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The main theme of this work is the extremely close connection between British and American humanitarians during the nineteenth century. This age, which is more usually noted for unfriendly relations between the two countries, produced at the same time a generation of Anglo-American reformers bound to each other by many ties. This is exemplified very clearly in the influence of various American reformers who visited Britain at this period.

In the first chapter the framework of this connection is discussed, which then leads to a more detailed description of the place of the reform movements in the British scene. In this chapter the importance of Scotland in the reform world, and its special relations with American reformers is stressed. Throughout the thesis, indeed, special reference is made to Scotland. The work and influence of various American reformers is then considered in detail. For anti-slavery William Lloyd Garrison and certain Negro abolitionists have been selected as best giving an insight into the radical wing of the British anti-slavery movement. For the peace movement, Elihu Burritt was easily the most notable reformer to visit Britain, as was John Gough the most colourful to advocate temperance. The visit of George Cheever does not merely show the continuing interest in anti-slavery but also the close links between British and American churchmen, and in some measure, too, it brings to a close the work of this generation of reformers.

The influence of the Americans on working class and democratic
movements is considered separately, since it was felt that their influence in this sphere was an important one, if less radical than might be expected. The final chapter contains an overall assessment of the influence of the Americans. That this was often destructive, but always provocative, is clear. The Americans might divide movements, but they always encouraged popular support. Their work, too, might be limited in scope, but it nonetheless had wide indirect repercussions, and sheds an invaluable light on the importance of British humanitarianism. But above all, the visits illustrate the close ties between the two countries, and the value of studying this connection rather than stressing the differences between Britain and America.
NOTE

The following abbreviations have been used throughout:

A.H.R. American Historical Review.
S.H.R. Scottish Historical Review.
J.N.H. Journal of Negro History.
W.L.G. William Lloyd Garrison.
M.W.C. Maria Weston Chapman.
F.D. Frederick Douglass.
H.C.W. Henry Clark Wright.
G.B.C. George Barrel Cheever.
SOME AMERICAN REFORMERS AND THEIR INFLUENCE
ON REFORM MOVEMENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN FROM 1830 TO 1860
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION.

The close ties which existed between Britain and America in the nineteenth century have increasingly become a subject for study and discussion. In the field of diplomatic history it has for some time been a truism that America at this period did not live altogether free of 'entangling foreign alliances', nor did Britain dwell in 'splendid isolation', and that events in one country frequently produced a marked reaction in the other. But this connection is seen in a much more marked degree in the intellectual, the economic and the social history of the period. Ideas, commerce and men crossed the Atlantic in both directions, building up a powerful, self-conscious, if at times informal link between the two countries, well able to withstand the shocks of popular prejudice and dislike which at the same time existed between the peoples of the two nations.¹

All of this is very plain in what Frank Thistlethwaite calls "the Anglo-American world of humanitarian endeavor";² and it is clear that the many reform movements which flourished during the

1. "Ideologically America has never been isolated from Europe nor Europe from America, and the cross fertilization of ideals and practices has yielded mutual benefit." Arthur M. Schlesinger, The American as Reformer, Cambridge Mass., 1950, p. 54.
2. Frank Thistlethwaite, The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century, Philadelphia, 1959, who gives a full discussion of this whole subject. See also J. B. Brebner, North Atlantic Triangles, New Haven Connecticut, 1915; Halvdan Koht, The American Spirit in Europe, Pennsylvania, 1909. These links had been acknowledged in the nineteenth century, and William Wells Brown, a Negro abolitionist and historian, had commented: "England and America has each its reforms and its reformers, and they have more or less sympathy with each other." Three Years in Europe, London, 1852, p. 252.
middle years of the century found the Atlantic no barrier whatsoever in their development. In both countries we find early beginnings of humanitarian thought in the period of the Enlightenment, and again we find a parallel development in the early years of the nineteenth century when the work of pious individuals was taken up by organizations now of a national character. Thus we find emerging in both Britain and America movements working for universal peace, for the abolition of slavery, for temperance, for women's rights, better treatment for those imprisoned or mentally ill, for the spread of popular education, moral reform, reform of diet and dress; movements with purely secular aims seeking to establish communities based on socialist ideas and dreams; movements with religious ends seeking to establish on earth a new and better way of life based on their own religious tenets - movements, in short, which aimed at putting into operation the ideals and beliefs of a generation.¹

Anglo-American work for these reforms extends through the entire century, but the years between 1830 and 1860 have a special place in the history of this field of joint humanitarian activity. The period is remarkable, however, not so much for a closer degree of co-operation between the two countries than at other times, but for the widely publicised work of a particular generation of Anglo-American reformers. Their hysterical fervour, extravagant and sweeping assertions, and enthusiasm for all reform make the period particularly notable, though not unique, in the history of Anglo-

¹ The history of the American reforms has been very fully discussed; see, for example, Alice Felt Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, Minnesota, 1944.
American humanitarianism. Various other features characterise the period, too, including the rise of multiple reform societies, and their conscious stress on international co-operation, for the age of individual philanthropy was, in fact, dying, and the era of the professional reform societies beginning. The popular beliefs of the mid nineteenth century, too, gave a marked impetus to these reform movements. Thus the optimistic faith in progress, the Romantic idealisation of man, and the spread of Evangelical Protestantism and liberal democracy, all lay behind the mushroom growth of the many reform movements, and coalesced into a general fervour for reform. The age, finally, is dominated by the anti-slavery movement and its reformers, beginning as it does with the


2. That reformers felt moved by a common spirit and fervour is very plain from a speech made by Elihu Burritt, the leading American Peace advocate: "There is no fact in the experience of the philanthropic associations of the present day more evident and auspicious than that of oneness or identity of spirit, aim and end. Whatever may be their respective departments of labor in the great field of humanity. This one spirit seems to be the vital spirit of the Christian missionary, Temperance, Peace, Anti-Slavery, Penal and Penitentiary Reform Societies, and all others that labor for the elevation of men.... All these seem to be pervaded with one and the same spirit. The lines of their sympathy and philanthropic labor converge on one point, the elevation of man, as a being, as a brother, irrespective of his country, color, character or condition. And while they labor towards this common end, these converging lines bring them more and more closely together, until we find them on common ground." Lecture delivered by Burritt in England in 1847 and never published. Handwritten MS. in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts.
British Emancipation Act of 1833, and closing with the American Emancipation Proclamation of 1863. With the outbreak of the American Civil War a new series of factors enters Anglo-American relations, and reform activity largely passes from the hands of this generation of Anglo-American reformers. Co-operation over reforms continued, but it was no longer dominated by the anti-slavery group, and the new body of reformers attracted less popular attention, and on the whole aroused less controversial feeling.

Humanitarian activity, then, during the middle years of the nineteenth century is best seen as the work of an Anglo-American community. Various factors bear this out, the most noted being the interrelation of the history of the reform movements, and the close ties binding the reformers themselves. Tracing briefly the common history during these years of the three major reform movements, anti-slavery, peace and temperance, we see clearly how their development extends beyond national boundaries and at the same time gives to the period a unified aspect.

Anti-slavery without doubt attracted the most popular attention during the middle years of the nineteenth century and enters into every sphere of Anglo-American relations. It was from the earliest days essentially an Anglo-American venture. In the last

---

1. For the common history of some of the other social reforms of this period see Appendix I.
quarter of the eighteenth century leading Quakers both in Britain and America had attacked slavery, and the movement which sprang up, guided mainly by the British, had succeeded in outlawing the slave trade, though the United States was very unwilling for various reasons to permit a strict enforcement of this enactment. When reformers once more became active in the early 1820s it was the British again who took the lead and achieved the resounding success of the 1833 Emancipation Act abolishing slavery in all British territories. National societies were not founded in America, however, until the 1830s when important groups were formed in New England, New York and the Midwestern states, achieving for a time a loose national connection in the American Anti-Slavery Society. With the passing of the British Emancipation Act American slavery became the main focus of abolitionists everywhere. Scotland led the way in Britain with the formation in Edinburgh and Glasgow of Emancipation Societies, working chiefly for the abolition of American slavery;¹ and in 1838 the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was founded in London, taking over the work of the older abolitionists, and also concerning itself to a great extent with American slavery.² Thereafter the paths of the British and American move-

1. These Societies came into being largely as a result of the visit of the American reformer, William Lloyd Garrison. See below, Ch. III.

2. Though not entirely: "The Reporter tells us from time to time of deputations to this and that great man and visits at foreign courts and addresses to crowned heads ... they seem fond of spreading themselves far and wide and letting their existence be known to all the world, but, whether any great amount of fruit will be seen I somewhat doubt." Elizabeth Pease to Ann Warren Weston, Darlington, December 30, 1841, Weston Papers, vol. 15, pt. 1, no. 122. The Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society at an annual meeting angrily charged the B.F.A.S.S. with "dragging in foreign topics." Anti-Slavery Letters to William Lloyd Garrison, 1840, MS.A.1,2, vol. 10, no. 107.
ments became inextricably entwined. The great World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840 in London underlined the international scope of the movement and the close links between its leaders. This Convention was to be the model for all future joint humanitarian meetings, though ironically enough it marks also the open internal divisions among British and American Societies.

So serious, indeed, were these divisions that nearly all anti-slavery history after 1840 revolves around them. Largely due to the actions and personality of William Lloyd Garrison, the leader of the New England faction, they may be described as a cleavage between the conservative and radical wings of the movement. The 'Old Organization', led by Garrison, demanded among other things, immediate emancipation for the slave, full participation of women in anti-slavery activities, and abandonment of legal political measures to obtain abolition.¹ The 'New Organization' drew its support largely from the New York and Mid-Western societies, adopted a more temporising view over the immediacy of abolition, and were prepared to work for this through political measures to the extent of forming their own political party, the Liberty

Party. These divisions spread at once to Britain, where in general it may be said that the London-dominated British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society supported the New Organization, the party of the Tappan brothers, James Gillespie Birney and Henry Stanton, who acknowledged their debt to the British movement by calling their party the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The group led by Garrison, however, who still retained control of the American Anti-Slavery Society, drew their support in Britain largely from the great provincial groups, such as the Bristol and Clifton Society, and the Edinburgh and Glasgow Emancipation Societies. So deep rooted was this cleavage on both sides of the Atlantic, that abolitionists found they could no longer rely on any uniform support, but had thereafter to throw in their lot with one or the other party.

1. "There is a split among the abolitionists here and in America. One party who have peculiar government principles and (are?) in favour of the rights of women to participate in their discussions, are the disciples of Garrison. The other, who oppose such views, are generally united with such of the clergy as are abolitionists. Both are firm to the great cause, but (?) have the most dependence on the old or Garrisonian party." Webb MS. in Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, MS.A.1.2., vol. 9, no. 60.
2. For an account of the lives of Arthur, Charles and Lewis Tappan see Dictionary of American Biography.
One immediate result of this schism was that the second World's Anti-Slavery Convention in 1843 was a very much smaller affair, and was attended only by members of the British and the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Societies. It was these two societies, again, rather than the entire movement who co-operated in framing the protests to the Amistad and Creole cases – affairs which arose out of British attempts to suppress the slave trade.¹

British preoccupation with American slavery continued even after the subject was virtually outlawed in America. Repressive measures, such as the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, served only to spur on British abolitionists, and led to the Stafford House Address, a petition from the women of Britain to the women of America, which set off a chain

---

¹ These cases roused great public interest in Britain and drew protests over Article X of the recently concluded Webster-Ashburton Treaty, since it was felt that this clause, dealing with the extradition of criminals, might be employed at the demand of the Southern states for the return of runaway slaves, as well as involving the whole intricate question of Anglo-American relations over the suppression of the slave trade. For the correspondence of the two societies over these cases see A. H. Abel and F. J. Klingberg, A Side Light on Anglo-American Relations, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1927. These letters reveal, too, the attitudes of the reformers to the Texas and Mexican questions – an interesting side light since it shows that British and American reformers were at one in their fear that the annexation of these areas to the Union would lead to the spread of slavery, and so welcomed the idea of British intervention. This was an attitude shared by no one else in America, and the reformers' demands had in fact little effect on the British government, who, moved by much wider considerations, retained a neutral attitude. Ibid., pp. 16-23.
of protests in both Britain and America.\(^1\) The publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which probably roused more popular feeling in Britain than any other American novel has succeeded in doing, was another highlight, followed by Mrs. Stowe's memorable visits to Britain.\(^2\) The coming of the Civil War brought the anti-slavery movement in both countries virtually to an end. What part the American abolitionists had in bringing about the war is debateable, as is the role of abolitionists everywhere in bringing pressure to bear on Lincoln to issue the Emancipation Proclamation; but even if their influence was indirect, the issue of slavery was never far below the surface.

But in spite of these cross currents and misunderstandings, anti-slavery still produced some of the most intensive Anglo-American co-operation. There was a constant exchange of reformers from one


country to the other; of the British, Captain Charles Stuart, an itinerant West Indian soldier and abolitionist, George Thompson, the radical politician, and Joseph Sturge, a Quaker philanthropist, all made important contributions to the American movement on their visits to the United States; whilst practically every American abolitionist of note visited Britain during the 1840s and 1850s. But apart from the personal influence of particular men, the British contribution was mainly one of example, moral support and financial aid. Thus the success of the British abolitionists in 1833 was an added encouragement to the American reformers in founding the American Anti-Slavery Society; and the celebration of 1st August, Emancipation Day, was long observed in anti-slavery societies on both sides of the Atlantic. American reformers, too, faced by the controversial nature of the anti-slavery topic in their own country, drew on the British societies, who could afford to condemn slavery in easy general terms, for moral support and material aid.

This close connection created many difficulties outside the anti-slavery sphere, however, clearly illustrating the importance of humanitarian reforms in other fields of activity. The self

---

1. One of Stuart's most noted American converts was Theodore Weld; see Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844*, New York, 1833, p. 32.
2. For an appraisal of Thompson's stormy visit to America in 1834-5 see Thistlethwaite, op. cit., pp. 110-111.
4. Barnes, op. cit., Ch. III.
righteous tone of British appeals to America for emancipation was bitterly resented by all save the devoted abolitionists in the United States,¹ and there was a general feeling that the complexities of the American problem were not understood abroad; that the British were hypocritically ignoring the "slavery" of their working classes, and were interfering for ulterior purposes. But the anti-slavery societies managed to maintain their close connection despite this outside criticism, and the American question undoubtedly kept alive many British anti-slavery societies as well as the general interest in abolition.

Britain, too, became the battle ground for many of the struggles of the American abolitionists, apart from the quarrels between Old and New Organization. One of the earliest of these was the attack by the leading members of the newly formed American Anti-Slavery Society on the Colonization Society, a Society formed early in the anti-slavery struggle with the aim of resettling the Negro slaves in Africa.² Thus the visit in 1833 of William Lloyd Garrison, the Boston journalist and radical abolitionist, was largely for the purpose of combating the influence of Elliott Cresson, the agent of the Colonization Society, then working in Britain on behalf of his Society.³

---

1. See for example, the furor in America over the Stafford House Address. Moreover, when the Colonization Society was being attacked in Britain an American complained: "I am sorry the colonization question has been agitated just now in England; it has fair play, and is properly an American question." Liberator, January 11, 1834. Another pointed out that by the immoderate tone adopted by British resolutions on American slavery: "You say before the world that the major part of America is guilty of the most atrocious crimes and you impute motives to ecclesiastical bodies that would disgrace the worst of heathen." Ibid., November 30, 1833.


3. See below, Ch. III.
Another major issue on which American abolitionists concentrated while in Britain was the encouragement of the British churches to bring pressure on their American counterparts to denounce slavery. The hesitancy of American churches to condemn such a controversial issue was rightly felt by American abolitionists to be a barrier to general American condemnation of slavery, and it is no accident that the American, James G. Birney, wrote his book, *The American Churches the Bulwark of American Slavery*, (London, 1841), while in Britain. British churches in general proved quite willing to admonish their American brethren, and during the middle years of the century we find that flow of pious resolutions which was so to enfuriate the

---

1. cf. a letter from Matthew Forster to W.L.G., Newcastle Upon Tyne, November 3, 1836: "It is quite shocking that the horrid system of slavery in America should find so many apologists in your various churches. This must be scorching and withering to vital religion. I hope the Addresses and Remonstrances from this country will produce some salutary effect. We cannot find any countenance given to it in any quarter." *Liberator*, January 2, 1837. Or again: George Thompson to W.L.G., Manchester, November 11, 1836: "I am doing what I can to rouse the Christians of this land to a sense of their duty in regard to slavery and the slave trade throughout the world. I have not laboured in vain. My rich reward has been to see almost every dissenting body act upon the subject. The United Secession Synod of Scotland, the Baptist Association, and the Congregational Union of Scotland, have adopted addresses and resolutions on the subject of slavery in the United States. In England the Baptists' Union, the Congregational Union, the Friend's Yearly Meeting and the Methodist Conference have all taken the right ground, and have addressed their brethren on your side of the water in terms of solemn and faithful remonstrance. Of these the Baptists have, I think, acted more nobly than the rest. They are really doing much more on this subject, and are well demonstrating their disapprobation of the conduct of their delegates to the United States." *Liberator*, January 14, 1837. For an American reaction see: "As we always suspected, it now appears that one of the chief objects of this body (the English Baptist Union) in instituting a correspondence with the Baptists of America, was to agitate the question of abolition among the Churches." Extract from the Southern Watchman, reprinted in the *Liberator*, April 21, 1837.
Two other factors reinforced the humanitarian motive in attracting British attention to American slavery. The supply of raw cotton on which the major British industry depended, came almost entirely from the slave owning southern states of America. This economic factor was never overlooked by the anti-slavery societies as is shown by the existence of the movement advocating the use of cotton grown by free labour. Slavery, too, and especially American slavery, became closely bound up with current political philosophy. Thus the existence of slavery in a country which stood as the greatest example of the democratic experiment, was used as a telling argument for those who attacked the ideal of popular democracy, and became a major obstacle for those who described the United States as a "beacon of freedom."

It becomes increasingly clear, therefore, that anti-slavery was not only one of the major humanitarian causes on both sides of the Atlantic, but also enters into every aspect of Anglo-American relations. If it made for closer links between those like minded individuals who were working for abolition, it also created dissension and misunderstanding between the two nations, who, not for the first time, misunderstood the actions of the other.

1. For an account of Addresses and the reaction they provoked see the Liberator April 27, 1838 (Baptists); and S. J. May, Some Recollections of our Anti-Slavery Conflict, Boston, 1869, p. 338 (Unitarians).

2. See G. D. Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom, Pennsylvania, 1955; this issue was brought out very clearly in the debates on democracy in Britain during the American Civil War. See Henry Pelling, America and the British Left, London, 1956, Ch. II.
But if the history of Anglo-American work for abolition reveals a close degree of co-operation, the connection between the Peace Societies of both countries is equally strong.¹ In both countries general sentiments of peace had existed among the Quakers,² but it was not until 1815 that we find the beginning of organised peace societies in the United States. Encouraged by the news of these as well as by a general revulsion against war, a consequence of the recent struggles against Napoleon, British peace advocates soon followed the lead of the American societies.³

International co-operation was from the first the theme of the peace movements everywhere, making them rise above national prejudices and embody the Romantic ideal of fraternity. To promote this, the societies, stimulated probably by the great Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840, held a similar conference in London in 1843, a move which was followed by a series of International Conventions - the first in Brussels in 1848; then Paris, 1849; Frankfurt 1850;

² Though American Quakers played little part in the later history of the movement: Curti, op. cit., p. 15.
³ Ibid., pp. 15-16.
London, 1851; and finally petering out in the small Edinburgh meeting in 1853. Much of the organisation of these congresses was done by the American reformer, Elihu Burritt, who after 1846 was mainly active in Britain and the Continent. Indeed, the history of the peace movement at this juncture seems to centre around Burritt,¹ who was active in preaching the creed of brotherhood throughout Europe, and in forming societies there, while still maintaining links with the American movement. Friendly Addresses were exchanged between various towns in Britain and America at the time of the Oregon crisis, a practice which was followed in connection with French and British towns over the crisis occasioned by the coup d'état of Louis Napoleon.

The Crimean War, however, was to sound the death knell to much of the organised activity of the peace movement. In Britain especially, the early optimism of the reformers faded before so stern a challenge to their principles, and popular sympathy for the cause of peace disappeared almost completely. Some of the work of the movement lived on, however. The American plan for a Congress of Nations was not to meet with success in the nineteenth century, but the idea of the codification of International Law, and especially the principle of arbitration, had a more immediate success. Although Cobden's attempt in 1849 to get a resolution on compulsory arbitra-

¹. See Ch. IV.
tion through the Commons failed, it attracted much publicity; and a similar measure met with more success in the following year at the hands of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Senate. The real success of arbitration, however, was to be seen in the great victory for the principle in the Alabama Arbitration of 1870. Fittingly, the first major attempt to work this principle was over an Anglo-American issue, and ensured peace between the two countries whose reformers had done most to put into practice the ideals of brotherhood and peace.

The third of the major reform causes, temperance, is perhaps the most neglected of all the nineteenth century movements. Many writings do exist on the subject, it is true, but the number of critical, impartial works on the subject are scarce indeed, a surprising and regrettable observation to make of a movement which was, apart from anti-slavery, the most widely influential of the many reform causes. ¹ Unlike the two other great movements, anti-slavery and peace, temperance was an active force throughout the entire century, though in Britain at any rate, its years of greatest activity lie perhaps in the latter half of the age.

More so than the previously discussed movements, the British societies gained much of their inspiration from the United States. Krout makes this point very clearly:

¹ There is in fact no good modern work on the British movement, though the American has fared very much better; see J. A. Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, New York, 1925.
"English and Scottish leaders in temperance work had paid the American societies, the sincere compliment of imitation, in many instances making public profession of the fact that their inspiration came from the United States."

This sentiment is echoed by a British writer whose work gives a good contemporary account of the movement:

"Thus it appears that America was first in the field on the temperance question: and to Americans belongs the honour of having formed the first temperance society of modern date, and proved the possibility and utility of introducing combination and association into this department of philanthropy."  

As a movement temperance sprang partly from the great drive to reform the morals of society, for temperance, it was optimistically believed, would reclaim the degenerate, and improve the lot of the poor. And, indeed, in Britain at any rate, the connection between poverty and drunkenness was too great to be ignored, and led to an otherwise unexpected degree of upper class support for the movement.

In America many local societies sprang up in the early years of the nineteenth century; some attempt was made towards the formation of a national society in 1833 (the year of the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society), at a meeting of the American Temperance Societies out of which grew the American Temperance Union.

1. Ibid., pp. 178-9.
The movement was to lose some of its impetus in the following years, due partly to the controversy over partial and total abstinence from drink, but the rise of the Washingtonian movement in the 1840s, with its more radical and thoroughgoing insistence on total abstinence, was to revive popular interest and support for the cause.

