents ebbed and flowed, a ground swell of active or ideological support was always present. Despite the evolution of a "special relationship" between America and Britain by the end of the nineteenth century, a relationship fostered by similar imperial aspirations and a common Anglo-Saxon identity and ideology, the Atlantic reform community provided a countercurrent and counterposition to that racist kinship. Even when physical or political support was less than forthcoming, American reformers invoked the heritage of British humanitarianism as a lever with which to affect American racial sentiment. Britain and her reform heritage thus remained the thorn with which to prick the American conscience into action.

The Atlantic abolitionist and freedman's aid movement of the nineteenth century clearly owed its existence to the British abolitionist heritage. Organizations that had worked hard to bring about emancipation within the British Empire turned their attention after 1833 to eradicating slavery in
a former colony. The sometimes fractured and even fratricidal nature of that movement, however, did not imply that a contiguous and consistent Atlantic relationship was impossible. In the wake of jurisdictional disputes between and within the British and American movements, marginalized campaigners kept the Atlantic relationship alive and viable. African-Americans and women helped to bind the movements together both before, and especially after, emancipation. Disfranchised, women's role within the British abolitionist movement prior to 1833 had focused on humanitarianism as a force against slavery. Unable to influence American domestic politics women were thus well suited and well prepared for the ante-bellum crusade. Feminized ideas of charity, identification with the second-class status of African-Americans, and consciousness of a shared life as the targets of sexual abuse, meant that women remained an essential element within the Atlantic community from the anti-slavery through to the anti-lynching crusades.

The role of African-Americans within the Atlantic community grew as the nineteenth century progressed. African-Americans were able to capitalize on Briton's paternalistic interest in the slave as their white counterparts could not. But more than this, African-American reformers forwent the intervention in British domestic and organizational politics that impeded the effectiveness of white American abolitionist societies in Britain. Moreover,
even before the abolition of American slavery, African-American reformers were sowing the seeds for a post-emancipation campaign. The campaigns of African-Americans even before the Civil War were consciously raising money to support the equality of free blacks as well as the freedom of unequal slaves. The transition from anti-slavery to equal rights was a far from obvious one for many white abolitionists. In this way, African-American activists provided an ideological continuity between the ante- and post-bellum movement.

In placing marginalized groups back into the picture, then, the fundamental continuity of the Atlantic movement is revealed. Women and African-Americans were mere not footnotes to the abolitionist and freedmen's aid movement as previous scholarship has concluded, but were major, and in the case of the Atlantic movement essential, actors in the history of racial activism. It was not the Anglo-Saxon relationship that curtailed the Atlantic relationship then, so much as it was that the narrowness of historical investigation hid that history from view.

But merely reinserting women and African-Americans into the picture does not suffice. Despite their contributions, the Atlantic movement pendulumed from occupying a leading role in the humanitarian crusade to at times a mere understudy to the more important issues. In part, the natural cycles that all humanitarian movements undergo can
explain this marginalization. It was unrealistic to expect that after 1833 the British could sustain the height of agitation it reached during the domestic campaign. Like all campaigns, the antislavery campaign experienced peaks and troughs. Its history seems to support Verta Taylor's contention that in non-receptive political and social environments, social movements sustain themselves through abeyance structures, organizations that integrate hard core activists to retain a challenge to the status quo and provide continuity between one stage of the movement and another.\footnote{1}

After the initial enthusiasm generated by emancipation in 1833, support tapered off somewhat by the 1850's as the politico-diplomatic climate created Anglo-American friction. The Civil War and in particular the Emancipation Proclamation reawakened fervor, however, and created an environment supportive of racial activism. By the end of Reconstruction support for freedman's aid had again levelled out. Thereafter, although the height of anti-slavery agitation was never again to be matched, British interest in and support for African-American civil rights continued finally being absorbed into and combining with the anti-imperialist and Pan-Africanist sentiments emerging at the turn of the century.

Although the changing racial feelings within Great Britain contributed to the degree of support that Britons lent the American cause, racism was far from the sole factor.
affecting the racial barometer. Although Britons were certainly not above expressing opinions on American affairs without the slightest invitation, the Atlantic antislavery and freedman's aid movement relied upon American leadership after 1833. Thus British aid was to a degree beholden to the American movement for leadership, direction, and information regarding American racial problems. The disputes, indecision, and fractionalization of the American abolitionist movement thus all took their toll on British support. American leadership was not always constant or consistent. From the ante-bellum dispute between immediatism and gradualism through to the Washington-Du Bois controversy, constant disagreements within and between American reform organizations all played their parts in periodically leaving the British movement bereft of leadership, confused as to direction, and fractionalized. Compounded by cultural misunderstandings on both sides, political and diplomatic disputes between the respective national governments, and the inevitable promotion of personalities over programs, the Atlantic movement thus ebbed and flowed.

When American leadership was forthcoming, however, Britons generally responded enthusiastically. The monetary support lent the American freedman's crusade provided a valuable auxiliary to American efforts. It furnished immediate relief to thousands of homeless, jobless, and hungry emancipated slaves and expanded educational
opportunities for African-Americans on both sides of the Atlantic. The motivations behind such expressions of generosity were many and varied. Racial "uplift" was at the heart of most organized donations, however. British reformers, like their white American counterparts, worked against an ideological backdrop that perceived the world in hierarchical terms. British aid to African-American slaves and freedmen was thus often uplift from above. This fit well with Briton's maternal attitude towards America as a nation. Britons thus saw uplift not merely in racial terms but in the wider context of their historical relationship with the American nation. Paternalism thus colored the Atlantic relationship as it colored less humanitarian relationships between African-Americans and whites.

American reformers largely accepted the paternalism that Britons exhibited towards African-Americans, however. In fact, not only did they accept it but they implicitly encouraged it. From Garrison to Du Bois, the moral superiority of Britain was the constant and most cited weapon of American reformers. As the first country to abolish slavery, Americans consistently called upon Britain to live up to the reform heritage of the doyens of the British domestic campaign. Wilberforce and Sharp became the leaders of the historical pantheon of reform to which British and American abolitionists aspired. Bereft of sufficient support within the United States, American reformers relied on
international moral suasion as a major weapon in their arsenal. Whether this weapon was effective or not is almost incidental. But in each decade organized or independent reformers, European or American, believed that the maintenance of this moral cordon was a key element in their fight against slavery and racism.

The credibility of the claim to moral superiority was sometimes hard to retain, however. The growth of racist ideology in the ante-bellum period, the appalling treatment of freedmen in Jamaica, and the new imperialism of the late nineteenth century all called into question Britain's moral leadership. When opponents had exhausted examples of racial inequity within the British Empire, they turned to the social system itself as evidence of Britain's hypocrisy. But while these incidents put a dent in British bombast, British and American reformers refused to let them permanently injure the Atlantic reform effort. Even the admittedly worst challenge to British self-righteous beneficence—the Jamaica Rebellion—did not in the long term dampen British support for the uplift of American freedmen nor the desire of American reformers to enlist traditional sources of British aid.

That such challenges were surmounted is testament to the durability of the Atlantic relationship. Even the challenges of that great "immoral" conflict, World War One, could not destroy the Atlantic movement completely. The Great War shook the confidence of both African-Americans and Britons in
the superiority of the European conscience. But the conscience recovered to manifest itself in international movements for racial reform in the inter-war period. And at the height of that conflict, even Du Bois, who often had little but contempt to express for the Anglo-Saxon, pleaded with his readers to take heed of the words of the British author and his acquaintance H. G. Wells:

There is no more evil thing in this present world than Race Prejudice.1

NOTES


2. Crisis, November 1918, 63.
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