Scotland was the first to follow the American example, and in 1829 we find John Dunlop acknowledging his debt to the American as he worked for the formation of temperance societies in the Glasgow area. The movement spread south into England, and again we find, as in America, the division between those advocating total and those partial abstinence. But by the 1840s some of the difficulties caused by this breach had healed, and all sides came together at the International Temperance Convention held in London in 1846, another Anglo-American effort based on the model of the 1840 Anti-Slavery Convention. A second international gathering was held in New York in 1853, the only one of these series of international meetings to be held on the American side of the Atlantic.

The close links between the societies are seen not only in the divisions found in both countries between those advocating total

---

1. T. W. Hamilton, The Temperance Movement in Scotland, Greenock, 1929, pp. 17-18. For the importance of the temperance movement on social reform in Scotland see J. R. Fleming, A History of the Church in Scotland, 1843-1874, Edinburgh, 1927: "Apart from local experiments it cannot be said that social reform entered at all into the programme of the Scottish Church until the Temperance question pressed urgently for attention on the conscience of the country." p. 76.
and those partial abstinence, but also in the exchange of reformers across the Atlantic. Thus the visits to Britain of E. C. Delavan in the 1830s and John Gough and Neal Dow in the 1850s, are matched most notably by that of Father Matthew of Cork to the United States in 1849. At the same time, however, it must be noted that the Americans were not slow to taunt the British with intemperance, especially when they felt that America was being excessively criticised for her refusal to abolish slavery. Neal Dow indeed, tells the story that at the Evangelical Alliance which met in 1846, the questions of temperance and abolition were tacitly dropped— the Americans agreeing to say nothing about the bottle if the British ignored the chains.¹

The passing in 1851 of the Maine Law, the first law to prohibit the liquor traffic in the United States, was noted with marked interest abroad, and a United Kingdom Alliance was formed in 1853 to work for a similar enactment in Britain.² In Scotland a limited measure was gained in the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act of 1853.³

---

² In a letter from the American Temperance Union, New York, the writer says: "The Rev. Dr. Patton was telling me today that he mentioned to Mr. Pope when he was last in Manchester that he should not be surprised if England had a Maine Law before the whole of the States had. Well, try; I have told the friends in America how much their success or reverses affected the movement in Britain. I may now say that "find your movements equally effect the cause here. Let there be more free interchange of information between the two countries and they will help each other." The Alliance Weekly News, April 16, 1857; clipping from John B. Gough's Scrapbooks of Personal Clippings, vol. V.
³ Cf. the Liberator, December 13, 1840; May 21, 1844.
Scotland, indeed, was always more active in temperance affairs, as American reformers were not slow to comment; Horace Greeley even going so far as to say of the English movement that: "The cause of temperance ... is here about twenty years behind its present position in the United States."  

The Maine Law, however, served to set off another division in the British movement which, during the 1850s, was seriously divided between the two factions, one advocating the spread of temperance by 'moral suasion', that is, personal persuasion and conviction, the other by 'legal suasion', or by legal enactments such as that pioneered by Neal Dow in the Maine Law. The breach was eventually healed, and by the end of the nineteenth century temperance had become one of the major social forces on both sides of the Atlantic.

Thus the histories of the anti-slavery, peace and temperance movements during this period clearly reveal the extensive degree of Anglo-American co-operation and the great fervour for reform.

1. Cf. The Liberator, December 18, 1840; May 21, 1841.
But even more notable in revealing the strength of the Anglo-American partnership is the generation of humanitarians who carried on the work of reform. Bound by various factors, religious, social and intellectual, they were part of a distinct Anglo-American community, not always harmonious, but always fully alive to the opinions and actions of the other.

The key to a description of this personal connection lies to a great degree in the religious beliefs of these men.¹ A brief examination soon reveals that the leading figures in the humanitarian crusades on both sides of the Atlantic were strongly moved by evangelical religious beliefs, and in general came from those groups which belonged to no established or hierarchical church, from the Quakers, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Unitarians and Methodists.² Members of the Church of England, and to some

1. The London Times noted this: "A common religion is again another great bond of union and sympathy between the two countries. The English Protestant cannot in his religious map afford to leave out the large and wide field which the United States present - a field in which he sees the action not of a cold or sceptical or rationalistic faith, but of a simple and enthusiastic one like his own.... Whether we look to race then, or whether we look to religion, we see in the American a natural ally and brother for whose welfare and success we wish on interested principles because we wish well to our race and our religion." July 8, 1856. See also the Edinburgh Review, April, 1838.

2. Though they were pioneers in the temperance movement in Britain, Methodists in both countries were often very conservative in their attitudes to reform movements. See the Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle, New York, August, 1844, p. 245; Gilbert H. Barnes, op. cit., p. 18.
extent the established Church of Scotland,\textsuperscript{1} tended to keep aloof from the existing movements, or, when they took part in humanitarian causes, did so in societies formed within their own denominations. Nor is it surprising that the strong evangelical beliefs which dominated much of nineteenth century Protestant thought should give also a marked impetus to the humanitarian movements. Reformers shared a religious faith which stressed among other things the acceptability of good works before God; a strong moral ethic; faith in the fundamental teachings of the Bible; and the necessity for each man to be witness to and carry the gospel of salvation to the world. These strong religious and sectarian ties between the two countries were part of a long historical tradition: British Dissenters had always maintained close contacts with their fellow churches in America with whom they shared many traditions, and these connections could with ease be turned from relations over practical religious matters to the problems of reform.

This old nonconformist alliance between the two countries\textsuperscript{2} was in many ways strengthened during the nineteenth century. These later connections are exemplified by the Evangelical Alliance of 1846, an Anglo-American gathering of Protestant ministers, in its way comparable to the great humanitarian reform conventions of the

\textsuperscript{1} As also the Roman Catholics, since in both Britain and America they were under severe social disabilities and tended to keep aloof from the humanitarian movements. The exception is the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in its work for temperance, led by Father Matthew of Cork. See Ray Billington, \textit{The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860}, New York, 1938, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{2} For a discussion of these earlier ties see Michael Kraus, \textit{The Atlantic Civilization: Eighteenth Century Origins}, Ithaca, New York, 1949.
1840s. But there were also deputations of church leaders from one country to the other; constant exchange of news in church magazines and newspapers; and shared interest in missionary work to Catholic Europe no less than to the heathen. There were, too, close ties of personal friendship between ministers in both countries; all Protestants worked for a stricter observance of the Sabbath, and joined in the attack on Roman Catholicism; and both countries experienced those waves of religious revivals which were so noted a feature of extreme evangelicalism. These revivals form in themselves another example of joint Anglo-American activity and shared experience, and were closely and vitally bound up with the purely secular reform movements.\(^1\)

But the reformers did not merely share a common religious tradition, they were bound also by close ties in economic and intellectual matters, and by a roughly similar political philosophy. Frank Thistlethwaite has clearly demonstrated the nature of this economic connection; pointing out, too, the especially close ties binding British merchants of the Dissenting tradition to their American counterparts, and the fact that several of the humanitarian reformers linked economic issues to their programmes, whilst others were actively engaged or interested in

---

1. e.g. John Angell James, a noted Congregational minister of Birmingham. "About the year 1827 he (J. A. J.) began to form intimate friendship with several American ministers, and it is my conviction that he owed very much of the religious earnestness of the last thirty years of his ministry to his intercourse with them." R. W. Dale (ed), The Life and Letters of John Angell James, London, 1861, pp. 219-220.
2. R. A. Billington, op. cit.
the north Atlantic trade. But equally interesting are the common intellectual traditions shared by so many of the reformers. That stress on learning and higher education, bred partly of the taste for theological disputation, which was so marked a feature of New England life, is found also among the leading Dissenting sects of England, and preeminently in Scotland. A high proportion of the humanitarian reformers in both countries were educated above the average, and could and did, turn at will from argument over anti-slavery action to a closely reasoned discourse on their theological beliefs. Moreover, it is interesting to note that several were booksellers, publishers or journalists. In Britain this number included Charles and Alfred Dyer, Charles Gilpin, R. D. Webb of Dublin, Charles and Edward Miall\(^2\) and William Tweedie. In America Horace Greeley,\(^3\) William Lloyd Garrison, Elihu Burritt and Frederick Douglass were all noted journalists and reformers. Harriet Martineau was another literary figure deeply interested in reform; her American counterpart is perhaps the New England poet, John G. Whittier. Not all who shared this intellectual tradition were typical humanitarian reformers, however. The friendship of Carlyle and Emerson well illustrates these close intellectual ties, but neither man can be said to represent typical humanitarian reformers devoted to popular causes.

---

1. Thistlethwaite, op. cit., especially chapters I and III.
2. Both Charles and Edward Miall (the latter was the editor of the radical paper, The Nonconformist) had interesting journalistic connections with another American reformer, Amos Phelps. Phelps Papers, 1844, vol. 14, nos. 26, 27. For an account of the work of Edward Miall, see Arthur Miall, Life of Edward Miall, London, 1884.
3. Horace Greeley also had a very real and interesting influence on British journalism. While on his visit to Britain in 1851 he was questioned about cheap daily papers by Bright and Cobden, (The American Diaries of Richard Cobden, ed. Elizabeth Cawley, Princeton, 1952, p. 29) and gave evidence on the same subject before a Parliamentary Select Committee. Scotsman, September 24, 1851.
From the common intellectual heritage it is only a step to consider the common political philosophy of this Anglo-American world. America in the nineteenth century was par excellence the great example of the democratic experiment, and Americans almost to a man defended their institutions and the beliefs which had brought them into being. Among the ruling groups of Europe, and Britain was no exception, there was a general fear of egalitarian democracy and distrust of American institutions. English Nonconformists, however, fall outside this latter generalisation partly by virtue of the fact that they were tacitly and by legal enactments excluded from social and political dominance in their country.¹ Scotland, also to some extent stands apart from the general distrust of popular democracy. The tenets of Presbyterianism had stamped upon the country a democratic form of church government, and adulterated though this might have become, as the 1843 Disruption was to show, it had also fostered among the people generally a less hierarchical social outlook than was common south of the Border. It was indeed, not merely romantic sentiment which made William Lloyd Garrison declare that the Scottish social tradition was closely akin to that of New England.² Thus English Dissenters, by virtue of their exclusion from so many


² "I was much pleased with Scotland - better pleased than with England; ... I like her people better than I do the people of England; they are more like New England in their appearance and manners." W. L. G. to S. J. May, Boston, September 5, 1840, Anti-Slavery Letters Written by William Lloyd Garrison, 1838-1843, MS.A.1.1., vol. 3, no, 62.
aspects of social life found themselves not only in opposition to the established order at home, but in marked sympathy with the state of affairs in America, where their fellow churchmen suffered none of the disabilities imposed upon English Dissent but rather held leading positions in their society. But we must not suppose that British humanitarians were in any sense radical revolutionaries. Even the most politically minded of them, men such as Richard Cobden and John Bright, who were outspoken in their praise of America, were by no means champions of radical democracy; and the majority of social reformers were at one with the rest of middle class Britain in their fear of revolutionary or nonrespectable action.¹ Nor, interestingly enough, did so many of the American reformers follow any very radical political tradition. Loyal to "American democracy", it was as David Donald has pointed out,² a rather less egalitarian form than that proclaimed by those adhering to extreme Jacksonian democracy. Indeed, as Donald makes clear, most of the leading abolitionists were Whigs, some actively campaigning against Jackson.³

Looking more closely at this world of professional humanitarians we find that important members were drawn from the Quakers, and, to a lesser extent, the Unitarians. In both countries these were long

1. e.g. J. B. Estlin to S. May, Bristol, October 1, 1846, May Papers, 1844–49, vol. 2, no. 34.
established sects fully exemplifying the tradition of joint action and understanding in economic as well as social matters. In Britain especially Quakers form the background of the anti-slavery and peace movements. The London Yearly Meeting of Quakers served as a focal time point for meetings of the Peace Society especially, and indeed the Quakers were the mainstay of this cause, contributing such leaders as Joseph Sturge, John Bright, Joseph Crosfield and the Frys, especially Edmund, who worked for several years with Elihu Burritt; as well as Scottish Quaker families such as the Wighams and the Smeals. Over anti-slavery, however, there was no such unanimity; in general the Society followed the lead of their most active member, Joseph Sturge, and adhered to the conservative B.F.A.S.S., which Sturge himself had been responsible for founding. This Society, the 'Broad Street group', included most of the older Quaker families traditionally associated with abolition, especially the Gurneys and the Frys, and maintained close connections with the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

But it is interesting to note that certain Quaker families, mainly in the north, and in Scotland and Ireland, where the Quakers were very much in a minority, were leaders of anti-slavery societies in these areas which were foremost in supporting the Garrison led American Anti-Slavery Society. Among this group we find Joseph Pease of Darlington and his daughter, Elizabeth, who, after her marriage, went to Scotland,

1. See Thistlethwaite, op. cit., for a discussion of this whole subject.
where she was on terms of the closest friendship with another Quakeress interested in reforms, and also expelled for marrying outside the Society of Friends, Pricilla Bright McLaren. In addition, there was also the eccentric Mrs. Anna Richardson of Newcastle, responsible for the purchase of Frederick Douglass, one of the most noted of the American Negro abolitionists, from slavery. And from Scotland we have the Glasgow family of Smeals, related by marriage to a prominent Edinburgh family of reformers, the Wigham's, originally a north country family, who contributed such figures as Jane Smeal Wigham, Eliza Wigham, Eliza Nicholson and Mrs. J. D. Carr of Eden Bank, Carlisle.¹ Ireland was another Garrisonian stronghold, especially in and around Dublin where the anti-slavery group was led mainly by the Webb family, headed by Richard D. Webb, and included his wife, Hannah, two brothers, Thomas and James, their cousins, Mary Waking and Sarah and Lizzy Poole, together with Richard Allen, all forming a tight knit group.²

In America by the 1830s, however, the Quakers had begun to withdraw themselves from full participation in these societies,³

---

¹ For some of the family history of the Wighams see A Brief Memorial to Eliza Wigham, n.d., Estlin Papers, Dr. Williams's Library, London.
² Anti-Slavery Letters to William Lloyd Garrison, 1840, MS.A.1.2.; vol. 9, no. 60, the Webb MS.
³ Rufus H. Jones, The Later Periods of Quakerism, 2 vols., London, 1921. Thomas E. Drake, Quakers and Slavery in America, New Haven, 1950. American Quakers who persisted in active anti-slavery work tended to be expelled from the Society for this, or for other reasons not unconnected with their abolition work, e.g. the Grimke sisters and Prudence Crandall. See also H. Aptheker, "The Quaker and Negro Slavery," Journal of Negro History, XXV, 1940.
individual figures such as Arnold Buffum, John G. Whittier, Sarah Pugh and the Motts\(^1\) forming notable exceptions.\(^2\) Interestingly these rebel Quakers all supported the radical wing of the anti-slavery faction. Moreover, in America the schisms which divided the Society of Friends not only drew attention from anti-slavery matters but caused a degree of opposition from British Quakers.\(^3\)

Thus there was a great distrust of the American Hicksites, the American Quakers who followed Elias Hicks, yet it is ironical that British Friends, while not hesitating to chastise their American brethren for their reluctance to support abolition more positively, were at the same time hostile to those American Quakers actively engaged in abolition work by reason of their allegiance to the radical wing of the anti-slavery movement.

In Britain the Unitarians were not far behind the Quakers in leading the reform movements of the day, especially the anti-slavery movement where they were among the chief supporters of William Lloyd Garrison.\(^4\) This support came largely from the Bristol area with such figures as John Bishop Estlin\(^5\) and his daughter, Mary, the Carpenter

---

1. For the life of James and Lucretia Mott, see Anna Davis Hallowell (ed) James and Lucretia Mott, Life and Letters, Boston, 1884; Mary Grew, James Mott, A Biographical Sketch, New York, n.d.

2. That these friends maintained a close and steady correspondence with British supporters of Garrison is clearly revealed in the Anti-Slavery Collection in the Boston Public Library.

3. But note the conservative attitude of the Friend, the official organ of the British Quakers, which caused William Sneal to found the British Friend in which anti-slavery Quakers could give full expression to their feelings. See R. Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh, 1955, p. 13.


5. "Not even G. T(hompson)'s death would be regarded as the loss to the cause which it now sustains in Mr. Estlin's." Samuel May to R. D. Webb, Leicester, Mass., July 24, 1855, May Papers, 1853-55, vol. 5, no. 76.
family, noted Unitarians theologians, the Rev. George Armstrong and the Rev. S. A. Steinthal. In other areas there was Harriet Martineau, possibly the most noted figure of them all,¹ Mrs. Reid, "an opulent Unitarian lady", Sir John Bowring, a leading Radical member of Parliament, William Rathbone of Liverpool and the Rev. Charles Wicksteed of Leeds.²

But while relations between individual Unitarians on both sides of the Atlantic remained cordial (the close friendship between J. B. Estlin and Samuel May of Leicester, Massachusetts, is an instance of this), it is interesting to note that American Unitarians as an official body, like other American church organisations, did not come out strongly in defence of slavery, a fact which the British Unitarian Associations noted with some disapproval.³

Two points, however, must be made at this juncture. Whilst it is profitable to discuss the religious affiliations of the reformers it is clear that the churches of these reformers were often not directly concerned with the reform movements themselves. The disinclination of American Quakers and Unitarians to intervene in the slavery question has been noted, but the other churches faced similar

---

1. Her links with America are close in the extreme. The visit to the United States of the noted authoress and journalist during the 1830s, had given her a better knowledge of the country than most foreigners possessed. It is typical of the close ties between Anglo-American reformers that Wendell Phillips' last speech was made at the unveiling of a statue of Harriet Martineau (see Dictionary of American Biography), and that Maria Weston Chapman of Boston should have been chosen by Harriet Martineau to complete her autobiography. For a recent study of Harriet Martineau see Vera Wheatley, The Life and Work of Harriet Martineau, London, 1957.
difficulties, and not only with regard to slavery. Thus in America the internal divisions facing the Presbyterians and Congregationalists over old and new school Presbyterianism drew much of the attention of church leaders from social reform. In Britain similar problems may be found: in Scotland the conditions which led up to the Disruption engaged the attention of most of the official church leaders until late in the 1840s, whilst the Church of England, distracted in some degree over the Oxford Movement, contributed only the Clapham Sect, pioneers in the early history of the abolition movement, until the 1850s when a Church of England Temperance Society was formed.

The other point to be made arises in part from this disengagement of the churches from fully active work in social reform. Thus in America especially one of the main features of the major reform movements was their non-sectarian character. Moved by the strong evangelical fervour of the day, lay men and church leaders of all denominations worked together in the various reform movements. Moreover, no particular cause became the prerogative of any sect, and active reformers tended to support the three major movements, anti-slavery, temperance and peace, with almost equal degrees of enthusiasm. For example, the Tappan brothers, wealthy merchants of New York, were active supporters of both temperance and anti-slavery; Elihu Burritt was in some ways as active for anti-slavery as he was

---

1. Barnes, _op. cit._, p. 18.
for peace;¹ and William Lloyd Garrison supported with fervour the most radical principles of temperance, peace and anti-slavery.

In Britain this is not entirely the case. In the first place sectarianism was much more pronounced, as Burritt noticed,² though there was no actual denominational bar to any of the reform societies. Much of this sectarianism, however, took the form of active rivalry between the Quakers and the Unitarians, which had serious effects on the anti-slavery movement especially. Moreover whilst we find in Britain figures such as Samuel Bowly, Jabez Burns, Joseph Sturge or Edinburgh's Duncan McLaren, who were active in all three of the major causes, it is interesting to note that the temperance movement was for many years robbed of the support of the older reformers who for various reasons did not attempt this later reform as quickly as their American partners did.

From a survey of these various social cross currents it is clear that the Anglo-American world of the reformers, though close-knit, was by no means a harmonious one. The cleavages within the societies produced a radical group in the abolition movement especially, which sealed off a separate body of reformers in both Britain and America, who in some ways had more in common with each other than they had with reformers in their own country. Thus the radicals of the anti-slavery movement came largely from a group whose strongholds were Boston and Philadelphia in the United States, and Bristol, Glasgow, Edinburgh

². "Sectarianism is exceedingly alert in this country and bitter in its manifestations." MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol. 6, Sept. 21, 1846.
and Dublin in the United Kingdom. Consisting largely of well-to-do men and women, this group belonged to a class which in the United States was rapidly losing social power, and in England was denied social standing. This, of course, does not wholly explain the position of the British; as has been pointed out the majority of all social reformers came from groups outside the established churches, which meant in England that the reformers were under social disabilities as well. But radical British abolitionists were very largely drawn from Unitarians and Quakers in outlying areas of the kingdom, and it is interesting to note that Unitarians were a body long accustomed to severe religious and political persecution, and inured to the support of an unpopular cause; whilst the Quakers in Scotland and Ireland were a very small, yet extremely close knit minority sect, cut off from the prevailing religious thought of the countries in which they lived, and equally accustomed, therefore, to support a cause which had not the stamp of popular approval. The fact that the leaders of this radical coterie, William Lloyd Garrison and George Thompson, do not fit into this category of well-to-do but socially displaced person, does not disprove this theory. They were regarded with deep admiration and loyal affection by their followers, but there were times when the limitations of their leadership were keenly felt. Samuel May declared that John Estlin's death was a greater blow than George Thompson's would have been, and from Britain there were repeated requests that Wendell Phillips, one of the well born

2. *May Papers, 1853-1855*, vol. 5, no. 76.
'proper Bostonians', be sent to exhort and encourage, whilst a visit from Garrison was actively discouraged. Another feature of this particular connection was that to a very marked degree it was carried out by women. The closest friendships were maintained by correspondence which in some cases ceased only at the writers' death, and from these letters we may obtain some idea of the work which Mary Estlin, Elizabeth Pease, and Eliza Wigham in Britain, and Maria Weston Chapman, and her sisters, Caroline and Ann Weston, together with Sarah Pugh and Lucretia Mott, were able to do for anti-slavery working in conjunction with each other, to say nothing of the influence which their example gave to the feminist movement. In connection with the whole world of humanitarian reformers, however, another feature must also be considered. Not all who actively supported reforms had close ties, or indeed felt any great bond of sympathy with the other country. The anti-slavery movement again furnishes a proof of this. Thus the Stafford House group were in great measure anti-American in their statements, as the Americans were not slow to declare, nor could measures advocated in one country always be easily adopted by the other. The Maine Law which was heatedly attacked in Britain by foes as well as certain advocates of temperance, was denounced as an American innovation.  

1. e.g. Weston Papers, 1853, vol. 27, no. 6.  
2. Ibid., 1857-59, vol. 29, no. 76.  
3. "For our part we believe the Maine Liquor Law, as it is called, to be as purely American and as impossible to be transplanted to this soil as slavery, or tar and feathering or the general use of cowhides, bowie knives and revolvers. It surely won't do here." First leader, The Times (London), October 3, 1856.
In the nineteenth century no less than in the twentieth the popular sentiment between the British and Americans was one of dislike, prejudice and misunderstanding, and reformers were not always an exception to this rule. Remove the leaders of humanitarian causes and the lower ranks of reformers will generally reveal men who shared all the popular prejudices and dislikes of those not allied by the bond of common labour for reform. But when all this is said, the close ties of friendship and remarkable degree of co-operation which existed among British and American humanitarians still remains, a witness to the common inheritance and values of the two countries.
CHAPTER II

THE PLACE OF THE REFORM MOVEMENTS IN THE BRITISH SCENE.

We have seen that in both Britain and America humanitarian activity was largely carried out by a group whose social and intellectual ties were very close. At this juncture another feature must be noted: in the same way that geographical divisions occur in the reform societies of America, the most noted being the isolation of New England from New York and the Mid-Western states, so in Britain these regional distinctions are an important, if little studied feature. One of the main British divisions are the distinctions between the Scottish and the English reform movements; these are not merely the result of a nationalist dislike of English leadership by the Scots, or an unwillingness to submit to London domination by provincial towns, but have a much deeper significance. In England humanitarian reformers tended to come from the great Nonconformist families, an important difference between the reform movements in England and those north of the Border; for while Nonconformity was socially unacceptable in England, there were no such barriers in Scotland. This meant that social reformers often had more social prestige in Scotland, where the leading reformers, in addition to being men of standing in the community, often commanded a degree of authority and respect not usually accorded to those outside the English Establishment. Something of this may be seen in comparing the social positions of John Bright and his brother-in-law, Duncan McLaren, a noted Lord Provost of Edinburgh:¹ both were leading figures in

the humanitarian world, but while the fame of Bright today greatly surpasses that of McLaren, in his own time the latter enjoyed by far the greater social distinction and standing.

The fact, too, that reform was more generally supported in Scotland than in England had various consequences. The close connection between religion and reform has already been noted. On the practical sphere this meant that the churches were willing to allow their halls and chapels to be used for lectures and meetings by reform societies. But in England this almost without exception meant Nonconformist churches, and if meetings were to have a general public appeal they had, therefore, to be held in such neutral ground as the Town Hall. This might seem a small matter, but the significance of it is to be seen when the situation in Scotland is compared. In the latter country Presbyterian and occasionally Congregationalist Churches were almost always used for meetings, and since the church was usually the social focal point of the community, this meant that the church going population (and in nineteenth century Scotland this included the vast majority of those who claimed any degree of social standing), could be expected to support the meeting. Samuel Ringgold Ward, a Negro abolitionist, commented on this forcefully:

"There are classes in England which the anti-slavery cause never reaches, the classes who compose the multitude. It is not so in Scotland, because the whole population, high and low, attend divine services and they naturally enough acquire the habit of attending the kirk for any subject for which it is open."

It is evident, then, that in the freer social atmosphere of Scotland reform movements had a greater opportunity to flourish than in England. This is most clearly seen in the case of the temperance movement, the latest organized of the three major societies, which succeeded earlier in Scotland to a far greater extent than it did south of the Border. Technically, too, London was also the headquarters of the anti-slavery movement, but the marked Scottish support for the radical anti-slavery wing, and indeed the active state of anti-slavery in Scotland, has already been noted. The peace movement alone forms an exception to this rule, in spite of the championship of the Wighams and Duncan McLaren. Cobden gave very interesting reasons for this in a letter to McLaren:

"Nowhere has the movement fewer partisans than in Scotland; and the reason is obvious. First, because your heads are more combative than even the English; which is almost a phrenological miracle; and secondly, the system of our military rule in India has been widely profitable to the middle and upper classes in Scotland, who have had more than their numerical proportion of its patronage; therefore the military party is very strong in your part of the kingdom."

It would be tempting to conclude that Scotland had more in common with the United States over reform than did England. Several factors, indeed, bear this out: over educational reform the two countries shared a common sympathy and tie; over temperance

2. See Appendix I.
Scotland was certainly more in step with American reformers than was England; and even in temperance controversies it was Scotland which took the lead. In anti-slavery matters the bond was no less close; in the 1830s Scotland was roused by George Thompson to a high pitch of enthusiasm to work for American abolition; in the 1840s the controversy over the acceptance of money from the southern states by the Free Church of Scotland caused a social furor over an Anglo-American issue which was probably unprecedented; in the 1850s it was Scottish anti-slavery circles again who took the lead in the invitation to Harriet Beecher Stowe to visit Britain, probably the chief event in anti-slavery activity during this decade.¹

On the other hand, Americans felt a special sympathy for Scotland.² They noted the similarity of so many of her social traditions to their own, and they were attracted almost without exception by the romantic history of Scotland's past, making them tacitly exclude


the Scots from any share in the list of English sins and misdeeds.

But the Scottish-American connection must be seen in perspective. Scotland might take the lead, but London remained the hub of the universe in social reform as in everything else. American reformers in Britain used it as their centre for carrying out their activities, and to speak at Exeter Hall was the pinnacle of a lecturer's career. Moreover the area which in fact had most in common with Scotland was New England, and while New England was prominent in support of reform movements, and almost every leading humanitarian was Yankee in origin if not by birth, yet when considering the general pattern of American reform it is clear that the most important area was probably western New York, the 'burned over district', and the comparatively recently settled states of the Midwest. New England and Scotland, it is interesting to note, both tended to support the more extreme tenets of the reform societies and so place themselves to one side of the humanitarian crusade.

Considering further the place of the reform movements in Britain, it is clear that their importance as social movements has not always been fully acknowledged, for that their influence had far reaching implications is undoubted. Thus they did not merely remain the benevolent enterprises of the British bourgeoisie, and it is interesting to note the reactions of the other classes to the three leading movements, anti-slavery, peace and temperance.

---

Anti-slavery, the oldest organised and most conspicuously successful, has an interesting background. We have already noted the division in anti-slavery circles between the London dominated B.F.A.S.S. and the provincial societies. In addition to other factors there is a subtle tinge of class snobbery in this division: the London group being the more 'genteel' of the two, as is seen in the reaction in anti-slavery circles to the 1843 Convention.¹

Anti-slavery, too, is interesting for the support it evoked in upper class circles. Almost at the same time that the emphasis shifts from colonial to American slavery we find an aristocratic coterie dabbling in anti-slavery matters. Stanton indeed remarked that "the cause of slavery wore gold slippers in England".² The Stafford House party led by the Duchess of Sutherland is the most notable of these groups, and included such other Scottish notables as her son-in-law and daughter, the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, Lord Kinnaird, and Lady Byron. By their actions, however, this exclusive and fashionable set succeeded in rousing more opposition and ill will on both sides of the Atlantic than possibly any other

1. James Haughton to W. L. G., Dublin, September 15. "The bigots in London are, I find, bigots still: they invite 'gentlemen' to their next gathering .... Is it likely that any man from your side, worth going to meet, will be there? English aristocratic anti-slavery may, no doubt it will, do much good; but it is not exactly the pleasantest thing to come into close contact with. It is not downright freedom at all." Liberator, October 14, 1842. Cf. also: "The terms of admission are that everyone shall be a gentleman, and no other reason need be adduced why such a narrow minded convention should be repudiated by every true hearted abolitionist. Genuine Christian philanthropy has nothing to do with it." Ibid. March 31, 1843.

2. H. B. Stanton, Random Recollections, New York, 1887, p. 76.
single group,¹ save the Garrisonians. The bitter reaction in America to the Stafford House Address, a petition from the women of Britain to the women of America to help abolish slavery, was immediate, caused to a great extent by American appreciation that the Address was motivated almost as much by dislike of the United States as of slavery.

Working class feeling for abolition is no less interesting.² The sympathy which the slave of the loom might be expected to have for the slave of the soil has been generally accepted, and the support of the Lancashire cotton operatives for the North during the Civil War has been taken as an example of this. But it is becoming increasingly clear that this simple view cannot wholly be accepted.³ British workers felt a sympathy for the slave, it is true; radical working class movements had supported abolition pressure groups in the struggle to bring about the 1832 Reform Bill,⁴ and though they became disillusioned with middle class humanitarians as political leaders, many workers still retained a feeling of

2. For a very similar attitude on the part of the American worker see Williston H. Lofton, "Abolition and Labor", J.N.H., XXXIII, 1945.
sympathy for the slave.\footnote{e.g. The \textit{Liberator}, July 30, 1841, which gives an interesting account of an anti-slavery meeting at Ipswich at which workers expressed these feelings. In 1837, however, an Address had been sent to the working class of America to counteract the anti-American attacks of the Whig and Tory press showing that though not insensible to defects in America, they had very different views. The Address stressed the fraternity of the working class everywhere and urged unity between the British and American workers, though at the same time expressing a dislike of American capitalism and slavery. William Lovett, \textit{Life and Struggles of William Lovett}, London, 1920, p. 132.} Moral force Chartists, especially, had connections with abolitionists, the friendship of Henry Vincent and William Lovett with men such as Garrison and Douglass being an instance of this. But in general the Chartists tended to use abolition meetings mainly for their own ends, the Glasgow working men in particular appearing to have had a tradition of linking anti-slavery to their demands for political reform, as was seen most clearly over their reaction to the Fugitive Slave Act.\footnote{cf. Cobden's statement that Free Trade and Peace "are one and the same cause." J. A. Hobson, \textit{Cobden the International Man}, London, 1919, p. 37. For a discussion of the whole subject see Helen Bosanquet, \textit{Free Trade and Peace in the Nineteenth Century}, Kristiania, 1924.}

Much of this position is seen also with regard to the peace movement. The Peace Society was very strongly supported by adherents of the Manchester School,\footnote{\textit{Liberator}, May 28, 1841; \textit{Weston Papers}, 1850-51, vol. 25, no. 47; \textit{Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison}, MS.A.1.2., vol. 19, no. 106. At a political soiree given in St. Martin's Hall, Ernest Jones described the English poor as in a worse condition than the "Hindoo pariah, the Russian serf and the African slave." \textit{The Times}, London, October 9, 1856.} and leading Free Traders, men such as Richard Cobden, John Bright and George Wilson, the Chairman of the Anti-Corn Law League, were followers of this cause. Partly because of this alliance, however, the peace movement was not well received by radical working class groups. George Julian Harney, the physical
force Chartist, ridiculed praise of all middle class freedoms, but was especially virulent about the Peace Society. To Harney the pacifist views of the Quakers and manufacturers were "a weak washy flood of 'moral' twaddle" and amounted to "the condonation of the despotic status quo in Europe which it was futile and foolish to believe could be changed peacefully."¹ George Weerth, another extremist, and a member of the Communist League, who had lived in Yorkshire for some years, caused a sensation at the Free Trade Congress in Brussels in 1843 by denying that free trade would alleviate working class conditions, and declared that he, and not the Peace League, who were strongly represented at the Congress, spoke for the English working class;² sentiments which Harney endorsed some weeks later at a meeting held in honour of George Thompson.³ Yet for leaders of the moral force school pacifist arguments had a very real appeal. Henry Vincent, a leader of this group, was a friend of Elihu Burritt, who in his turn aimed several of his arguments at the working class. Thus Burritt attacked the British National Debt for creating a system whereby the workers were paying for aristocratic wars.⁴ But, in fact, the working class do not seem to have been unduly attracted to the movement. Chartists used the meetings and arguments of the peace reformers for their own

2. Ibid., pp. 153-4.
3. Ibid.
4. The Christian Citizen, September 12, 1846; The Bond of Brotherhood, February, 1848.
ends as they did in so many other instances,¹ and this was especially seen in 1846 in the agitation over a Militia Bill, popularly held to be the result of a war scare over the Oregon Crisis. Thus the Northern Star, a physical force Chartist newspaper, described meetings in Scotland and England to protest against the Bill, endorsing the cry of 'No Vote! No Musket!' "When henceforth the masses, the impoverished, unrepresented masses, are called upon by their rulers to fight for 'their country'...," Harney wrote, "they will answer ... if you will monopolise all, fight for the country yourselves."² But the whole temper of the working class was generally against pacifism, and by the 1850s when they had become active champions of the liberal movements in Europe and were pressing for intervention all hope of enlisting their support had to be abandoned.

Upper class support, on the other hand, was even less forthcoming. Not only was there a distrust of all that was sponsored by Manchester, but there was also a clear recognition that many of the objectives of the movement were attacks on upper class privileges and prerogatives. Thus demands for the reduction of the Army and

1. e.g. The Scotsman, November 14, 1840; MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol. 10, January 19, 1848.
2. Schoyen, op. cit., p. 138. cf. also a similar reaction to the panic caused by an invasion scare in 1848. "George Thompson ... and Henry Vincent, and men like them have been telling the masses 'if the government call out the militia, say to the government "What are we going to fight for?" and if it be right to fight, which it is not, also say, "enfranchise us, and give us our just rights for at present we have nothing to defend."" Richard Thurrow to W. L. G., Edinburgh, Scotland, February 16, 1848, Liberator, March, 10, 1848.
Navy, traditionally upper class provinces, were vigorously attacked in staunch conservative circles. Blackwood's Magazine, for example, was an avowed enemy of the peace movement (as indeed of temperance and anti-slavery), and at the small Edinburgh Peace Congress of 1853 Sir Charles Napier attacked the delegates claim of the need for disarmament.

A somewhat similar situation is seen in connection with the temperance movement. Until the 1850s temperance as a cause drew its support almost entirely from the Scots and the English Nonconformist middle class, especially the Methodists. To the upper classes the drinking of wines and spirits was a social custom and part of a way of life. Drunkenness, with its attendant, vice, was, on the other hand, traditionally associated with the poorer classes. Moreover, members of the Episcopal Church, especially the Puseyites, were effectively alienated from an endorsement of teetotalism by the controversy over communion wine. But while there was little upper class support for temperance principles as a personal way of life, the wealthier classes were prepared to patronise a movement

1. See a letter from Amasa Walker, an American reformer, to the Liberator, stressing the cult of war in Britain especially among the gentry of the country, and the respect given to the army in England. Liberator, October 13, 1843.
3. Scottish Guardian, October 18, 1853.
5. Strict teetotalers felt that abstinence should be extended to the point of using unfermented wines at communion.
which might make the working classes more respectable and socially amenable. Thus John Gough found in Britain that the leaders of the Church of England became increasingly active in advocating temperance.

Working class opinion, however, was again divided on this issue. There seems to be some indication that radical working class forces were aware of the determination to cure the ills of poverty by making beer and spirits more expensive and difficult to obtain. Feargus O'Connor in 1841 denounced "Teetotal, Church and Household Suffrage Chartism," and while Harney on one occasion proposed that the Sheffield Chartists should take the pledge, "this aberration was only temporary." But at the same time it should be noted that some of the earliest leaders of the temperance movement were Primitive Methodists, as for example, Joseph Livesey, who in turn were interested in other working class reforms. Temperance might not be "genteel" but it was "respectable," and there were many among the poorer classes who saw that temperance offered an avenue to respectability and social standing. Moral force Chartists,

4. Ibid., p. 124. See also Elihu Burratt, A Walk from London to John O'Groats with Notes by the Way, London, 1864, p. 223. Burratt felt that had the Chartists adopted temperance whole heartedly they would have come closer to achieving manhood suffrage.
especially, were interested in temperance. Vincent was a firm adherent of the movement; and in Scotland it is clear that temperance was an important tenet in the beliefs of several of the Chartist leaders, especially John Fraser and Abram Duncan, and that as a movement it played an important role in the history of Scottish Chartistism. ¹

From the intimate connection of the humanitarian movements to class interests, it is not surprising that the reform movements play an important though little studied role in the politics of the day. This connection is emphasised by the fact that the leaders of reform generally came from the Nonconformist middle class, newly enfranchised, but still with many unsatisfied social demands, and therefore tending to be radical in politics. Scottish reformers, too, largely followed this tradition, in part a consequence of Scottish antagonism, especially in the towns, to English Conservatism. The society in which the humanitarians moved was one which was accustomed to form pressure groups to urge those changes which would satisfy the Nonconformist conscience as well as interests. Thus in the period between the first and second Reform Bills when governments no less than Members of Parliament had to be continually aware of the wishes of the electorate, we find a series of highly organised and extremely active interest groups agitating for various causes. Many of these groups worked

¹. L. C. Wright, Scottish Chartism, Edinburgh, 1953, pp. 37-40, 87; 95-96; 172; 179-180; 210-211.
through Conservative Members to support some long entrenched interest, but many more were the organs of the newly enfranchised middle classes, and drew their chief support in Parliament from the loosely knit group of Radicals. The Anti-Corn Law League is the most famous of these pressure groups, but almost as important were those bodies agitating for Sabbatarian legislation or popular education, attacking in every sphere the vast privileges of the Established Church, and generally seeking to make some breach in the hegemony of the established order. Anti-Slavery had formed one of the important pressure groups in the years before the passing of the 1832 Bill, and even after there still remained a small group working for better treatment of West Indian Negroes, and for a stricter enforcement of the laws against the Slave Trade. In this later period too, we see coming into being pressure groups working to promote the cause of peace and temperance.

Of these two, it is the peace movement, perhaps, which is most closely linked to the politics of the day. Through its connection with the Free Trade movement and the leaders of the Anti-Corn Law League it was assured of support by the most successful members of the radical group in Parliament. Moreover, since the peace movement worked mainly for general principles and had few positive objectives, it was easy for politicians to adapt these principles to their own ends. As has been pointed out its attack on the Army and Navy, strongholds of the upper class, greatly appealed for many reasons to members of the Nonconformist middle class, tacitly barred as they were from holding commissions in the
services; while the attack on the National Debt and government spending served to forge yet stronger links with the Manchester School. 'Peace, Retrenchment and Reform' were, after all, no idle catchwords in Victorian politics.

The main strength of the peace movement as a political force came during the years 1846 to 1856. The first attempts to bring pressure to bear on the government were indirect. This was seen in 1846 over a proposed Militia Bill when Joseph Sturge led a series of public protests against the government's action. At the beginning of 1848 it was agreed by leaders of Elihu Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood and the London Peace Society to promote popular demonstrations throughout the country against any government proposal to increase the National Defences. But after the successful International Peace Congress at Brussels, the peace movement became more ambitious. On October 30, 1848 a delegation called upon Lord John Russell to urge the claims of peace and the benefits of arbitration. By the end of the year plans were being made not merely to have public support for the principle of arbitration but to have such a motion brought before Parliament itself. Richard Cobden was therefore approached to undertake such a task.

1. "The Peace Society originated the recent movement against the calling out of the Militia ..." Liberator, March 27, 1846.
4. Ibid., November 13, 14, 1848.
and for the next few months peace activity was almost entirely centred around Cobden's motion, while important groups such as the Liverpool Financial Reform Association endorsed the principle.¹ From the pages of Burritt's Journal, too, we find an increasing number of Radicals in Parliament displaying an interest in the peace movement; these included John Bright, Sir Joshua Walmsley, Lawrence Heyworth, Joseph Brotherton, Charles Hindley, Charles Gilpin, William Ewart and Milner Gibson. The motion was finally brought before the House on June 12, 1849, but failed.

But the peace party still remained strong in Parliament. Headed by Cobden, it continued to offer resistance to those government actions which seemed to violate the broad aims of peace. One of these was the Austrian Government loan which Cobden especially opposed, seeking the help of Burritt to raise a public outcry to denounce the loan and its objects.² This move had apparently little success but Cobden later declared at the London International Peace Congress that "if Austria came forward for another loan, he pledged himself to attend a public meeting in the London Tavern for the purpose of showing up her bankrupt condition."³ Parliamentary opposition to the Militia Bill of 1852 again drew its

¹. MS. Journals. Vol. 12, December 13, 1848.
². Ibid., Vol. 14, September 28, 1849.
³. Ibid., Vol. 16, July 24, 1851.
information from Peace Societies.¹

In the events leading up the Crimean War peace and politics became more than ever entangled. Elihu Burritt declared of the tiny Edinburgh Peace Congress that it would "in a great degree be connected with British politics,"² whilst Cobden was again at the head of a peace party in Parliament. In 1853 he spoke vigorously on behalf of peace in an attempt to stem the anti-war feeling, and at this point "considered his anti-war campaigning as more important than the suffrage agitation which Bright was pressing him to undertake."³ In 1854 Russell withdrew a Reform Bill because of the possibility of approaching war, and Bright, while not friendly to a Bill which did so little for the urban middle classes, attacked this withdrawal on the grounds that "war taxation was coming which would breed a powerful agitation in the great centres of population for a larger and juster share in the control of Parliament than had yet been offered them;"⁴ an argument which Maccoby notes was heard by Palmerston with some respect since earlier he had greatly overrated the powerlessness of the peace party.⁵ The war, however, alienated much sympathy

1. cf. especially Ibid., Vol. 17, March 27, 1852; "Milner Gibson came in and staid with me an hour. His principle object was to get some facts to oppose to the new Militia Bill which is to be brought before Parliament on Monday evening. I gave him several which he took down." For an account of the debates on the Bill see Ibid. April 23, 24.
2. MS. Journals, Vol. 18, September 30, 1853.
4. Ibid., pp. 30-31.
5. Ibid., p. 31 note.
from the peace movement and strengthened Palmerston's hand politically so great was the distrust in Parliament of the group of "peace fanatics." 1

The temperance movement has a no less interesting connection with the politics of the age. Their "opponents", the brewers, had from the eighteenth century represented a small but influential pressure group in Parliament. 2 Thus for temperance reformers to achieve positive gains it became clear to one wing of the movement at any rate, that pressure on the government for legislative action would be necessary; and inspired by the example of the Maine Law we find growing up after the formation of the United Kingdom Alliance, a group of temperance men in Parliament prepared to advocate strict temperance legislation. The rising Liberal party, sympathetic to Nonconformist aims, showed itself ready to aid the cause. The brewers, on the other hand, finding their old, if informal, alliance with the Whigs a thing of the past, cast their lot - and their funds - with the Conservatives, "a movement of profound consequence to British politics." 3

But the leaven of temperance worked yet further in the political scene. Free drink had been one of the major features at General Elections, and to advocate and practice temperance could be political suicide for a candidate. Writing to Garrison Richard Allen, a Dublin Quaker, attributes Daniel O'Connell's failure to be elected

1. Ibid., p. 46
3. Ibid., p. 113.
for Dublin in 1841 to this very cause:

"Various causes are assigned for the defeat in Dublin. I believe it is in great measure owing to his noble position in the temperance cause, and to his spread of temperance in out city as well as elsewhere. But, some will query, how is this? I answer, little if any less than 500 public houses have been closed, and the occupiers of these, almost to a man, would have voted for him. But, surely, it is a noble triumph to be rejected on such grounds. To his credit, be it said, in asking for support, he stood firm on the total abstinence principle, in word and deed. The people are sorely disappointed."

But the days of the publicans' stranglehold on elections, and on working class organisations, were numbered. With the failure of radical Chartism by the 1840s, and an increase in prosperity, there is a definite tendency on the part of the more well to do among the workers to accept middle class standards and politics. This drift the temperance movement clearly aided, as well as fostering the growth of 'respectable' trade unions, a connection clearly apparent

1. Dublin, 16 of 7 mo., 1841, Liberator, August 6, 1841. George Thompson also underwent this experience. Writing to Garrison in 1852 he described his defeat at Tower Hamlets and blamed this on "a combination of Publicans, Brewers, Distillers, Gin Shop Keepers, Magistrates, Monopolists and great Corporations." London, September 24, 1852. Anti-Slavery Letters to W. L. G., 1852, MS.A. 1, 2, vol. 24, no. 99.

2. "The powerful temperance agitation, stressing as it did how much an artisan's welfare depended on his own self control had been exerting a steadily increasing influence on Trade Society habits and ideals for a generation. As early as 1840 a number of London Trade Societies were in alliance with parliamentary radicals like Wakely and Bowring to finance the building of Trades halls which would free them from dependence on publicans' hospitality. It was a dependence which involved some societies in expending as much as one third of the weekly contribution in 'refreshment'. By 1850, however, such a society as the Iron moulders may be found reporting that the advance of temperance was causing the disgruntled publicans to refuse the society the use of their club rooms. The way was, indeed, clearing for that large abolition of liquor allowance to members of the committee which was to mark the next decade of Trade Society history." S. Maccoby, English Radicalism, 1832-1852, London, 1935.
when it is remembered that meetings were frequently held in coffee and public houses (e.g. the Crown and Anchor in the Strand was a haunt of the Chartists), and thus club night too often became an excuse for drinking bouts which consumed the society's funds. It is interesting to note that a Chartist, Robert Cranston, was responsible for opening several temperance hotels throughout the country.

The connection of the anti-slavery movement and politics is perhaps the most complex. Previous to the 1832 Act the abolitionists had formed one of the most influential pressure groups in urging reform, but with the passing of Emancipation slavery ceased to be a domestic issue, and, indeed, the equation of slavery with America caused not a few responsible politicians to remain neutral on this subject for fear of unnecessarily antagonising the United States. By the 1840s it is clear that the political power of the abolitionists had sharply declined:

"The anti-slavery cause in this country is by no means in the plight its friends could wish to see it. The present government looks on it as a question in which a certain portion of well meaning, narrow minded people are interested, and they do not care a rush about it. For

1. S. Maccoby, English Radicalism, 1853-1886, p. 30n.
2. L. C. Wright, op. cit., p. 211.
3. John Bright, curiously enough, never supported the abolitionists until the Civil War. See R. D. Webb to (Caroline?) Weston, n.d., "he who never said a good word for the anti-slavery cause or for its advocates until the war broke out and obliged him to declare himself". Weston Papers, 1841, pt. 2, vol. 16, no. 20.
the anti-slavery body is no longer feared because it does not make itself felt. The time of mighty efforts is gone by, that of small ideas and trivial measures, and gigantic means of carrying little plans into execution is come.... The spirit of democracy is dead and buried in the anti-slavery body; and as for my part I am growing weary of the manner the question is worked, and begin to look to the promotion of the general interests of liberty and good government as the only hopeful means here for the advancement of anti-slavery views."  

From the second half of this letter we may get a hint of the paradox contained within the anti-slavery movement - the conservative character of many of its leaders together with the very radical nature of the ideals they advocated. That this had political repercussions is clear. An American paper, admittedly biased, commented in 1846:

"The truth of the matter is, that the anti-slavery party is not very popular just now; they leagued with the protectionists to oppose the repeal of the Sugar Duties, and though the reports of their proceedings are duly published in the newspapers, one does not see any of these 'thundering' articles denouncing slave holders and the American slave states which were formerly so fashionable....  

Among commercial men to a great extent the case is different. They say that the unreasoning zeal of the anti-slavery advocates has become a public nuisance; that they are for meddling in every question of diplomacy and finance, where the word 'negro' crops up, and that their ill directed enthusiasm has of late years been productive of nothing but mischief."

1. Dr. R. D. Madden to W. L. G., April 28, 1843. Sloane Square, Chelsea, March 3rd, Liberator, April 28, 1843. cf. also John Scoble to W. L. G., London, 1st October, 1837. "We find ourselves without a leader in the House of Commons, or a single peer in the House of Lords, to represent our principles or to urge our prayers." Anti-Slavery Letters to W. L. G., MS.A.1.2., vol. 6, no. 72.  
2. Extract from the Charleston Courier, reprinted in the Liberator, November 27, 1846.
But anti-slavery with its demands for liberty and equality was too enmeshed in radical theories of democracy to remain divorced from radical politics. However little they might do for the movement radical leaders were not slow to make use of the cause for their own ends. The Irish question is a case in point. Daniel O'Connell, for example, spoke eloquently of the parallel between the white slaves in Ireland and the black slaves in America, and claimed that the only distinction between them was that the Irish slave was nominally a free subject, while the American was supposed to be chattel property, though in fact he bore no hardships so great as those of the Irish peasant. 1

The connection of anti-slavery and the working class has already been discussed, but though the working class and especially its extremist leaders, might have little love for abolitionists, the issue of slavery was again too apposite to their cause for the two to be divorced. An account of a public meeting in Glasgow at which slavery and political reform were inseparably connected illustrates this well:

"On Tuesday evening a public meeting of the working classes and others in the city, friendly to the emancipation of British slaves, and a just measure of political reform in the British House of Commons was held in the City Hall, Candleriggs Street, to adopt resolutions against the infamous Fugitive Slave Bill, recently enacted in America, and in favor of reforms in this country ..." 2

2. Extract from the Glasgow Press reprinted in Ibid., January 10, 1851.
The great day of anti-slavery and politics was to come during the Civil War when slavery became equated with reaction, and the success of the North with the triumph of democracy; when working class sympathy for the slave (no matter how simple this view British politicians yet believed it), and the restrained behaviour of the Lancashire cotton operatives during the famine, all led politicians to fear the enfranchisement of the working man less, and agree at last to the passing of the 1867 Reform Bill.¹

One of the themes underlying British politics from 1832 to 1867 is the question of extension of the franchise. Only the more extreme humanitarian reformers connected this with the legislation they were seeking, but more important is the fact that these humanitarian movements offered a common ground to members of the middle and working classes. It was a lack of this common basis which explained the failure of so many of the attempts to find agreement over a reform of Parliament.² Much was hoped from the temperance movement on this score,³ and a few hoped that the principles of the Peace Society might disarm the extremists in the working class movements.⁴ Ironically it was the anti-slavery question which had done least through its organisations to bring the worker and the social reformer together, which precipitated the debates leading up to the 1867 Reform Act.

2. See F. E. Gillespie, Labor and Politics in England, 1850 to 1867, Durham, North Carolina, 1927, for a discussion of this whole subject.
Such then are various aspects of the British reform scene. It has been thought necessary to discuss it in some detail not merely to illustrate further the close connections with American reform but to give some idea of the importance of humanitarian activity in Britain. American reformers coming to Britain were not thus simply the agents of benevolent enterprises of limited scope but were concerned with work which involved far reaching social consequences. That they found the reform scene full of complexities and cross currents is clear, and the success of their missions often depended on steering a course between the more obvious conflicts involved, or better still, allying themselves to the most powerful group they could. Almost all realised the social issues involved; and the great numbers of American reformers visiting Britain assured a supply of reasonably accurate information as to the state of affairs. It is to a detailed consideration of the work of some of these reformers that we must now turn.
CHAPTER III.

ANTI-SLAVERY: WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND
THE NEgro REFORMERS IN BRITAIN.

The anti-slavery movement in the years between 1830 and 1860 was probably the most powerful and certainly the most controversial of the humanitarian causes. The abolition of slavery in the British territories had shown that emancipation could be achieved, and meant also that the efforts of abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic became concentrated on American slavery. Their work was carried out in a blaze of publicity, and their every action was discussed in numerous pamphlets, newspaper reports and editorials. Yet despite all this, the movement during these years was a curiously ineffectual one. In America it was divided and wholly divorced from public support, and the work of abolitionists there only served to make the South more intractable and a solution to the problem more difficult. In Britain the main activity of the anti-slavery leaders consisted only in encouraging their American friends, joining with them in their disputes and quarreling among themselves.

Anti-slavery history, indeed, during these years is largely a record of the schisms between the factions in the movement—divisions which occurred both in Britain and America, the quarrel being conducted in a transatlantic setting. But while the American movement has been discussed at length, and some attempt made to evaluate the relative importance of the main parties within it, 1 in Britain this is by no

1. See, for example, Gilbert H. Barnes, The Anti-Slavery Impulse, New York, 1933; Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond, Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimke Weld, and Sarah Grimke, 2 vols. New York, 1934 - who are the first to give prominence to the Mid-Western wing of the movement.
means the case, and indeed, much of the later history of the British anti-slavery movement has been curiously neglected. Thus there is a marked tendency to ignore the British anti-slavery movement after the 1833 Emancipation Act, or to treat it still as a homogeneous movement, represented nationally by the B.F.A.S.S., and to disregard the cleavages and regional distinctions within it. It is partly for this reason that the work of William Lloyd Garrison and his Negro supporters has been chosen for special discussion, for their visits so clearly reveal these divisions which make the later stages of anti-slavery history everywhere less notable for practical achievements than the earlier period. Many American abolitionists visited Britain, but Garrison had probably the most dynamic effect. It was he who was largely responsible in the first place for splitting the movement in Britain as he did in America, and he and his helpers kept the breach open whenever it seemed likely to be healed. As in America, the Garrisonians were the most vocal of the abolitionists, if possibly the least constructive; but the hostility which these extremists roused everywhere served only to draw them closer to each other. If the American radicals could find little sympathy at home, they could always rely on help from their British adherents; and by practical means, such as the contributions to the Boston Bazaar and the other smaller Bazaars, and purchase of Garrison's newspaper, the Liberator, and the other radical paper, the Liberty Bell and especially by never failing moral support, these British sympathisers enabled their American friends to weather the long years

of public hostility which faced them in their own country. Indeed, to a very real extent it was British supporters who helped keep alive the spirit of New England abolitionism, and then to heap upon it public acclaim when emancipation was finally achieved. So powerful was the British support for the American abolitionists which the visits of Garrison and his friends reveal, that it is clear that the anti-slavery movement must be studied in a transatlantic setting.

On each of his visits to Britain before 1860 Garrison was helped in his work by Negro abolitionists, who form in their own right an especially interesting group with a marked influence on British anti-slavery circles. Several Negro abolitionists toured Britain in the midnineteenth century; many, though not all, were Garrisonians, and we find in the struggles between the British anti-slavery societies, both factions using the Negroes to further their own ends. The Negro reformers, indeed, had a special attraction for the public, making yet more dramatic the appeal for abolition. Coming to Britain in surprisingly large numbers, especially after the passing of the Fugitive Slave Act, they were at once the embodiment of the illtreated slave, and for the nascent anthropologists, clear proof that the black man was fully as capable as the white.

The work of Garrison and the Negro reformers largely centred around internal anti-slavery conflicts, though in some respects this is not altogether true of Garrison's first visit in the 1830s, made before

---

1. During the nineteenth century "more than a score of black abolitionists went to England, Scotland, France and Germany...Almost everywhere they were received with enthusiasm and were instrumental in linking up the humanitarian movement with various reform movements on both sides of the Atlantic." J.H. Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom*, New York, 1952, p.249. See also, Benjamin Quarles, "Ministers without Portfolio," J.N.H., XXXIX, 1954.

the great rifts in the anti-slavery parties. This visit came soon after his emergence on the anti-slavery scene in America. In 1831 he had begun publication of the *Liberator*, and had helped in the same year with the formation of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. The journey to Britain in 1833 was not an impromptu affair, however, but the result of several months deliberation. Coming at a time when British anti-slavery effort had reached its apogee with the passing of the 1833 Emancipation Act, it represents one of the earliest efforts of transatlantic cooperation in a fully organised humanitarian movement, and is a clear example of the close ties which already existed between reformers of the two countries. Garrison indeed was particularly anxious to foster this spirit of co-operation:

"Another important object I have in view is, to establish a regular correspondence between the abolitionists of England and those of this country, and to secure a union of sentiment and action. Much useful information may be obtained, and many valuable anti-slavery tracts and publications collected for distribution among us. We deem it important to learn, precisely, the methods adopted by the friends of abolition in England, in operating upon public sentiment; upon what principles, and by what regulations, their anti-slavery societies are conducted; in what manner female influence has been so widely secured, and so powerfully exerted against slavery; and, in short, to gather up all those instructions, in relation to this great cause which can in any degree assist us in destroying the monster OPPRESSION, in placing the whole race upon a footing of equality with the rest of the world."  

Garrison's friends were equally enthusiastic about an English tour and the benefits that might be expected to follow from it. Writing to Garrison in November, 1832, Arnold Buffum declared that Garrison in England would do the cause more good in three months than in twelve in

---

3. Address before the Free People of Colour, April, 1833, p.21, quoted in *Ibid.*, I, p. 337.
America by the reception he would meet there, and by the reports he would then be able to publish in the *Liberator.* A more concrete aim was needed, however, if funds were to be secured for the journey, and it was decided that Garrison should go to Britain as the agent of the New England Anti-Slavery Society to collect money for a Manual Labour School for coloured youth. The excitement raised in anti-slavery circles by the triumphal final stages of the fight for abolition in Britain was a further spur, but Garrison was no less encouraged by the prospect of a more personal engagement. Transportation of slaves back to Africa, the object of the American Colonization Society, had been heatedly denounced by Garrison and his followers, and from Rev. Nathaniel Paul, a Negro abolitionist then in Britain, had come news of the success of Elliott Cresson, an agent of the Colonization Society, also touring Britain.

"Mr. Paul informs us that the apostate Quaker Elliot Cresson, the agent of the Colonization Society, was making rapid progress in deceiving the English philanthropists, until Mr. Paul clogged his chariot wheels...It is fortunate for the cause of truth and benevolence that Mr. Paul happens to be in England at this time; and we sincerely hope that he will spare no efforts to expose the base impositions which Cresson is palming upon the generous hearted Britons."

Garrison was therefore determined when he sailed for Britain on

---

2. But see also R.B. Nye, *William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers*, Boston, 1955, p. 65, who gives no account of his sources, but claims that this was adopted as a resort since the New York society refused to finance Garrison as the delegate of the New England Society to a proposed World Anti-Slavery Convention in London.
3. See, however, the statement of Oliver Johnson, a founder of the New England Anti-Slavery Society, that the American people as a whole were unaware of this great event since the American press were "too afraid" to print the truth. Oliver Johnson, *William Lloyd Garrison and His Times*, London, 1882, p. 97.
May 2nd, 1833, that one of his chief tasks would be to discredit Cresson and his society in the eyes of the British.

This, it transpired, was to be the major work of Garrison's first visit, and his plans for raising money for the Manual Labour School were abandoned.1

Garrison, who throughout his British tour was aided by the Rev. Nathaniel Paul,2 began his campaign by a challenge to Cresson to answer the charges that the American Colonization Society was 'utterly corrupt and prescriptive in its principles.'3 Cresson at first refused to meet Garrison at a public meeting, but finally a small gathering was

1. Garrisons, op. cit., I, p. 352. The authors claim that this was due to the advice of English friends since the prevailing excitement over West Indian Emancipation was unfavourable to the project; though Captain Charles Stuart apparently collected money for the school in Britain: Barnes, op. cit., p. 221.

2. Little is known of Paul. A note in the Liberator mentions his departure for Britain on December 31, 1831, from Wilberforce, Canada, and continues: "Mr. Paul crosses the Atlantic for the ostensible purpose of making a disclosure of all the circumstances which gave birth to the infant establishment at Wilberforce, to present a detailed and ingenuous statement of the present disfranchised condition of the colored population of the United States— to attempt a humble but strenuous effort in obtaining the kind patronage of the crown-- and to make a fervent and important appeal to the warm and expanding sympathies of the good people of England, for funds in aid of this little colony, which an inscrutable providence has permitted to be planted in Canada, under the protection of the equitable laws of the British Government." Liberator, Jan. 14, 1832. He worked in Britain with Garrison and lent the New England abolitionist funds for passage money back to America, a sum which Garrison was to repay to Arthur Tappan on his return. Barnes, op. cit., p. 53. Paul remained in Britain for some years after Garrison's departure. (Liberator, June 27, 1835, which gives an account of the meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society at which Paul and another Negro, J. McCune Smith were present), but had left the country and settled in Albany, New York, by 1836 (Liberator, June 11, 1836). He married an English wife who found her social and later financial position in America one of great difficulty. (Anti-Slavery Letters Written to W.L.G., 1850, MS.A.1.2., vol. 19, no. 40.).

arranged on June 10 at which Cresson and his supporters were heavily outnumbered. He was not present at a meeting some days later at which it was triumphantly declared that Wilberforce had withdrawn his support of the Colonization movement.¹

Soon after this Garrison left London with George Thompson, the radical politician, then beginning his career as an anti-slavery orator, and ever afterwards a close friend of Garrison. They visited Bath, where they were received several times by Wilberforce and obtained from the noted abolitionist further assurances of his opposition to Cresson. Garrison was recalled to London by news of a proposed meeting for Cresson at which the Duke of Sussex was to preside, but not only did the Duke take no part in the proceedings, but this, and another meeting sponsored by the Colonization Society, met with apparently little success.²

The climax of Garrison's attack was a meeting at Exeter Hall on July 13.³ By this point Thomas Buxton and Zachary Macaulay, two of the older abolitionists, were firmly behind Garrison, whilst Daniel O'Connell, the Irish radical, was a speaker, and possibly the instigator of the meeting.⁴

A visit in company with Nathaniel Paul to Clarkson at Ipswich, and the funeral of Wilberforce at Westminster Abbey were the main highlights of the last weeks of Garrison's visit. On his return to America, Garrison was very optimistic about the success of his tour.⁵

2. Ibid., I, p. 367.
3. See the Liberator, Nov. 9, 16, 23, 30, Dec. 7, for a complete account of this meeting.
5. Liberator, Sept. 7, 1833; Anti-Slavery Letters to W.L.G., 1834, MS.A. 1.2., vol. 3.
His attack on the Colonization Society had certainly won over most of the leading figures in the British anti-slavery scene, though he had by no means destroyed the influence of the Colonization Society in Britain. More important, however, he had made the acquaintance of George Thompson who became a lifelong friend and co-worker. It was Thompson who carried Garrison's attack on the Colonization Society to Scotland, an attack which led to the formation of Emancipation Societies in Glasgow and Edinburgh, the Glasgow Society in 1835 sending Thompson over to the United States for a visit which had profound effects on anti-slavery affairs in America.

But of greater interest is the way in which the Colonization Society dispute was used by others for their own ends and to involve wider issues. And indeed much of the importance of the reformers' work lies in this indirect influence, as is so clearly seen in this early visit of Garrison. Thus at the Exeter Hall meeting we find Daniel O'Connell deliberately linking Colonization to the very vexed issue of transportation as a punishment for criminals when he declared:

"In this country, the aristocracy and the oligarchy have got up an admirable scheme for transporting the peasants of England.... You read of partisans everyday transporting Englishmen for the crime of being poor: and the Colonization Society is taking up the

---

1. See below for the struggle with Gurley in 1840.
2. Liberator, April 27, 1834. It is interesting to note that Thompson's close connection with Scotland and his unpopularity with the general public in America where he aroused bitter feelings in New England especially, was to cause a certain amount of anti-Scottish feeling in that area. Thus the Liberator notes: "Enemies of George Thompson have sneeringly styled him 'the Scotch emissary', 'the Scotchman' as if it were disgraceful, or criminal for a man to have been born in Scotland....We allude to this matter in order to correct the misrepresentation. Mr. Thompson is an Englishman, and was born in Liverpool—of course he cannot properly be a Scotchman at the same time. Yet there is no man living who may justly deprecate, nay who may not proudly wish to claim, a filial relation to Auld Scotia. No man can sneer at her, or her intelligent and virtuous population without first losing all self respect and sense of shame." January 2, 1836.
same principle."^1

When we remember, too, that the transportation issue was at that very moment a burning question among British radicals because of the sentence passed on the Tolpuddle Martyrs, it is very clear that radical politicians could make skilful use of anti-slavery matters for their own ends. At this meeting, too, we find an early suggestion that the slavery question might be relieved by finding an alternative source of raw cotton. Ironically this suggestion came from an American, and was scornfully attacked by George Thompson, who a decade later was to be leading advocate of cotton growing in India.2

The Colonization Society in America had the support of many moderates and conservatives, and we find a similar pattern emerging in Britain. Thus in Scotland it is clear that Cresson succeeded in winning the support of many of the more conservative Presbyterian clergy.3 This in its turn was used by the Glasgow Chronicle as part of the attack then beginning on the Established Church then in Scotland. Elliott Cresson, they declared, had the support of the Established clergy (of Glasgow), while the Dissenters had supported George Thompson:

"Yet it is attempted to be made out in the Scottish Guardian, and by other defenders of the Establishments, that the existence of slavery in the United States is to be ascribed to the absence of an

---

1. Liberator, November 23, 1833.
2. For the speech of the Rev. Mr. Abrahams see Ibid., November 30, 1833. George Thompson's reply: "Cotton was the Alpha and Omega of his speech. The planting of cotton trees is to work the destruction of slavery in the United States." Ibid., is an interesting remark from one who was later to become the leading exponent of cotton growing in India.
3. Ibid., November 9, 1833. Denouncing Cresson, Garrison also declared that Cresson had said that "in Scotland only had he found kindness."
established sect!"1.

Scotland, it is clear, even in these early days was divided in her attitude to slavery, and these divisions were being used in the church establishment disputes.

If Garrison's first visit aroused a certain amount of controversy, the same is even more true of his second. This was made in company with Charles Lenox Remond,2 another Negro abolitionist, and was occasioned by the calling of the World Anti-slavery Convention in London in 1840. This Convention coincided with the final break in the American movement and the setting up of a new organisation, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, under the leadership of J.G. Birney and the Tappans. Their specific repudiation of Garrison's doctrines in religious and political matters, and his claim for women to be admitted to full participation in anti-slavery affairs, was still being debated in anti-slavery circles, and it was over the question of women's rights that much of the interest in the 1840 Convention turned.3

When Garrison and his party arrived in England in the middle of June, the Convention4 had already begun, and on this occasion the

---

1. Extract from the Glasgow Chronicle, December 8, 1834, reprinted in the Liberator, March 12, 1835.
2. Remond was a free born Negro who lived and worked in Salem, Massachusetts. His sister, Sarah Parker Remond, was also a noted abolitionist. See D.B. Porter, "Sarah Parker Remond, Abolitionist and Physician," J.N.H., XX, 1935.
3. "It was the ironical fate of the Convention to stand rather as a landmark in the history of the woman question, than in that of abolition." Garrison, op. cit., II. p. 381.
American conservatives had found support and the American women delegates were not permitted to an official place in the proceedings. Garrison and his supporters consequently refused to take an active part and remained seated in the public gallery, though Remond spoke once. Garrison, however, was given an opportunity to parade his 'heresies' at a soiree for the foreign delegates at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand. He and Remond were well received socially, and met the Duchess of Sutherland and Lady Byron. But the current of feeling was not generally for Garrison and the Old Organization, as his party came to be known.

Wendell Phillips, a staunch Garrisonian, made a significant comment on the Convention:

"They will now I think, take sides in our disputes;...and they will take sides most of them with the new organization." I except the Scottish and Irish friends."

Phillips indeed spoke truly for the fight between the Old and New Organization was now to be carried on in Scotland, Ireland and the north of England as the American Reformers at the Convention toured the country.

2. Ibid., p. 384, note 2.
4. "Defeated in New York the delegates of the new AFASS triumphed over their victors in London." A.H. Grimke, William Lloyd Garrison, the Abolitionist, New York, 1891. Birney crowed over this defeat: "I suppose you know that Mr. Garrison, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Remond, did not take their seats in the Conference, because of the refusal to admit Mrs. Mott as a delegate. He had ample room, however, to make known publicly, and privately, his singular views. He has gained but few adherents to them." Birney to Lewis Tappan, Derby, (England), July 23, 1840, Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1834-1855, 2 vols., ed. Dumond, New York, 1939, II, p. 584.
5. Garrisons, op. cit., II, 367-8. Remond also wrote to Francis Jackson that he had been "pained" because of the treatment of American ultras and their friends at the "Convention of the B.F.A.S.S." Liberator, October 9, 1840.
By the middle of July Garrison and Remond, accompanied by George Thompson, had begun the journey north to Scotland. The Scottish visit was in some respects the highlight of Garrison's tour, for here, almost for the first time he met anti-slavery groups who were favourable to the Old Organization. While in Edinburgh Garrison spoke on temperance and attended a public breakfast held in his honour. He then travelled across to Glasgow for a great public reception given for him by the Glasgow Emancipation Society. Leaving Remond to follow, Garrison and N.P. Rogers, another American delegate, crossed over to Ireland where already they had firm friends in the Webbs and their circle, whom they had met at the 1840 Convention. Garrison finally sailed for America on August 4 leaving Remond to carry on his work.

But if Garrison's personal appearances in Scotland and Ireland were brief, his influence and personality were to be felt there for many months to come, and his visit forms in fact the beginning of the campaign to win the support of the Scottish societies by Old and New Organisation alike. Thus Garrison's visit was countered in October by that of Birney and Stanton, leaders of the New Organisation, who, with John Scoble, a secretary of the B.F.A.S.S., went to Edinburgh and

1. Elizabeth Pease wrote Garrison: "I trust soon to hear that you have had a pleasant (journey?) and are enjoying the free and genial atmosphere of Scotland after the murky mists of prejudice, by which you were surrounded and which obscured the discernment of what was ever due to men, aye and to women too, who have sacrificed so much and come so far to advocate the cause of the slave." London, 18th inst. (1840), Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, 1840, MS.A.1.2. vol. 9, no. 75.
3. Ibid., p. 399.
4. Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, 1840, MS.A.1.2., vol. 9, no. 60.
Glasgow where they met with some success despite the presence there of Remond.¹

In a letter to J.H. Tredgold, another secretary of the B.F.A.S.S., Scoble gives a clear picture of the situation:

"I think I discover a good feeling towards us notwithstanding all the Garrison party have been doing to produce a contrary state of things. Stanton arrived yesterday--Birney is just arrived from Glasgow...We all dine at our friend John Wigham's, and Thompson is invited to meet us. Gurley, the colonizationist, is also here endeavouring to make a favourable impression, so that our visit is well timed. Things do not look so promising at Glasgow, but I hope all will pass off well, tho I learn that our friend Smeal is exceptionally sore about the women's question. I shall act purely on the defensive and confine myself to explanations merely for the purpose of justifying the committee, and exonerating myself and others from blame."²

Nevertheless Scoble was hopeful that their work in Scotland would be successful:

"...our Scotch friends gave the deputation a warm and cordial reception. Birney and Stanton made two capital speeches...."³

he wrote, and again:

"I am extremely happy to say that Garrison has made but little headway in Scotland; and that even his warmest admirers are by no means prepared to advocate his extreme views--indeed I may say that they are more inclined to repudiate them. As opportunity was offered the Deputation did not fail to give such information as our Scottish friends desired upon the matters at issue."⁴

But it is possible that Scoble was seeing things in a somewhat hopeful light; the real crisis of Old and New Organization in Scotland came with the begging mission of J.A. Collins, Garrison's friend and the emissary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, at the end of the year. Aided by Charles Remond, Collins met with a very mixed reception

---

¹ Writing to Maria Weston Chapman, J.A. Collins declared that Scoble, Birney and Stanton were "embarrassed" by the presence of Thompson and Remond in Edinburgh, but prejudiced the Glasgow committee against him. Weston Papers, 1840, MS.A.3., vol. 13, no. 69-70.
³ Ibid., p. 74.
⁴ Abel & Klingberg, op. cit., p. 75.
in Britain where anti-slavery supporters were not only confused over the issue of Garrisonianism but unsympathetic generally to the whole question of begging missions. The London Committee of the B.F.A.S.S. firmly rejected Collins' attempt to enlist their support,¹ and Scotland once again became the scene of dispute. The climax came with a series of stormy meetings of the Glasgow Emancipation Society at the beginning of 1841,² at the end of which, thanks to the loyalty of the secretary, William Smeal, the Glasgow Society came out finally in support of Garrison, an action which resulted in the resignation of some of the leading members of the Society.³

Thus the meeting on March 25 when Collins presented his credentials to the Glasgow Society was more than just a mere personal triumph. It was the victory, for the present, of the Garrison faction in Glasgow, and the assertion of independence by a provincial society⁴ against the domination of the London Committee. The Glasgow meeting, however, was Collin's main triumph as the financial success of his mission seems to

---

1. *Liberator*, March 5, 12, 1841; see also *Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison*, 1841, MS.A.1.2., vol. 11, nos. 51 and 57, for the rash of printed circulars which Collins' struggles with the London Committee evoked.
3. Joseph Sturge refused to be a corresponding member (25 January, 1841); while the vice-presidents, Drs. Heugh and Wardlaw, resigned. (Heugh to Smeal, February 11, 1841; Wardlaw to Smeal, 19 February, 1841). The Glasgow Society issued a public resolution condemning the actions of the B.F.A.S.S. towards Collins in particular and Garrisonianism in general, and made public their correspondence and the minutes of the meetings over the Collins' affair. Microfilm of Anti-Slavery MS. in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Dr. Wardlaw was later to help in the founding of the specifically anti-Garrison Glasgow New Association. See also the Minute Book of the Glasgow Emancipation Society in the Smeal Collection, Mitchell Library, Glasgow.
4. The Hibernian Society also expressed disapproval: *John Rylands' MSS.*
be very much in doubt.¹

Remond in all this controversy plays a not insignificant role. Working largely in company with other reformers, Garrison for the first few months, then Collins, his speeches dwelt on other anti-slavery issues apart from the purely internal disputes. Thus he was active in the campaign against R.R. Gurley, another emissary of the American Colonization Society — a campaign at this point conducted largely by Birney and Stanton.²

But it is possibly in Ireland that Remond received his greatest support. He had a great personal success as letters from Ireland go to show. The Secretaries of the Cork Ladies Anti-Slavery Society were loud in their praise; writing to Maria Weston Chapman they declared:

"The lectures of your friend Charles L. Remond have been productive of much good but no one could listen unmoved to his appeals on behalf of the suffering and oppressed. If such as he had come long since amongst us the clouds of ignorance with which we were surrounded would have been dispelled and our sympathy would not have been so long withheld."³

Remond, however, had done more than merely rouse public interest in the slave. He had urged abolition efforts into practical channels, and in doing so had forged yet stronger Anglo-American ties:

1. See letters from Elizabeth Pease to W.L.G. in which she mentions that Collins had some difficulty in securing his passage money home. Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, 1842, MS.A.1.2., vol. 12, pt. 1.

2. Scoble to Tredgold: "C.L. Remond made a very good speech against the American Colonization Society." Abel and Klingberg, op. cit. note 37, p. 75; also Liberator, May 21, 1841. For an entire account of the campaign against Gurley conducted largely by the New Organization, see also R.R. Gurley, Gurley’s Mission to England, Washington, 1841. Gurley charged Remond with trying to foster war between the two countries on the excuse that it was the only way to free the slave: pp.173ff.

"...tho some friends were at work for the Boston Bazaar since July yet there was no general interest excited until the arrival of Mr. C.L. Remond whose eloquence and lectures were most efficient in arousing the active spirit among those hitherto indifferent because in a great measure ignorant on the subject of American Slavery." ¹

Cork was not the only scene of his labours, however. He lectured in Waterford, where he had large audiences despite rumours of his connection with the "odd" anti-slavery society, and also in Limerick² and Belfast.³ Dublin was, of course, one of the main centres of his work, and from one of that staunchly Garrisonian group of abolitionists who lived in Dublin we find this report of Remond's activities which was sent to Garrison in America:

"He has now been in Ireland for a few weeks, and has done good service for the cause....I rejoice that he has come among us. He has done the cause of abolition great good. He has proved himself a judicious, skilful labourer....His audiences had had comprised among them a large portion of the respectable, the religious classes, and they have been faithfully dealt with." ⁴

Remond spent several months in Ireland and on his return to America in December, 1841, he brought back an address signed by Father Mathew and Daniel O'Connell, and six thousand Irish Roman Catholics, calling on Irishmen in America to take up the cause of the slave.⁵ His Irish visit, however, also raised other issues, notably that of the question of the repeal of the Act of Union, since Irish agitators were not slow to point out the connection between Irish 'Slaves' and American abolition Remond, it is interesting to note, gave apparently no sympathy to this

². R.D. Webb to W.L.G., 8th mo., 28th, 1841, Liberator, September 24, 1841.
Throughout his visit, however, Remond was to find his connection with Garrison a serious problem. The split in the abolition movement meant that at this point, and for years to come, internal struggles prevented any concerted effort being made for abolition, and fostered petty squabbles. Birney wrote to Tappan that had not Remond associated himself with Garrison, he would have been able to do a great deal of good for anti-slavery, but as it was, he would find himself much straitened in his efforts because of his supposed adherence to Garrison's notions. And Remond himself bears out this view. Writing to Garrison he declared that the Collins affair had seriously affected his chance of work:

"From causes of which you are doubtless aware I have not for the past three months been able to be heard (through the mists of the new organization) for the poor slave; but hope now, during the remainder of my stay to act unhampered."

He had been attacked by Captain Charles Stuart in a printed letter for his connection with Collins:

"The charge is, first that I am delegated to this country to collect aid for the American Anti-Slavery Society; and secondly that I am of the Garrison party! From this it would appear that what was great, and good, and noble, and Christian and philanthropic, and anti-slavery—in 1835, has become small, and evil, and mean, and infidel, and slavish, and pro-slavery—in 1841."

1. Liberator, September 10, October 22, 1841.
3. Liberator, May 21, 1841.
4. Liberator, May 21, 1841.
Other Negro reformers, notably Douglass, were to face this problem, but Remond at least remained faithful to Garrison, though it was no easy position to maintain.  

Thus the 1840-41 visit of Garrison and his supporters centres largely around the internal conflicts in the anti-slavery movement. They did not emerge from the contest in Britain as victors, and even staunch supporters were forced to confess that Garrison's party only flourished in pockets. But as Elizabeth Pease wrote, Garrison had nonetheless the support of the women:

"If we count by numbers, England may be called regularly new organised; but if we come to those who will throw their souls into the work, I am not so sure as regards the women at any rate. Glasgow, Dublin, Wexford, Limerick, Wales and other places, all possess a few hard labourers."  

The conservative wing retained control of the major events in anti-slavery history, and the 1843 Anti-Slavery Convention was not attended by any prominent Garrisonians. But Garrison and his followers were

1. "Let the friends in Boston who inquire, understand that though you leave me the last of the old school in England, poor, persecuted and calumniated for the truth's sake; I shall be the last which heaven shall witness false to my trust." Liberator, July 30, 1841. It is possibly for this reason that British Garrisonians were so lavish in their praise of Remond: "C.L. Remond left us only yesterday after paying us a visit of a week. He is in good health now, and is getting on well. I can truly say, that the more we have seen of him, the more highly do we appreciate his character—his gentle and Christian forebearance, his candour and honesty, and ability in serving the great cause, which he is sacrificing so much to advocate. His course is wise and judicious, upright and honest—and he is exciting a warm interest in the question of American slavery, by his powerful and convincing appeals. He gave three lectures here, and six or seven both at Newcastle and Sunderland; and has also addressed large audiences at Shields, Durham, Wrexham, Gateshead, etc." Elizabeth Pease to W.L.G., Darlington, May 2, 1841, Liberator, May 21, 1841. See also Esther Sturge to M.W.C., Weston Papers, 1844, vol. 20, nos. 14-17.  
2. Liberator, July 30, 1841.  
3. Liberator, October 14, 1842, March 31, 1843.
not without their influence, and it is clear that they were dominant in the outlying areas of the kingdom, Scotland, Ireland and the West of England, the so-called "Celtic fringe", remarkable in politics even in this century as centres of radicalism.

If the keynote for Garrison and Remond of the 1840-1841 tour of Britain was the struggle to win support for radical abolition, the main feature of the visits of Frederick Douglass and Garrison in 1845-1846 was the attack on the churches and church leaders on both sides of the Atlantic for their failure to give full support to the cause of abolition. All this is most amply demonstrated by the visiting reformers, Henry C. Wright, Frederick Douglass and J.N. Buffum, and later in 1846, William Lloyd Garrison himself, in their attack on the newly formed Free Church of Scotland for accepting money from

1. See a letter from Isabel Jennings, a Secretary of the Cork Anti-Slavery Society, to M.W.C., Cork, April 12, 1843, Weston Papers, 1843, pt. 1, vol. 18: "America was never a new world to us until we knew of Garrison and Mrs. Chapman and N.P. Rogers and Mrs. Child and Wendell Phillips and Henry C. Wright--and Mr. Remond who first (after Miss Martineau's book) introduced them to us personally and interested us in them--we do feel very, very grateful to him for the knowledge and when we think, instead of condemning us for our culpable ignorance how kindly he treated us and told us everything we do admire him for it. It is very hard for me to think that it is far short of two years since we first felt that Americans were our brethren and not the inhabitants of a world with which we had no feelings in common, for tho' Miss Martineau's book was read, it was not felt until after C.L. Remond's visit. Beside anti-slavery, non-Resistance is now added--before Henry C. Wright's visit Hannah E. White and I were of one mind on the subject, but when talking with him we felt still more that love and that alone can cast out fear and that fear is torment, whether it be fear of God or fear of man."
Southern slaveholders.1 The radical nature of the Garrisonian anti-
slavery movement and the unconventional religious beliefs of Garrison
himself had effectively alienated the American church in the north at
any rate, and much of the American abolitionists' efforts in their
own country were devoted to a vigorous attack on Church leaders for
their attitude, which as the abolitionists clearly recognised, robbed
them of much respectable lay support. Much effort was therefore
expended in keeping the support of the British churches and in
encouraging them to send pious exhortations and memorials to their
American brethren on the subject of slavery.

Fleeing America in 1845 to avoid recapture, Frederick Douglass2
soon joined another American extremist, Henry C. Wright, in denouncing
the action of the Free Church in most of the large towns of southern
Scotland. At a time when the American Church was refusing to co-operate

1. "Scotland is in a blaze of anti-slavery agitation—the Free Church
and slavery are the all engrossing topics. It is the same old
question of Christian union with slaveholders—old with us, but new
with most people here. The discussion is followed by the same
result as in America, when it was first mooted in the New England
Convention, There is such a sameness in the arguments, pro and con,
that if you be landed on this side of the Atlantic, without your
knowledge, you will scarcely distinguish between our meetings here
and our meetings at home". Frederick Douglass, to W.L.G., Glasgow
April 16, 1846, Liberator, May 15, 1846. For a discussion of the
campaign of Douglass and Garrison against the Free Church in Scotland
see George Shepperson, "The Free Church and American Slavery," Scottish
Historical Review, 1951-2; George Shepperson, "Thomas Chalmers, the
Free Church of Scotland and the South," Journal of Southern History,
XVII, November 1951; George Shepperson, "Frederick Douglass and Scot¬

2. The most noted of the Negro abolitionists, Frederick Douglass later
broke with Garrison, and was on friendly terms with the New York
group of abolitionists. Settling in Rochester, New York, he began
publication of the North Star, in which he was aided by the English¬
woman, Julia Griffiths. Despite his quarrel with Garrison, he remaine
on close terms with many abolitionists in Britain, his freedom
being purchased with money obtained by another Englishwoman, Mrs.
Anna Richardson of Newcastle. See E. Quarles, Frederick Douglass,
Washington, 1946; P. Foner(ed). The Life and Writings of Frederick
Douglass 4 vols., New York, 1950; F. Douglass, Life and Times of
Frederick Douglass, London, 1883.
with the anti-slavery movement, the apparent defection of a section of the British Church, long a traditional ally of abolitionism, was all the more keenly felt by the American reformers. The work of Douglass and Wright raised the issue to one of the foremost importance in Scottish circles, and led to the invitation to William Lloyd Garrison by the Glasgow Emancipation Society. Garrison's tour of Scotland at the end of September served once again to awaken public interest in the cause, though it had no immediate effect on the Free Church who never in fact returned the money. The conflict, however, subjected them to attack from the United Presbyterian Church and the old established church, as well as causing them to lose popular support.

It is clear that the Free Church did not enjoy being branded as a friend

1. For Frederick Douglass' account of this first Scottish tour see Foner (ed.) Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass, I, pp.125ff. From Glasgow there came this comment: "We have with us very efficient lecturers in our friend Frederick Douglass and James N. Buffum: the former of whom from peculiar circumstances is himself a host, and they have for some time past been producing a powerful sensation in the North especially, respecting the pro-slavery predictions of the 'Free Church', and the countenance she has given to slavery through the influence of slaveholders' money of which she holds a firm grip and is still as reluctant as ever to part with." (H.C.W. had done some pioneer work in this agitation, but Free Church ministers were not prepared to listen). "But the effect of the pro-slavery league of the United States has become greatly more perceptible in consequence of the sympathies of the people having been excited by the powerful appeals of Frederick Douglass in behalf of his brethren in bonds." John Murray and William Smeal to W.L.G., Glasgow, 30 March, 1846, Liberator, April 24, 1846.

2. Liberator, May 26, 1846, gives an account of the resolution passed at a meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society on April 21, inviting Garrison to visit Britain "to cheer us by his presence, and encourage us by his counsels."

3. "The clergy with their supporters who left the society are still alien as ever and thus we have continually to combat with their opposition," Catherine Paton to (M.W.C.?), 16 Richmond Street, Glasgow, November 17, 1846, Weston Papers, vol. 22, no. 13.

4. See the articles by George Shepperson, op. cit.; also R. Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, Thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh, 1955, pp. 2-3.
to slaveholders, and church leaders who in 1845 and 1846 had defended their church's actions, were in 1860 the most prominent in coming to the aid of the American minister and abolitionist, George Cheever.¹

But the main activity of Garrison and Douglass was not centred only in Scotland. On Garrison's arrival he went first to London where he remained for over a month working with Frederick Douglass in a campaign against the American clergy then in Britain.² They attended the World's Temperance Convention, then being held in London, and succeeded in creating disharmony in that assembly by their insistence on linking temperance with anti-slavery, and branding the American delegates, most of whom were ministers, as friends of the slaveholders.³ Douglass especially became involved in a dispute with the two leading American delegates, E.N. Kirk and Samuel Hanson Cox, for his attempt to bring abolition into the proceedings.⁴

1. See below, chapter VI.
2. Previous to this Douglass had already been engaged in blackening the characters of visiting Americans in Britain: "I am playing the mischief with the character of slaveholders in this land. They will find the atmosphere very hot for them. The Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D. of South Carolina has been kept out of every pulpit here. I think I have been partly the means of it. He is terrible mad at me for it." Douglass to William A. White, Edinburgh, Scotland, 30 July, 1846, Life and Writings, op. cit., I, pp. 183-4.
3. Liberator, September, 18, 1846.
4. The affair was carried out in a lengthy public correspondence which was collected and published: Correspondence between the Rev. Samuel H. Cox and Frederick Douglass, New York, 1846.
Their main target, however, was the Evangelical Alliance, a meeting of Protestant clergy of all denominations, also holding its meeting in London at this juncture. The Alliance itself was torn over the question of slavery, but managed to smooth over the issue in the interests of Anglo-American solidarity. For Garrison, the willingness of British ministers to confer with their American counterparts, many of whom were prepared to accept the condition of slavery in the South, was merely a repetition of the situation in Scotland, and he had no hesitation in condemning "the 'pseudo Free Church' and its guilty ally the Evangelical Alliance." The linking of the events in Scotland and the Evangelical Alliance was in fact common in anti-slavery circles at this time--further indication that the question of clerical support for slavery was uppermost in abolitionists' minds.

Garrison had not forgotten the difficulties he faced in having no London organization with which he could work, since the B.F.A.S.S. was completely unsympathetic to his cause. On August 10, soon after his arrival, he formed the Anti-Slavery League which he hoped would fulfil this purpose. Its first act was to attack the Evangelical

1. The Liberator claimed that Frederick Douglass had "shattered the 'E.A.' to atoms and 'divided the 'Free Church' against itself on account of slavery." April 23, 1847. See also Garrisons, op. cit., III, pp. 164-8, and Douglass, Life and Writings, op. cit., I. p. 241, for an account of the Evangelical Alliance and its difficulties.
2. Liberator, December 4, 1846; reprint of a letter by W.L.G. to the Christian Witness in which he declared that "the masses had pronounced a righteous condemnation against the pseudo 'Free Church' of Scotland and its guilty ally, the Evangelical Alliance."
3. cf. a letter from Andrew Paton to W.L.G., Glasgow, 6 October, 1846, Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, 1846, Ms.A.1.2. vol. 16, no. 103.
Alliance, and American ministers in particular, at the inaugural meeting at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in London. But the League never prospered, and there had to be another attempt to refound a similar movement in 1859. Even from among his adherents Garrison met with some opposition as was seen when he paid a visit to Bristol where he met J.B. Estlin. Though Estlin remained a close and valuable ally of Garrison, responsible for organising much of the British anti-slavery activity of those sympathetic to the Boston group, he was at the same time critical of Garrison, and saw clearly the detrimental effect that some of his more extreme doctrines and speeches would occasion. He expressed this vividly in a letter to his American friend, Samuel May of Leicester:

The visit of Messrs. Garrison and Douglass to Bristol has greatly strengthened the anti-slavery zeal of this neighbourhood....

1. J.B. Estlin to S. May, Bristol, January 12, 1847. "The Anti-Slavery League gets on but little. If Frederick Douglass keeps firm something may come of it, but he dislikes the uphill work." May Papers, 1844-1849, MS.B.1.6., vol. 2, no. 42.

2. Liberator, July 1, 1859, mentions a meeting in London for the formation of the London Emancipation Committee to deal with slavery especially in its American aspects. The need for such a body in London was particularly felt. At the meeting George Thompson declared that a delegate could be sure of a welcome in Warrington, Leeds, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin and Cork, but not in London. In 1846 provincial Leagues were also envisaged. In Bristol and Exeter auxiliary Leagues were begun by Garrison and Frederick Douglass "under very cheering auspices." Anti-Slavery Letters by Garrison, MS.A.1.1., 1844-53, no. 31.

3. W.L.G. commented that the Bristol meeting had been rather a formal one, and he feared that Douglass' remarks about slave holders might have offended some especially since Bristol was once the headquarters of the West India interest. Douglass was nonetheless effective: "Their zeal (at Bridgewater) has only sprung up since F. Douglass' visit, when I have before tried to interest them I was assured we had no right to interfere with America. And this change of sentiment he will be able to effect on numbers whom we have no powers of influence." Mary Estlin to M.W.C., Bristol, November 2, 1846, Weston Papers, 1846, vol. 22, no. 114.
(Garrison is) making a great blunder and pursuing a mistaken line. He seems to consider it necessary for his credit in America, to meddle with all sorts of questions that divide the population of this country, Universal Suffrage, the rights of (?), the observ- 

vation of the Sabbath, monarchical form of govern. (sic) etc. etc. are discussed in public and pronounced upon by him....Were the middle and lower classes of this country the parties likely to do much for the abolition cause, there might be some use in courting their favour, even at the risk of offending higher circles. But these lower and lower middle classes have not sufficient personal interest in the subject to induce them to take it up (warmly?), and if they did they would do little or no good. It is not in the kitchen or workshop that we need anti-slavery agitation for America's sake, but our drawing rooms, the salons of the wealthy, and the libraries of the learned."

Estlin, indeed, feared that Garrison would become branded as a general agitator and his influence thus fall short of what is should be.¹

The Irish societies, however, still remained loyal to him, partly due to the work of Douglass, who in coming to Britain in 1845 went first to Ireland where Remond had a few years earlier met with such a warm welcome. Douglass seems to have been no less successful

¹. J. B. Estlin to S. May, Bristol, October 1, 1846. May Papers, 1844-1849, vol. 2, no. 34.
as glowing testimonials from the ladies of Cork go to show.¹ R.D. Webb, the leader of the Garrison party in Dublin, was more critical in his comments, however,² and there are also ominous signs that the British group did not like too great independence of action among

1. "I do not like to send the contributions without a few lines telling you of the good done to the cause by the visits of Frederick Douglass—for the first time some members of the Church of England have become interested—never have I known anyone who has excited such general interest as Frederick. In Limerick one of the most popular soirees was given to him—a friend of mine who was there says that from four to five hundred of the most respectable inhabitants assembled to meet him. Frederick remained three weeks with us and every day only increased our affection and respect for him." Jane Jennings to M.W.C., Cork, November 26, (1845?), Weston Papers, 1840, pt. 2, vol. 14, no. 694. For further praise from Cork see Ibid., vol. 22, no. 104. Belfast was equally laudatory, and adds this interesting comment: "An intense interest has been excited by the powerful oratory of Frederick Douglass during this late visit to this town and in consequence a female anti-slavery party is about being formed just at present. All who have listened to Mr. Douglass are warm in the cause of the slave, many are earnest and energetic and if a fair development of these impulses were permitted I am more convinced there is scarcely a lady in Belfast who would not be anxious to join in any means calculated to promote the enfranchisement of the deeply injured Africans. But also those who usually take the lead in other good works, offended by the uncompromising tone of Mr. Douglass with regard to the Free Church of Scotland are either avowed enemies or very hollow friends.... It was first whispered but dare not now be repeated that Frederick Douglass was an imposter—it has also been insinuated that C.L. Remond was a white man who had assumed the Ethiop tinge to suit a purpose but, every heart is filled with admiration of Mrs. Chapman." Mary Ireland to M.W.C., Royal Academical Institution, Belfast, January, (?) 24, 1846. Weston Papers, 1846, vol. 22, no. 14. See also Address from the Committee of the Belfast Ladies Association to the Ladies of Ulster, May Papers, 1844-1869, vol. 2, no. 31.

2. Writing to Wendell Phillips he noted that Garrison and Douglass had had great success in Bristol, but there was not much stir in Dublin since there was too much Popery. Great zeal, however, had been raised in Belfast by Douglass and "from what I can hear the tables are quite turned against New Broad Street." Dublin, September 1, 1846, Weston Papers, 1846, vol. 22, no. 85.
Negro lecturers. 1  Webb, who first published Douglass' autobiography, was soon turned against the Negro by bitter disputes over business affairs, 2  as well as dislike of Douglass' independent attitude; and his hostility created many problems for the Negro. A long series of letters between Dublin and Boston was set off when Douglass attended a meeting of the B.F.A.S.S. 3  and in British correspondence with American friends we can trace the beginning of that rivalry between Douglass and the Garrisons which was soon to divide still further the abolitionists.

1. "Frederick is somewhat touchy and high—he does not take a hint very cordially, but he is a much greater and more powerful man than Remond." Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, MS.A.1.2., vol. 15, no. 62, R.D.W. to Elizabeth Pease, Dublin, 9th month, November 25, 1845. And again: "Frederick Douglass goes on swimmingly in Limerick. He took huff at me while in Dublin for giving him one or two hints as to his demeanour (which I did much against my will). He is very proud and can't bear anything half so sweetly as praise and petting. I don't mean to give him any more advice, but I think he is foolish to resent it...I think it most likely F.D. will go to Birmingham and Bristol next week. He didn't incline to (fraternise?) with H.C. Wright who is a far finer minded large hearted man than he is. It seems to me that Douglass' cause is not large and that he don't take half enough pains to extend its limits." Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, MS.A.1.2., vol. 15, no. 79. R.D. Webb to M.W.C., Dublin, 16 November, 1845.


3. M.W.C., February 24, 1846, writing to R.D.W. fears that Douglass is deserting to the London Committee. May Papers, 1837-1845, vol. I, no. 66. F.D. was "grieved" by this: F.D. to M.W.C., Scotland, 24 March, 1846, Weston Papers, vol. 22, no. 35. R.D.W., who had first told Douglass in reply to one of expostulation from M.W.C., Dublin, 16 May, 1846, Weston Papers, vol. 22, no. 51. Interestingly enough, Estlin had no criticism of Douglass for this action: "I think Douglass did most wisely in attending the annual meeting of the B.F.A.S.Socy. His first business is to excite sympathy for the slaves, and then he may go on to enlist in behalf of the American A.S.S. as the most true in principle of the abolition parties." Estlin to May, Bristol, November 2, 1846, May Papers, 1844-49, vol. 2, no. 37.
in America.¹

In Britain Douglass, too, faced fully the difficulties of
furthering the anti-slavery cause while belonging to the Garrison party,
and it is clear that he preferred an independent course of action as the
best means of achieving success. He himself admitted this quite openly:

"As to accompanying friend Wright I think it unwise to do so. I
by no means agree with him as to the importance of discussing in
this country the disunion question, and I think our differences
in this matter would prevent that harmony necessary to success.
Beside friend Wright has created against himself prejudices which
I as an abolitionist do not feel myself called upon to withstand.
My mission to this land is purely an anti-slavery one, and
although there are other good causes which need to be advocated, I
think that my duty calls me strictly to the question of slavery."²

An ambitious but practical man it is clear that he had recognised at

1. Samuel May later remarked: "His (F.D.'s) self conceit and vanity
are enormous and generally remarked. Many think he was spoiled
in England. May to Estlin, Boston, November 4, 1851. May-Estlin
Correspondence, 1849-65, MS.B.1,6., vol. 14.

2. F.D. to R.D.W., Limerick, 18th November, 1845, Anti-Slavery Letters
to Garrison, MS.A.1.2., 1845, vol. 15, no. 76; Joseph Sturge and
John Angell James both received him very coldly because of his
Garrisonian connections: "I called on the Rev. John Angell James D.D.
to whom I had a letter of introduction. I spent ten or fifteen
minutes with him, I found him not only cold toward me, but absolutely
suspicious of me. He wished to know if I came recommended and if I
belonged to the Garrison party in America, whether I was a member
of any church and if any to what church. I told him that I belonged
to the Garrison party, and that I had credentials. He said,
significantly, I understand the different parties in the United
States. I sold him one of my books. He gave me three shillings and
sixpence for it, and we parted. I have not seen him since. Friend
Boulthie and I then went to the office of Joseph Sturge, the man
of men whom I wished to see. We met him. He appeared conscious
even amounting to coldness. He seemed to have a heavy thought on
his mind...." (Later at a meeting in the Town Hall) "I thought I
perceived strong evidence that the committee did not intend to let
me speak. They acted for a long time as though I were not there,
and as though they had not (invited) me." F.D. to R.D.W., Victoria
Hotel, Belfast, 20 December, 1845.
that the cause of the slave would be little furthered by the groups who were wholly preoccupied by internal disputes.

The 1845-46 visit of Douglass had set off some heated controversies, and had caused further bitterness in anti-slavery circles, without perhaps having any positive effect in furthering the cause of the slave. Their actions had indeed caused at least one of the societies supporting them to fall into debt as a result of the 1846 campaign, and to take a less active share in anti-slavery work. But if Garrison and Douglass roused other conflicts and kept open the breach between the two factions of the anti-slavery movement by the very controversy that their work aroused, these men yet kept alive the question of American slavery in British minds. Jane Wigham, indeed, commented that Scotland was becoming too anti-slavery for American slave holders or their apologists to travel through publicly preaching and lecturing after 1846, and the practice of sending addresses and appeals to America on behalf of the slave was even further stimulated.

Garrison himself paid no further visits to Britain until his triumphal tour of 1867. His attention became more and more fixed on the domestic scene, and if the columns of the Liberator are any judge, his interest in the British societies decreased. Contacts between the Garrisonians in both countries was largely maintained by the annual contributions to the Boston Bazaar, and the continuing

---

3. *Ibid.*, vol. 26, no. 11. See also: "I want to make the clergy in this country (not those of the Establishment for they will attend to nothing out of the church) be upon their guard in respect to their Am. Brethren, and for those in America to feel a little uncertain as to the reception they may meet with here." J.B. Estlin to W.L.G., Bristol, February 21, 1851, *Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison*, MS.A.1.2., vol. 20, no. 6.
correspondence of faithful friends: Elizabeth Pease, the Wighams, Smeals, Estlins and Webbs in Britain; the Weston sisters, Sarah Pugh and Samuel May in America, forming links which were further stimulated by the visits of Maria Weston Chapman and Parker Pillsbury in the early 1850s.

But the controversies raised by Garrison in anti-slavery circles did not cease; and after 1846 they begin to centre around the Negro abolitionists, who, by the beginning of the 1850s were coming to Britain in growing numbers, partly because of the passing of the Fugitive Slave Act. The visits of the Negro reformers clearly illustrates the divisions in anti-slavery circles since most of them became the protegés of one side or the other, and were used by their patrons for party ends. One of the most interesting examples of this conflict is shown by the further schisms which occurred as a result of visits by these coloured abolitionists, especially the Rev. J.W.C. Pennington, W.W. Brown and William and Ellen Craft. Thus the former became associated with the B.F.A.S.S., and the other three with the provincial Garrisonian societies.

Scotland was the area where the visits had the greatest impact, and, to a lesser extent, Bristol, where the Bristol and Clifton Society finally severed all connection with the B.F.A.S.S. In the north, the campaign opened with the visit of J.W.C. Pennington to

Scotland in 1850. During the course of this year certain Glasgow ladies set up a new anti-slavery society since they felt that the old one repudiated Christian notions. This roused heated attacks from Maria Weston Chapman then on a visit to Europe. Even further wrath was occasioned when the hitherto faithful Edinburgh Ladies Emancipation Society decided to withhold its contributions from the Boston Bazaar, an action which brought down many reproaches on Eliza Wigham. Both these actions were held by William Smeal of the Glasgow Emancipation Society to be the work of Pennington, the emissary of the B.F.A.S.S., who had succeeded in frightening the 'respectable' element among the Scottish abolitionists. Writing to Brown he gave a good description of the situation:

"On consulting with our mutual friend Andrew Paton about thy coming to Glasgow it appears to us desirable for us to make an effort for a real, good, and bold anti-slavery meeting at this crisis; not having held a public meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation for about 4 years—the reason for which is, that our agitation of some years against the Free Church of Scotland, for receiving the contributions of slaveholders to build churches etc., entailed upon us a load of debt which is not yet quite paid off, although very much reduced.

Secondly, some months ago, on Dr. Pennington coming here, certain parties male and female, mostly the latter, having become dissatisfied with contributions to the Boston anti-slavery Bazaar, because identified with W.L. Garrison and H.C. Wright whose religious views they could no longer be held as virtually approving, they formed a new female society termed the 'Glasgow Female Association for promoting the abolition of slavery,' limiting their support to the vigilance committee of New York. They issued circulars also exposing the ultra views of W.L.G. and H.C.W. etc., and although their circular has been replied to by Mrs. Chapman and broadly charged with containing positive falsehood, these said parties have not only taken no notice but have succeeded to some extent in sowing divisions in our anti-slavery camp, not a little aided as we apprehend by Dr. P. who it is understood is connected with the "vigilance committee" of New York, and is to be correspondent in that city, of this new organisation in Glasgow.

An attempt has not been made so far as I know to institute a new male anti-slavery society, but the friends of the new female one are to hold a public meeting tomorrow evening, to protest against the new Fugitive Slave Bill, at which Dr. P. is to assist in conjunction with certain Dissenting and Free Church clergymen.¹

William Wells Brown was therefore brought up to Scotland to counteract this trend.² Touring with the Crafts, who had just made a sensational escape from slavery and were the objects of great public curiosity, he met with some success. In Edinburgh there was apparently much activity. Brown and the Crafts held various crowded meetings, including one in conjunction with Pennington. His attitude at this meeting greatly angered the extremists,³ though he had been counselled to moderation by Eliza Wigham who was obviously more concerned with patching up anti-slavery differences than furthering their divisions.⁴ But the split continued. Although by 1855 the Edinburgh Ladies Emancipation Society was once more contributing to the Boston Bazaar there also sprang up a New Edinburgh Association devoting its energies to the New York Vigilance Committee. The new Glasgow Society gained great credit for itself by its invitation to Harriet Beecher Stowe, an action which was again treated in a very partisan spirit by Garrison's

---

¹ William Smeal to W.W. Brown, Weston Papers, vol. 25, no. 50. See also Ibid., vol. 25, no. 45, Andrew Paton to Ann Warren Weston giving similar reasons for the defection of the Edinburgh Society.
² Liberator, January 24, 1851.
³ Weston Papers, vol. 26, no. 29.
⁴ Ibid.
Much the same pattern is shown in Bristol where the Crafts and Brown were well received, and according to the Special Report\(^2\) issued by the Society there, convinced the Society that the merits of the Boston Bazaar outweighed all others.\(^3\) But this is not to say that the Negro reformers were entirely responsible for this and for all the cleavages in Scotland that followed as a result of their visits. They were thrown into a situation which was none of their making rather than actively creating dissension. A reaction to the extreme views of Garrison was always threatening, especially among his Quaker supporters, and by 1859 even Webb felt that a visit by Garrison would be of very little profit.\(^4\)

---

1. The Glasgow Emancipation Society and the Dublin group remained very cold to Harriet Beecher Stowe: "Mr. Webb calls all this fuss about pennies and memorials, 'soda water'—a good American anti-slavery speaker is much needed." Mary Estlin to M.W.C., Park Street, January 10, 1853, Weston Papers, 1853, vol 27, no. 4. Also May Papers, vol. 5, no. 79. Eliza Wigham showed a spirit of great moderation, and commended the visit as a "good thing since it gets the public interested in the question." Eliza Wigham to Mary Estlin, Edinburgh, 22.3.53. Weston Papers, 1853, vol. 27, no. 18. For a discussion of the visit of Harriet Beecher Stowe to Britain, the main event in British anti-slavery circles in the 1850s, see F.J.Klingberg, "Harriet Beecher Stowe and Social Reform in England," American Historical Review, XLIII, 1938; George Shepperson, "Harriet Beecher Stowe and Scotland," Scottish Historical Review, 1953.

2. op. cit.

3. But cf. the Minute Book of the Bristol and Clifton Anti-Slavery Society which seems to suggest that it was the visit of Maria Weston Chapman which in fact had the greater influence. Estlin Papers, Dr. Williams's Library, London.

4. "As to our friend Garrison coming to England," he wrote Maria Weston Chapman, "you know how I love and honour him and that there is no man I would rather see under my roof. But I doubt whether he is as likely to make an impression on the British public as a much less remarkable man. He is so apt to say whatever he chooses upon every subject (many of them regarded with great distrust by the leaders of public opinion or a majority of them) that I fear his pulling down with one hand what he built up with the other." R.D.W. to M.W.C., Kilgobbin, co. Dublin, November 10, 1859. Weston Papers, 1857-59, vol. 29, no. 76.
Thus the power of the Garrison wing in Britain was increasingly diminishing. After John Scoble left for America in 1852 there were hints that the leaders of the provincial societies would make some attempt to work with the new secretary of the B.F.A.S.S., Chamerovzow, but nothing came of this. Greatly spurred by the visit of Harriet Beecher Stowe, the real force of the British movement after the early 1850s lay with the 'Stoweites', the aristocratic Stafford House circle, who gathered round the Duchess of Sutherland, and were responsible for such acts as the Stafford House Petition; and to sympathetic groups such as the new societies in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Negro reformers, too, increasingly allied themselves to this aristocratic circle, especially after the publication of Uncle Tom's Cabin, when "anything in the African line" became popular. In the prosperity and comparative social calm of the '50s, respectable groups appeared less inclined to ally themselves to a society whose leader held unorthodox religious and political views. Letters from British abolitionists to Boston at this date were full of the difficulties they were having to face:

"New organisation is as hydra headed as it is with you, and it is with the general prevalence of its poisons and its powerful means of diffusing and rooting itself among us that I think you are not fully conversant, in spite of all your protestations to the contrary. You hardly know by what coaxing and what keeping in the background of our ultraisms, we have hitherto been alone able to scrape together the only substantial proofs of anti-slavery sentiments that find their way to you. Some sinister reports of Garnett or Pennington as to the misdeeds and dangerous heresies of

the 'Garrisonians' will stop our supplies in many quarters for one year at least and sometimes irrecoverably. Now for the first time since New Organ was propagated in England has a prospect opened to us of unmasking it... The Quakers will in all probability rally round Jos. Sturje and his Free Produce nonsense, and in that way excuse themselves for not offending their leaders and their sect in America by uniting with other less timid advocates of freedom in some efficient action. Of course I am speaking of the body and they herd together so much that the exceptions who will venture on an independent course will be extremely rare. Miss Pease says she hopes nothing from them, and Mr. Webb has always affirmed that they will not risk the contamination of contact with heretics; and other authorities give the same judgment, and yet they are the people who have hitherto done the greatest part of the anti-slavery work in this country. Now we perceive a fresh set of zealous adherents growing up among the dissenters—chiefly the Congregationalists and Baptists who if their recently aroused indignation at their proslavery fraternities is rightly guided may be found the elements of a genuinely effective anti-slavery organisation. Oh, if we had one of your speakers among us, who are free from those glaring heresies which constitute an excuse with the narrow minded or the lukewarm for keeping aloof from the movement."

Increasingly, too, as anti-slavery came more under the leadership of the Stafford House Circle the fact that for many in Britain an attack on slavery was an overt attack on America, and especially American democracy, became apparent. Garrison, and indeed all the American reformers, who visited Britain were able to do nothing for their country in this respect. Indeed, by their uncritical admiration of British institutions Horace Greeley felt that Negro reformers were injuring the cause of political reforms (and hence the spread of American type democracy) in Britain. The American abolitionists could interest the public in the wrongs of the slave, but did not

2. Thus Elihu Burritt was reluctant to attend an anti-slavery meeting in London since he felt that there was so much said "savouring of national pique and prejudice against Am." at these meetings that it was "not pleasant" for him to attend. MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol. 19, November 8, 1854.
necessarily win them over to admiration for American institutions. This is abundantly clear at the outbreak of the Civil War when many in Britain, not least among anti-slavery circles remained unsympathetic to the cause of the North.

Nowhere perhaps is better revealed the dilemma of slavery and democracy which the Civil War occasioned in the minds of so many people than in the long letter of Richard Webb to one of the Weston sisters. Written in an attempt to persuade her that the attitude of British abolitionists to the war was not one of intransigence but of bewilderment, it shows clearly the strength and the limitations of the Anglo-American connection.

"The whole Civil War is eminently calculated to mystify that prodigious majority of the British nation, who have had but little previous knowledge of or interest in American politics. American politics and the whole framework and constitution of the American political system are so intricate and complex that I cannot wonder that 99 out of 100 Englishmen are confused and confounded and (mistaken?) when they attempt to form or pronounce an opinion.

It cannot be too often insisted on that by far the most influential and numerous class of teachers in this subject have been our American visitors—of whom an extremely small proportion have been abolitionists or favourable to abolitionism. You know better than I do that as gentlemen at (ease?), or moneyed men, merchants, divines, planters, etc. 99 out of 100 Americans in England have defended or (apologised?) for slavery and have represented abolitionists as foolish, irreligious, intermeddling fanatics, and they have been generally believed. The English people take an absurd pride in their practical turn of mind—their contempt for theory—their disposition to (mend?) piece by piece, & their dislike of violent revolution or any revolution. Then again the United States owed their existence as a nation to a successful insurrection which they have never done lauding and celebrating—it was successful revolution against England which Englishmen have often been invited to commemorate in London, and besides the American people have almost invariably shown a hearty sympathy with other rebellion against England and other constitutional governments. I don't wonder that a great number of all informed, misinformed Englishmen, whose knowledge of America and American politics and chattel slavery was derived from American travellers—I don't in the least wonder that they should have a sort of small vindictive pleasure in seeing that the United States
had a rebellion on their own hands even though the rebels were
slave-holders—more especially when the uprising of the North for
the maintainence of the Union did not affect to be for the over-
throw of slavery, when the government anxiously disclaimed such
an object, when slaves were repeated(ly?) returned to rebel
masters by northern officers, and when many northern newspapers
used all their influence to denounced such a thing as abolition
and were particularly dishonest and indignant in their condemnation
of abolitionists.

I never doubted from the time of the attack on Fort Sumpter
that the death blow of slavery in the United States was struck at
the same time, and that the (consummation ?) was merely a matter
of time—but when we consider that the number of tolerably-well-
informed-as-to-American-affairs-Englishmen is very small, and
that the number of Americans who had no notion that in fighting
for the Union they were also contending for abolition was very
great, we ought not to be angry or surprised that the English who
cared nothing for the Union regarded both sides as nearly equally
proslavery, and that the Northerners aimed at conquest and the
South at independence. Many thought that the North would become
really opposed to slavery if the South established a union of their
own—and that the South standing alone would be unable to maintain
a system so opposed to the public opinion of the rest of the
civilised world. I have no doubt that many Englishmen who were
tired of the quarrelsome tendencies of American Statesmen and their
disposition to pick quarrels with England which are so apt to fill
the columns of American newspapers, really thought that if the
North and South were separate empires they would have less time
for (?) quarrels. And as many who thought so really believed
that as to hostility to slavery there was not much to choose
between the two sections, I am not much surprised that they should
have looked without regret on the probabilities of the success
of the attempt at secession."

The Civil War brought to a dramatic close the end for which this
generation of abolitionists had striven. Divided so bitterly much of
their work seems to have an ineffectual and petty air about it—the
quarrels of men more concerned with their own part in reforms than in
the reform itself. To a great extent, therefore, this gives to the
influence of Garrison and his adherents a curiously negative aspect—
the distinction of having divided a movement and kept it so. But
there is at the same time a more positive worth to their influence.

1. R.D.W. to (Caroline ?) Weston, Kilgobbin, Co. Dublin, n.d., Weston
By the very publicity attendant upon their quarrels as well as by their speeches and writings, they helped to keep alive British interest in American slavery, not always an easy task since all the British could offer was sympathy and very limited practical support. The value and strength of this opinion was only too clearly revealed at the outbreak of the Civil War when it soon became apparent that popular British feeling, though not prepared to favour a war fought to maintain the Union, would support one whose aim was to free the slave. This, indeed, was very clearly recognised by American statesmen and was probably a factor lying behind the issue of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. By these indirect ways, perhaps, the abolitionists best served the ends of the slave.

Garrison and his followers were not the only American abolitionists to visit Britain, and the British societies with which they had such close connections were among the least influential in winning general support and guiding the course of the movement. But that the Garrison party was the main influence on, and in some ways the reason for being, of these societies, is clear. Highly vocal, alienating more people than they convinced by their dogmatic opinions, their main contribution to anti-slavery effort was a constant flow of publicity, which served at least to keep before the people the problem of slavery. The extremists in both countries were very closely linked indeed, possibly more so than any other group of humanitarians. The history of radical abolitionism belongs essentially in an Anglo-American setting, and the present controversy as to the relative importance of the Mid-West or

1. S.D. St.Clair, Slavery as a Diplomatic Factor in Anglo-American Relations during the Civil War, J.N.H., XXX, 1945.
New England as the dynamic centre of abolitionism might in some respects be made clearer by considering the position of the forces in Britain.

The work of Garrison and the Negro reformers, then, belongs clearly to an Anglo-American community. Their party in Britain might not have been numerous but it was always uncompromising in its attitude to slavery. When the Civil War demanded an unequivocal answer to the problem of slavery, it appeared that the extremists had been vindicated, and Garrison became established in men's minds as the champion of the slave. He was first honoured as such at a public breakfast in Britain in 1867,¹ an occasion which served not merely to herald Garrison's emergence as a popularly acclaimed hero, but also to mark the end of over half a century of Anglo American co-operation in the field of anti-slavery reform.

---

¹ Proceedings at the Public Breakfast held in Honour of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq. (June 29, 1867), London, 1868.
CHAPTER IV.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT: ELIHU BURRITT IN BRITAIN

For many years on both sides of the Atlantic the name of Elihu Burritt was almost synonymous with that of the peace movement. Certainly the most famous advocate that movement produced, Burritt was at home in both Britain and America, and was in many ways probably the most influential of the American reformers to visit Britain. Yet Burritt was in no sense the dynamic figure that Garrison and Gough were. Known popularly as the 'Learned Blacksmith', because in his youth he had followed this occupation in his native New England, at the same time teaching himself several languages, Burritt might more correctly be described as a journalist, editor of several papers, and author of many books and articles.\(^1\) He was not noted as a speaker,\(^2\) and his private journals reveal him as a nervous, timid and easily discouraged man, beset by sick headaches when practical difficulties became overwhelming. But to offset this, he was a constant source of ideas and plans, an active organiser, happiest of all in the role of secretary. If he found himself most at home in the company of small groups of refined Quakeresses, he was yet actively connected with some of the most influential figures in British radical politics, for he was the close

2. Henry Richard declared: "Naturally, perhaps, he was not an orator. His style was too elaborate and literary. He wanted the spontaneity and freedom of a natural speaker, and his voice lacked flexibility and compass. But there was such a philanthropic fervour in his spirit, and so much simplicity and earnestness in his manner, that he always carries his audience with him." Charles Northend, The Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt, New York, 1879, p. 476.
friend of Joseph Sturge, and had many dealings with Richard Cobden, John Bright and Milner Gibson. He formed, too, part of the delegation which waited upon Lord John Russell in 1848 to lay before the advantages of arbitration in international dealings; and in 1850, accompanied only by Sturge and another helper, he tried to act as mediator in the Schleswig-Holstein dispute.

Yet despite the fact that Burritt did most of his active work abroad, it is interesting to note that his international sympathies did not make him forget that he was at the same time an American citizen. On the delegation to Lord John Russell he put forward his views as the spokesman of his country, and as such was apparently heard with great interest by the Prime Minister. Moreover, when the peace movement became closely associated with internal events in Britain, Burritt consciously withdrew himself from an active share in the work.

Making his first visit to Britain in 1846 at a time when relations between the United States and Britain were strained over the Oregon boundary dispute, Burritt had already been working to restore peace and harmony between the two countries by helping the British Quaker, Joseph Crosfield, to organise a series of Friendly Addresses between the peoples of both countries. His sympathies for the leaders of the British peace movement, too, had been strengthened by the disputes which had recently left the American Peace Society

2. Ibid., Vols. 14 and 15, September to October (1850); Stephen Hobhouse, Joseph Sturge, His Life and Work, London, 1919, pp. 132 ff.
3. As in the case of the Manchester and the Edinburgh Peace Congresses, See below.
sharply divided.¹

His aim originally was to stay for a few months only, walking from one town to another in Britain, meeting groups in 'small upper rooms', and interesting them in the cause of international peace and brotherhood.² He was to some degree deflected from this simple plan by an invitation at the outset of his visit to attend a meeting in Manchester celebrating the repeal of the Corn Laws.³ He had for some time been in favour of this movement, claiming that war and commercial competition went hand in hand,⁴ and by this invitation and his friendship with the Quaker merchants, Joseph Crosfield and Joseph Sturge, he was drawn into the circle of Free Traders. This was to have important consequences: it meant that he was assured of a powerful body of support, while on the other hand the Free Traders found in Burritt's schemes an outlet for their interest in peace which the existing Peace Society had not hitherto offered.⁵

5. It is interesting to note that American reformers had watched with deep interest the progress of the Anti-Corn Law League, Anasa Walker and Joshua Leavitt, in particular, doing what they could to forward the movement in America. Walker and Burritt were both invited to represent America at the Free Trade Congress in Brussels in 1847. MS. Journals, vol. 9, Sunday, August 29, 1847.
Beginning his tour on foot as he had intended, he stopped in Pershore on his way to Stratford on Avon, and it was there that the League of Universal Brotherhood was founded. This was to be an international organisation whose aim would not merely be to abolish war but to promote friendly and fraternal relations between nations. There were to be branches in both Britain and America, and if possible on the Continent. The League for many years remained separate from the London Peace Society, largely supported by leading Quakers, notably Joseph Sturge and Joseph Crosfield, who contributed both support and money to Burritt's cause. Sturge was a generous benefactor, and it was thanks to him that Burritt was able to begin publication shortly after his arrival of a peace paper in Britain -- The Bond of Brotherhood -- which was to be the counterpart of his American journal, the Christian

1. "Last night 'a great fact' was launched to the world. I have long been contemplating a League of Universal Brotherhood, like the Anti-Corn Law League, but embracing men of all countries, colors and conditions. I completed the pledge and creed of membership yesterday and meeting about 20 persons at tea last evening, I submitted of it for the first time for signatures. After a full explanation, seventeen of the 20 signed it with much enthusiasm. So another association of a world embracing compass is formed." Elihu Burritt to (John Lee?), Pershore, July 30, (1846), MS. Friends' House Library, London. Burritt actually wrote the pledge of the League of Universal Brotherhood on Anti Corn Law League paper, Burritt to Garrison, Frome, September 8, 1846, Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, MS.A.1.2, Vol.16, no.87.

2. "Everything seems to be favourable in this country and on the continent for a grand alliance of all good men for the overthrow of slavery, war and all the other great systems of iniquity which have long oppressed the world. It was one of the principle objects I had in view in visiting this country, to form the nucleus of a great League of Universal Brotherhood, which would be to slavery, war, intemperance, ignorance, Political and Social Inequalities what the Anti-Corn Law League was to the monopoly of corn in this country." Burritt to Garrison, Frome, September 8, 1846, Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, 1846, MS.A.1.2, Vol.16, no.87.

3. This paper Burritt edited during most of its existence - 1846 to 1868.
Citizen.

Burritt made a visit to Ireland in the early months of 1847 at the height of the famine, which so filled him with horror that he immediately and successfully appealed to America for aid to be sent.¹ Returning to England Burritt began in earnest to enlist supporters for the League of Universal Brotherhood. Following the example of the Temperance Societies he had composed a pledge which members signed on joining the society. In addition to these labours, however, Burritt was also trying to win support for a Free Labour Movement, a movement to boycott slave grown produce and persuade the public to use goods produced by free labour instead. By July Burritt had enlisted such support for the League that at a meeting of peace supporters at the White Hart in London he suggested that Britain be divided into twelve districts, each with its local League, with a central committee in London. This met with some opposition from the Secretary of the London Peace Society, who felt that his society was being robbed of support; but the idea was carried through with the support of Joseph Sturge.²

Throughout the summer Burritt continued arranging organizational details of the League. Early in September he made a short visit to France, as well as Brussels where he attended the Free Trade Convention as the delegate from the United States. His efforts to found a League movement in France were unsuccessful, but the British movement continued to grow, and by January 1, 1848, he could say: "The League has grown and taken root beyond all my expectations." At the commencement of the


2. MS. Journals, Vol.8, Tuesday, July 13 [1847].
last year it numbered about 10,000 now nearly 40,000 and the good and true have come into it on both sides of the Atlantic." 1 1848 was in fact a most important year for the peace movement. The upheavals and unrest in Britain and on the Continent focussed public attention on a group whose pacifist views were in such marked contrast to the revolutionary activity which spread throughout most of Europe.

Burritt and his friends, however, were by no means in sympathy with the established order, and they began the year with a vigorous attack on the government's plans to increase the national defences. 2 Burritt in these early months was touring Britain, urging the cause of the League, attacking the proposed increase on National defences and working to establish free labour depots in the country. He noted with somewhat detached feeling the general interest in Britain in the European scene, and the sympathy among the lower classes especially for the new French government. He gives an interesting description of a meeting in the London Hall of Commerce at which his own League members discussed with enthusiasm the recent events in France, and talked of plans for universal franchise. Burritt, however, seems merely to have been concerned with drawing up Friendly Addresses, and the revolutionary meetings in the Hall of Commerce left him "weak, nervous and exhausted." 3

In spite of the precarious state of affairs Burritt left for Paris on April 6th to make arrangements for an international Peace Congress. This plan had been on his mind for some time, 4 and the fashion then

2. Ibid., vol.10, January 8,13,19 (1848).
3. Ibid., vol.10, Friday, March 3, Saturday, March, 4 (1848).
current in humanitarian circles of holding international gatherings both encouraged him and accorded with his own views that international problems would best be solved by friendly and personal exchange of opinion between men of all nations. But contemporary events were very much on his mind. In his journal during the weeks of his stay in Paris he noted the Chartist activities in England, and other popular demonstrations on the Continent, but again somewhat concerned approval rather than lively enthusiasm seems to have been his chief emotion. "One thing is certain," he wrote on April 11, "No monarchies will exist hereafter on the Continent except upon the basis of universal suffrage, freedom of the press, public meetings and religious equality." 1 While in Paris he had meetings with young communists, and discussed with them ideas such as the plan for a Congress of Nations, much advocated by the American Peace enthusiasts. But though he accepted their help in gaining support for an International Peace Convention, he noted that "I have not succeeded as well (as) I could have hoped in getting the subject before the right persons," 2 and indeed his success in gaining public sympathy for a Convention in France at this juncture seems to have been negligible. He returned to England after a two week absence resuming his work for the League, which had grown to such proportions that at the Annual General Meeting in May he successfully urged that Edmund Fry be appointed to share the Secretaryship of the League with him.

A Scottish tour in June brought him into close contact with the Wigham family with whom he always on the closest terms. He noted the flourishing state of the League in Edinburgh," which has been from the

2. Ibid., vol.10, April 17. (1848).
beginning the most efficient one in the Kingdom.1 His stay in Edinburgh was one of great personal pleasure and success. Through his friendship with the Wighams he was introduced to Duncan McLaren, one of the most influential men in Edinburgh, and a future Lord Provost, whom he persuaded to sign the pledge of the League.2 McLaren was to be a useful ally for it was due largely to his efforts that the 1853 Edinburgh Peace Congress was held.3 At the beginning of July he visited Glasgow where again he was well received, holding a meeting attended by the leading merchants of the city.4

But in spite of the revolutions and counter revolutions taking place everywhere throughout Europe, Burritt persisted in his plans for an International Peace Congress. His two wealthy Quaker patrons, Sturge and Crosfield, could offer little personal assistance,5 and the leaders of the Peace Society were hostile as they wished the Congress to come off under their auspices.6 The Committee of the League of Universal Brotherhood having imposed on Burritt the decision that Brussels rather than Paris would be a better and safer meeting place,7 Burritt and a few others left for Belgium at the beginning of September to make the final arrangements for the Congress.

Although this was to be held from 21st to 23rd September the weeks before the opening were apparently ones of extreme difficulty and confusion. Most of the organisers, including Burritt, did not

1. MS. Journals, Vol.11, June 23 (1848).
2. Ibid., Vol.11, June 30.
5. Ibid., Saturday, July 29.
6. Ibid., Wednesday, August 30.
7. Ibid., Vol.12, Friday, September, 8 [1848].
speak French sufficiently well to deal with the practical difficulties,\(^1\) and at one point the Congress was apparently abandoned. Indeed, it was not until Auguste Visschers, who was made President of the Congress, took charge of affairs that the practical difficulties were solved and the Congress was able to take place.

The Brussels Peace Congress proved a great and immediate success, and on the closing day members voted for Burritt's motion that a second Congress be held in the following year. But the significance of the 1848 meeting extended beyond the mere gathering of a group of European and America pacifist sympathisers. At a point when the established order in Europe was being assailed, the Congress, with its ideals of peace and harmony, had a popular appeal not merely for governments but for all who feared the thought of popular uprising.

The months after the Congress were spent by leaders of the peace movement in a frenzy of enthusiasm.\(^2\) Several public meetings were held, and on October 30th Burritt with John Scoble, Henry Richard, Auguste Visschers and William Ewart called on Lord John Russell to acquaint him with the ideas of the peace movement, and especially to urge on him that an arbitration clause be included in treaties made with other countries. Burritt as the spokesman of the United States received especial attention when he spoke of the pacific intentions of his country.\(^3\)

Within the peace movement, however, there was some criticism of

---

1. *MS. Journals*. Vol.12, Friday, September 8, [1848].
2. Burritt declared of the spirit of the Brussels Congress: "I believe it will give the Peace cause the force and character of a great movement, like that of the Anti-Corn Law League." *MS. Journals*, Vol.12, November 3.
Burritt, and as a result a Peace Congress Committee was set up of members from the League and the Peace Society to make arrangements for the next Congress. But in general there was widespread support for the peace movement, and at this point with public feeling running so strongly in their favour, it was resolved that a public petition be got up to support Arbitration Treaties. The idea of nations settling their differences by arbitration before having recourse to war had long been current in peace circles, though in America the plan for a Congress of Nations was more popular. But the Treaty of Guadeloupe Hidalgo which concluded the Mexican War had made the notion of arbitration clauses popular, though ironically clause in the Treaty was not due to any pressure on the part of the American peace party. Richard Cobden was approached by Burritt, Henry Richard and John Scoble to bring forward a motion in Parliament supporting Arbitration, and for the next eight months activities centred around raising popular support for Cobden's motion. On June 11th, 1849, came the "crowning demonstration of our arbitration movement" — a great meeting in Exeter Hall at which "1000 petitions some bearing the signatures of 10,000 individuals each" came in. Burritt was very impressed by this "operation of popular will", and declared "England and the United States are the only two countries in the world, in which public meetings have become an inalienable institution of the people."

That afternoon he had called with a deputation on Sir Robert Peel to

1. "I was called to experience much solicitude while in Birmingham from communications from the London Peace Society to Joseph Sturge, complaining of my operation in a certain degree, and speaking of my incompetence to lead a great movement. These things troubled me exceedingly as I found myself and the League movement rather in a competition with the Peace Society which had rendered them very sensitive." MS. Journals, October 30.
4. Ibid., Vol.13.
attempt to gain his support, but they received very little encouragement, and the next day the motion was brought before the House of Commons and defeated by 176 votes to 79.¹

But while raising popular support for the Arbitration Motion Burritt had also begun to turn his attention to two other schemes which had occupied his attention: a plan for assisting intended emigrants to the United States, and his scheme for Ocean Penny Postage. With regard to emigration schemes Burritt's main work was to publish information and practical advice in the columns of the various papers he was responsible for editing.² His concern for the emigrant and his desire for close personal ties of friendship between men of all countries were closely linked to his campaign for Ocean Penny Postage. He saw clearly that the personal links between the two countries could not be easily maintained when the rates of postage were so high that the poorest could not afford the high postal rates involved in sending letters across the Atlantic. During March, 1849 he was in close touch with William Ewart, a Member of Parliament, who proposed bringing before Parliament a similar motion dealing with cheap postage between Britain and the colonies.³ The two paid a visit to Cobden to interest him in this scheme,⁴ and Burritt also visited Rowland Hill, who had been responsible for introducing penny postage in Britain. Hill, however, was pessimistic about the chances of the British government agreeing

¹. Ibid., June 12, (1849). Palmerston, however, was courteous in his reply. Twenty four years later Henry Richard was to carry a similar proposal by a majority of ten. C.S. Miall, op. cit., pp. 36-7 n.; Curti, The American Peace Crusade, pp. 192-3; Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol.cvi, 1849, 5th vol., pp. 54-122.
³. Ibid., Vol.13, March 24.
⁴. Ibid., Vol.13, March 27.
unilaterally to such a scheme as cheap Atlantic postage.¹

The summer months of 1849, however, saw Burritt once again working for an international Peace Congress, this time to be held in Paris. At the beginning of July he left for a visit to the Continent; in Paris he was helped by Henry Richard and Richard Cobden in preparation for the coming Congress. Several leading Frenchmen proved disappointing allies, but Victor Hugo was prevailed upon to act as President of the assembly, and on August 22 the Paris Peace Congress opened, an even more notable gathering than its predecessor.²

During the next month Burritt returned to Britain and was largely concerned with the series of public meetings held to advertise the decisions of the Congress, and putting in order the affairs of the League for he had determined to return to the United States at the beginning of October. Ocean Penny Postage, he now decided, should be the main work of the League to give it a distinct character from the Peace Society.³ He sailed for America on October 6th.

Burritt's departure, however, was not a permanent one. On May 27, 1850, he returned to Britain once more to carry out his peace activities. On this visit one of his main tasks was to form Olive Leaf Societies, groups of women whose main aim would be to collect funds to pay for the insertion of Burritt's Olive Leaf Tracts in British and foreign journals.

By the end of June he left for the Continent where he remained for the next few months working with other members of the Peace Congress

Committee preparing for the annual Convention this year to be held at Frankfort. This Congress, held from August 22 to 24, was on a slightly smaller scale than the Paris meeting, but enthusiasm was still high.¹ Though tacitly barred from discussing contemporary politics the Congress agreed on its last day to send a private commission to enquire into the dispute between Denmark, the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein and the German states, especially Prussia. Joseph Sturge, Frederick Wheeler and Burritt were appointed, and travelled immediately to Kiel and Copenhagen to attempt to mediate between the Duchies and Denmark. Burritt remained for three months after the other two had departed, having several interviews with the ministers of the two governments and obtaining from them a promise that they would at least agree to discuss their differences before resorting to arms again. But despite Burritt’s optimism little came of his work, and fighting shortly broke out again.²

He spent the rest of the year on the Continent, chiefly in Germany, writing peace tracts and articles for journals. At the beginning of 1851 he returned to Britain and began a tour of the country visiting those Olive Leaf Circles already formed and founding new ones. This work was especially agreeable to Burritt; it at once gave him an opportunity to work for his cause while at the same time it was free from the conflicts and strenuous politics which the affairs of the League and Peace Society entailed. But though he appears to have lost a certain amount of interest in the League, whose interests were now

2. For an appraisal of the mission see Curti, op. cit., pp. 184-6.
largely handled by Edmund Fry, he had not deserted his plan for Ocean Penny Postage. He was in communication with Rowland Hill and Milner Gibson in Britain and Charles Sumner in America,¹ and worked unceasingly to obtain the interest of the two governments in a cheap Atlantic postage.

During the summer he was fully occupied in London with engagements as the Great Exhibition brought many visitors to the capital. The connection between the Exhibition and the progress of the world towards an era of peace and international co-operation and goodwill was apparent to many, and Burritt's journal in these months shows him to be filled with confidence and optimism. Through his work for Ocean Penny Postage especially he had become closely associated with a group of Parliamentary radicals, and after receiving an invitation to a banquet for the Queen at Whitehall a note of personal snobbery enters: "Thus far I have confined myself to the immediate circle with whom I have been a co-worker, but as the cause is making friends in other classes I think I may follow it."²

The Peace Congress Committee was at this point engaged in preparations for the coming Congress which was to be held in London. Burritt, however, appears to have taken an increasingly less active part in their work; and though he succeeded in retaining the motion for a Congress of Nations he feared that the British audience would regard it as

---

1. For the Summer correspondence on Ocean Penny Postage see M.E. Curti, The Learned Blacksmith, New York, 1937, p. 94 ff.
"chimerical and peculiarly American".  

The Congress was held from July 22 to 24, 1851 in Exeter Hall, and though it received wide public attention it was to be the last of the series of international conventions. The Peace Congress Committee had begun to lose interest and enthusiasm in annual Congresses, as had the American and the London Peace Societies; and though public sentiment for peace was still strong, already there were signs that the peace movement was beginning to lose sympathy with popular views when the London Peace Society refused to take part in the enthusiastic public welcome given to Kossuth.

During the next six months Burritt visited various parts of the country encouraging his Olive Leaf Circles and advocating Ocean Penny Postage, 1852, indeed, was devoted almost entirely by Burritt to the cheap postage movement. He had gained the interest of Milner Gibson in Britain and Charles Sumner in America, both of whom were prepared to bring forward the scheme in their country's legislature. He was able to secure the backing of leading Manchester men, which reassured him considerably. Milner Gibson was more enthusiastic on

1. MS. Journals, Vol.16, July 8 (1851).
2. Miali, op. cit., p. 84 ff; Curti, op. cit., pp.186-188.
4. Ibid., Vol.16, October 30, November 6.
5. "If the Manchester men take hold of it in real earnest, it must issue in success. I feel grateful indeed that this project, which I have held up almost for 5 years is coming to be regarded as a great and feasible measure by the public." MS. Journals, Vol.16, December 23 (1851). And again, at a meeting in the Mayor's Parlour in Manchester on 20th January, 1852, when his views were commended by John Bright, Milner Gibson, George Wilson, Alexander Henry and Thomas Bazely, he exclaimed:"This was a very satisfactory meeting in every way. I feel that the movement is now fairly launched, and that it must soon come to a successful issue now that the Manchester men have set their hands to the war. Their influence and munificent contributions will be irresistible." Ibid.,
hearing of Charles Sumner's activities, and a deputation was to wait on Lord Grenville and Lord John Russell to discuss Ocean Penny Postage.¹

Burritt concentrated on this reform on his tours round the country. Increasingly he was being drawn into the fringes of British political society and adopting the tactics so successfully pioneered by the Anti-Corn Law League. With a general election shortly to be held he wrote that there were plans to write to the constituents of every Member of Parliament asking them to exert their influence on their representatives in favour of the measure, since as candidates seeking election they would be especially susceptible just before an election.²

Milner Gibson was his main political contact at this time, but though not wholeheartedly enthusiastic for postage reform,³ he made use of Burritt to obtain information with which to oppose the Militia Bill debated in Parliament that session.⁴ Burritt became intimate at this juncture with the Bell family, a Quaker family with political connections, and noting that Jacob Bell, then an M.P., was interested in the peace movement, he commented: "He seems disposed to move in Parliament increased postal facilities with France, instead of the Militia Bill, as a guaranty against French invasion."⁵

Gibson in the meantime was wholly occupied with his attack on the government's Militia Bill,⁶ and continually proposed reasons why a motion for cheap ocean postage should not be brought forward at this

2. Ibid., Vol.17, April 17, (1852).
3. "Saw R. Cobden who expressed a doubt whether Gibson would bring forward the motion this season. If he declines I hope we may find a Conservative who might do it." Ibid., Vol.16, April 19, (1852).
4. Ibid., Vol.16, March 27, April 23, April 24, (1852).
5. Ibid., Vol.16, April 18.
6. For a Comment on Palmerston's hostility to the peace group see Miall, op. cit., p. 90.
point; and it was left to John Bright to introduce the subject in Parliament before it adjourned for the summer.¹

But in spite of his close association with Members of Parliament, and the connections which the peace movement had on the politics of the day Burritt was not altogether pleased to have the high cause of peace become a political issue, as during 1852 when Franco-British relations were unusually strained, it was increasingly becoming. At a very interesting meeting of the Peace Congress Committee the approaching General Election and radical opposition to the government's militant attitude toward France were the main concern of the committee; and Henry Richard proposed that in view of the election and the necessity of urging the people to rid the people of such a warlike government, no international Congress be held that year.²

The hostile relations between Britain and France prompted Burritt to organise a series of Friendly Addresses between French and British towns similar to the ones which had been exchanged between Britain and America at the time of the Oregon crisis. These Burritt personally took to France to distribute to the various French towns during September and October.

On his return to Britain he made a further attempt to interest Milner Gibson in Ocean Penny Postage. During the summer, however, a Cheap Postage Association had been founded whose aim was to secure lower postage rates between Britain and the colonies, and Burritt consequently determined to give his attention to the Free Labour

1. MS. Journals, June 26, (1852).
2. Ibid., Vol.17, May 21, (1852).
For the next few years Burritt gradually devoted more and more of his energies to anti-slavery activities which in his early days as a reformer in America had claimed his chief interest, and he declared, "I have almost written myself out on the peace question." He attended the Manchester Conference in January, 1853, which was largely attended by M.Ps. who used it as a platform to attack the government's attitude to France, but took little part in it.

But though his tours were now mainly to urge free labour products and to take advantage of the wave of interest and sympathy for the American slave which Uncle Tom's Cabin had evoked, Burritt still retained an interest in the fate of his scheme for cheap postage. The movement for cheap colonial postage led by men such as Sir Charles Dilke, had received some government

1. "I intend now to give myself to the free labour movement, and to other departments of our operations thus adding to the variety of the topics discussed, so as to render the Bond more interesting and useful. I feel anxious to take part in the great anti-slavery struggle, from which I have practically withdrawn myself, and Total Abstinence from slave grown produce appears to be the most efficient measure for Abolitionists on this side of the Atlantic." MS. Journals, Vol.17, December 22, (1852).


4. Ibid., Vol.18, January 27, 28. Miall claims that some of the members of the Aberdeen ministry, which included men such as Sir William Molesworth and Gladstone, who were of decided pacific tendencies, encouraged the Peace Society to convene another Congress. Miall, Life of Henry Richard, p. 91. Henry Richard made the arrangements for this Congress.

support and seemed assured of success and Burritt commented that "My own efforts will soon be superseded, and other parties will march in the van when the day of triumph comes. But I ought to feel well contented with this, as probably the organization of the new society grew out of our operations." He still hoped that Milner Gibson would move the setting up of a Parliamentary Committee of enquiry on Ocean Postage, however, and finally on August 4 and 5, 1853, Gibson introduced the subject in the House, and received a vague but courteous reply from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which filled Burritt with groundless encouragement.

He had decided to return to America in October, but before he left he took part in two important events. On July 14 he called upon the American minister to Britain, James Ingersoll, in company with Richard Cobden and Henry Richard. Their aim was to urge upon Ingersoll the task of offering the mediation of the United States in the Eastern Question, a task which he accepted with some reservations. Burritt later wrote an interesting letter to Ingersoll expressing views which he had not like to urge in the presence of Cobden and Richard: that this was a chance for American influence to be extended

---

1. MS. Journals, Vol. 18, March 5, April 16. On this second occasion Burritt was a member of a delegation to Lord Aberdeen. He commented: "This was a scene of the deepest interest to me. I could hardly realise that this great company of influential men had waited upon the Premier merely to urge the very propositions which I launched upon the tide of opinion in 1846." The Times also supported the Colonial Postage Association. Ibid., Vol. 18, January 22, (1853).
2. Ibid., Vol. 18, March 15.
3. Ibid., August 4, 5. In fact this was Burritt's last direct contribution to the question of cheap ocean postage, though by 1879 when Alfred Dyer was writing his biography of Burritt he noted that postal rates between Britain and America had appreciably declined. Alfred S. Dyer, A Hero from the Forge - London, 1879. p. 10.
in an area hitherto not before exerted, and also to encourage her reputation in the eyes of the world by this benevolent act.

The second event was the Edinburgh Peace Congress, which Burritt agreed to attend only after some persuasion. He claimed rightly that it would to a great degree be connected with British politics, and noted that though the majority of the delegates spoke against Britain entering a war, when Sir Charles Napier spoke he was greeted with tumultuous cheering though he was in fact ridiculing the movement. Burritt left immediately after the Edinburgh meeting for the United States.

His third visit to Britain was fairly brief, from August, 1854 to September, 1855, and during this time Burritt took very little active part in affairs. The cause of peace had suffered a severe set back with the outbreak of the Crimean War, and membership in peace societies had sharply fallen off. He had noted the decline of interest in his Olive Leaf Societies at the close of his last visit, and on July 31, 1855 he wrote of the League of Universal Brotherhood, that "The very existence of our society hangs upon a silken thread; and the chance of its surviving is very small indeed." His Olive Leaf Circles were soon to die away, and in 1857 the League of Universal Brotherhood finally amalgamated with the London Peace Society, having maintained its independent existence for ten years during

1. From Charles Gilpin: "He is strongly persuaded that I ought to go, lest the enemies of the cause should suspect a split among the friends of peace." MS. Journals, Vol.18, September 30, (1853).
4. Ibid., Vol.20, July 31, (1855).
which time it had supported all Burritt's schemes.  

Burritt had hoped that Gibson would take up the matter of Ocean Penny Postage again, but nothing came of it, though in fact there was at this point a very active peace party in Parliament, deeply committed to opposing the government's policy over the Crimean war.  Burritt's main work during this visit was to work for free labour produce, especially encouraging the setting up of free labour depots; but though his schemes were practical, such as the establishment of special cotton brokers in Liverpool and America, he found few who would act as agents or go as farmers to the Southern states and grow cotton without the aid of slaves.

Burritt was to visit Britain once more during the 1860s but his work on this occasion was almost entirely private, except for the years when he acted as American consular agent in Birmingham, and his interest in reform had no practical outlet. There was talk of his visiting Europe once again during the period of the Alabama Arbitration, but illness on Burritt's part prevented his going, and he never again visited Britain.

It is very easy to criticise Burritt as a "jolter pate", an idealist without enough force to carry out his beliefs, a reformer who turned to a new field of activity when faced by difficulties. Richard Cobden, indeed, declared that he had all the harmlessness of

3. Blackwood's Magazine, September, 1854, p. 313. Blackwood's was a vigorous opponent of the peace movement, cf. also March, 1852.

pp. 369 ff.
the dove without the slightest admixture of the serpent's wisdom. Moreover when we consider his work for the peace movement in Britain it might appear that Burritt, far from strengthening the existing society, weakened it by diverting interest to his own schemes and to his own societies. The leaders of the London Peace Society, indeed, constantly bewailed this danger and attacked Burritt for splitting the movement. But though Burritt drew support away from the existing Peace Society, by doing so he did not necessarily injure the cause of peace. The aims of the peace movement, universal concord and friendship, and opposition to all war, had a broad general appeal, but their special interests, codification of international law, a Congress of Nations and boards of Arbitrators for international problems, roused no great national enthusiasm. Moreover the London Peace Society tended to be run by a small, exclusive group of Quakers who often had little interest in raising popular support. One of Burritt's main contributions was that he constantly appealed to a wider circle than that reached by the Broad Street Committee of the London Society. By his voluminous writings rather than by speeches, and by a constant stream of ideas which all sought to make public the ideals of peace,

2. "The Peace Society are in trouble. Samuel Gurney had expressed his decided disapprobation of their course, and threatened to resign his post as Treasurer. He disapproves of all "agitators", or extraordinary efforts. He objects to the aid and co-operation of such men as George Thompson and Henry Vincent. He seems opposed to the employment of men and means which should popularize the principles of peace and enlist and elicit the sympathies of the people. He has honoured me also with the seal of his disapprobation. He did not like the Peace Convention in 1843, nor the Brussels Congress in 1848. In a word he would exterminate all vitality from the Peace Society." MS. Journals, Vol. 13, June 1, 1849.
he attracted a wide group of followers than the Peace Society had ever done. Chief among these were the men of the Manchester School and Parliamentary radicals, free after 1846 from their triumphant struggle against the Corn Laws. These men took their support of the peace movement to surprising lengths not merely by personal advocacy but by vigorous Parliamentary attack on the government's plans for defence and war. Peace they equated with trade and prosperity, and the limited objectives which Burritt proposed seemed to offer them practical means of working towards this goal. Moreover participation in Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood and in his schemes helped to band together a Parliamentary peace party which caused no little concern to the government.

But it must not be thought that Burritt received no help from the Peace Society. There were active members, especially Henry Richard, who co-operated fully with Burritt, and when the general support for peace died away in the prosperity of the 50s, Burritt's followers lost interest, and it was the old London Society which was left again as the chief body for organised peace activity.

To give Burritt the credit for all the activity in British peace circles between 1846 and 1856 would be false. Not only would such a claim ignore the work of men such as Sturge, Cobden, Edmund Fry and Henry Richard, and the Wighams, but it would place the activity of the whole peace movement in a false perspective. To a degree much of Burritt's work was at a tangent to the main efforts of the movement. He worked apart from the American and the London Peace Societies, and largely advocated his own schemes. Of these the free labour movement is of interest in so far as it revealed a somewhat quixotic attempt to deal
with the problem of British dependence on the South for cotton. The movement for cheap Atlantic postage was superseded by that for cheap colonial postage, an early indication of the reviving interest in Britain in overseas possessions, but Burritt may well have been right when he claimed that the germ of this idea was his.

But the objectives of the peace movement could only be achieved by constant persuasion, and Burritt, though he urged other reforms, was a tireless worker for peace, and his boundless enthusiasm spurred on those around him. He was fortunate in that his years of greatest activity in Britain, 1846 to 1850, were years when peace and security had a wide appeal to all who feared popular uprising and desired to restore a measure of prosperity to the country. If the triumphs of the Alabama Arbitration belong to the peace movement as a whole and not specially to Burritt, he yet served to make the ideals of the movement more widely known than they had ever been before.

A tireless advocate of peace he constantly reminded his generation that to the cry of liberty and equality there should also be added fraternity.
CHAPTER V.

TEMPERANCE: JOHN B. COUGH IN BRITAIN.

The close ties which existed between British and American abolitionists and peace reformers is found in no less degree between those advocating temperance principles on both sides of the Atlantic. But while many visiting American reformers lectured on temperance in Britain, it is interesting to note that only two, John Bartholomew Gough and Neal Dow, gained for their work the national prominence and publicity which the abolitionists and Burritt won for themselves abroad. Of these two, Gough has been selected because of the interesting reactions brought about by his visits. Dow, as the originator of the Maine Law, might be thought to have had the more dynamic influence, the British movement being deeply interested in the question of prohibition; but his visit to Britain was a fairly brief one, and his influence rested purely on his American reputation. Gough, on the other hand, paid two fairly extensive visits to Britain during the 1850s, during which time he came to champion the conservative element of the movement, and to some extent was responsible for interesting a wealthier upper class group in the benefits of temperance.

Not the first American temperance advocates to visit Britain, these two men came to Britain at a time when the public attitude.

1. During 1857; see Neal Dow, Reminiscences of Neal Dow, Portland, Maine, 1898.
2. An interesting article of the day compared these two reformers: "Neal Dow has the disposition of a Spanish Inquisitor, and is fond of rack and thumbkins. Cough, like the German reformer, Luther, appeals to a man as a rational being and brings persuasion and argument to be in place of whips and screws." Unidentified extract from the Scrapbooks of Personal Clippings (vol. IV) kept by Gough.
3. E.g. E.C. Delavan in the 1830s.
towards the temperance movement was gradually changing. Thus the early tolerance towards the moderate abstainers had given place to active opposition in the early 1840s when it seemed that temperance principles were challenging upper class habits and also were increasingly being adopted by Chartists. This opposition by the 1850s was gradually changing back to increasing public support for the temperance movement as the optimistic belief grew that temperance would solve most of the social evils especially for the poor. It was Cough's special fortune to ride the crest of the movement's popularity and to increase yet further public interest in this field of reform.

Cough, probably the most melodramatic of these Anglo-American reformers to visit Britain, made three much publicised tours, the first from 1853 to 1855, another from 1857 to 1860, and the third from 1877 to 1878. An Anglo-American in every sense of the word, he was born

1. R.M.W. Cowan, The Newspaper in Scotland, Glasgow, 1946, pp. 351-354. Scotland especially entered the attack since it was feared that the success of Father Matthew, particularly among the Glasgow Irish, would relax the vigilance against Rome. Ibid., p. 352.

2. Commenting on Cough and Anglo-American reformers in general, the Glasgow Examiner reported: "Whatever latent jealousies may exist between Britain and America, there is unquestionably no lack of interest when the men of note of the one visit the other... The Penningtons and Douglasses, and Mahans, and Burits(sic), and Garrisons, and Breckenridges have all received a large share of popular applause, and last, but not least, Mr. Cough has turned the heads of half Scotland, and it is to be hoped will also turn some of the customs into less exceptional forms... Such a furor to listen to and to lecture we have never seen... not even Mrs. Stowe with her world renowned 'Uncle Tom' --- created more unanimous or enthusiastic audiences." Sept. 3, 1853, Scrapbooks, V.

3. Interestingly enough this roused a degree of partisanship on both sides of the Atlantic with both countries claiming him for their own: cf. A. Arthur Reade, J.B. Cough, A Sketch of his Life, Work and Creations in America and Great Britain, London, 1878, p. 3; and Carlos Martyn, John B. Cough, The Apostle of Cold Water, New York, 1893, p. xi.
in Kent in 1817, of poor parents who sent him to America at the age of twelve. Working at various occupations including bookbinding and acting, he was beset by financial difficulties, and by his inability to maintain steady employment because of his heavy drinking. His sudden conversion to teetotalism in 1842 was a dramatic turning point in his life. Coming at a time when he was penniless, suffering from delirium tremens, with his wife and child dead partly from his neglect of them, his sudden decision to follow the advice given him by a stranger and sign the pledge was in itself a colourful story; but his subsequent career was no less flamboyant. "To use his own expression, wrote the Morning Star in 1860, "He signed the pledge', and from that day to this he has risen in the social scale." He became a speaker for the Washingtonian movement, at that time the dominant section of the temperance movement in America, speaking of his experiences first at a few meetings in Worcester, Massachusetts, the scene of his conversion; and then as his fame increased, at towns more distant. His two much publicised lapses from grace, the first five months after signing the pledge, the second in 1845, the "drugged soda water" incident, were used by Gough to win rather than alienate sympathy, and are a useful indication of his methods of countering adverse publicity by a flow of even more publicised explanations, speeches and counter accusations.

His spellbinding oratory dealing with events from his own life, ensured Gough of audiences further and further afield, audiences for whom his lectures were probably dramatic entertainments as much as

moral exhortations. So great had his fame become by 1853 that he was invited by the London Temperance League and the Scottish Temperance League to lecture in Britain, to which appointment Gough finally agreed after arriving at very favourable terms with the societies involved.

His visits to Britain during the 1850s form the main theme of this chapter, and indeed were the highlights of Gough's career. He made a third visit from 1878 to 1879, and was an active speaker in temperance circles until his death in 1886, but the heyday of the fire and thunder humanitarian reformers passed with the Civil War, and the close of Gough's career, like that of Burritt, Garrison and Cheever, had none of the national prominence and influence that had attended its earlier days.

His first visit, however, got off to an auspicious start. Leaving Boston on July 19, 1853, with his second wife, whom he had married soon after his conversion, Gough arrived in Liverpool on 30th, and by the beginning of August the pair were in London where Gough made his first speech in Exeter Hall. It was a great success, silencing those critics who felt that his fame had been overrated. On August 6th he left London for a tour of the West country. His lectures then took him north, and continuing at the same gruelling pace and resting only on Sundays, he usually delivered at least one lecture a day. Crossing the Border on August 24, and going via Galashield to Glasgow he spent

---

1. The Visit was largely engineered by the American temperance reformer, F.W. Kellogg, who had just returned from a visit to Britain: see, Autobiography, op. cit., p.231.
2. Details of this and the subsequent tour are taken from the daily record kept by Gough. MS. Journals.
3. "The temperance movement here, as well as elsewhere in Scotland, has received a fresh impulse from the visit of the great American advocate, J.E. Gough. During the week upwards of two hundred individuals have enrolled their names with the Glasgow United Total Abstinence Association; forty of these were given the night of Gough's lecture in the City Hall." Unidentified clipping, Scrapbooks, V.
a few days touring the surrounding area before going on to Edinburgh for a well earned rest, which was broken by a visit to London to speak at the Surrey Gardens fête to a crowd of seventeen thousand, the largest he had ever addressed.¹

By September 19 he was on tour again, visiting the midland cities. A visit to the south coast afforded him the opportunity to revisit his birthplace, Sandgate in Kent, and at this point the two Temperance Leagues, which had engineered his visit, urged him to stay on, and to this he agreed after stipulating that he be paid ten guineas for each lecture. He then returned to London where he spoke in some of the major halls and chapels before continuing his tour of the south coast, striking northeast in the early days of November and travelling via Cirencester, Gloucester and Reading, he visited Norwich, Ipswich, Colchester and Chelmsford before returning to London for a week of resting and lecturing.

By the end of November he was off again, accompanied by his wife who went with him on all his travels, journeying north via the great cotton towns of Lancashire, seldom staying more than one night in one place and lecturing at each stop. Christmas was spent in London, New Year in Edinburgh; January saw them making an intensive tour of south east Scotland; then by February the road lay through Glasgow, Dumfries, Stirling, Falkirk, Paisley, Perth, east again to Dundee, then west once more to Glasgow and its ring of manufacturing towns. It was not until March 8th that Cough returned to England, travelling through Carlisle and the manufacturing towns of Durham and Yorkshire. He remained in this area three weeks before crossing over to Liverpool where he snatched

a few days rest in between visits to nearby towns. On April 22 he returned to London, resting and speaking at Exeter Hall and other halls and chapels. At the end of three weeks he travelled again to Scotland speaking in Edinburgh and Glasgow, leaving at the end of three weeks for a journey to south west England, lecturing on the way, and arriving in Bristol on June 3. He was four weeks in Devon and Cornwall, travelling after this along the south coast with a brief visit to the Channel Islands, and back to London for a rest, breaking his stay there in the middle by a four day visit and rest at Sandgate; then by the end of the month he was again touring the midlands and north east England, travelling suddenly northwest to Glasgow where he remained for nearly two weeks resting, delivering only two speeches at the City Hall. October was spent working in the Glasgow area and south west Scotland; November in Edinburgh and the Borders. On December 8 he returned to London, resting and lecturing there; but the coming of the New Year brought him once again to Scotland. For the next two months he toured Scotland intensively, and by March 1 he was travelling south to London, stopping off to lecture at various places. The remainder of March was spent in London, resting and lecturing. By April 1 he was travelling again to Scotland for another lecture tour interrupted for a fortnight by recurrent hoarseness. By mid May he had returned to London where he remained for three weeks fully occupied with engagements. From June 13 to 15 he made a memorable visit to Oxford, then turned up through the great cotton manufacturing towns of England. During the first two weeks of July, 1855, he visited the smaller towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, arriving in London on the 16th. There he remained, mainly resting, before setting out for Manchester and Liverpool, finally

1. For an account of this visit see Autobiography, op.cit., pp.285,288.
leaving on August 4.

The itinerary of Cough's first visit has been gone into in such detail for various reasons. Not only does it give some indication of the tremendous scope of his activity (he visited all the main areas of England and Scotland and spoke some four hundred and thirty eight times in the course of two years), but it gives some idea of the efficiency and affluence of the London and Scottish Temperance Leagues — to say nothing of the light it sheds on the scope of the mid Victorian railway system.

The success of his mission was undoubted. Financially Cough did very well out of it. His earnings per annum, which in 1852 had totalled £5,027 for two hundred and thirty two speeches, went in 1853 to £5,749 for two hundred and twenty seven speeches, and jumped greatly in 1854, when he was all year in Britain, to £10,419 for two hundred and fifteen speeches, falling slightly in 1855 to £9,527, but this for one hundred and seventy speeches. His charge for lecturing at the beginning of the tour averaged £37 a lecture and rose to an average of £50 at the end. This, however, was to lead to attacks on Cough and the not unjustified claim that his charges were excessive.

Cough said of his visit that he had spent two pleasant years. "The two years of work though hard had been exceedingly pleasant. I met with no personal opposition; -- there were strong objections expressed to my temperance principles and many of the arguments against total

---

1. Autobiography, op. cit. p.267, Cough indeed specially commented on the excellence of the British organisation
2. Gough MS, Journals.
3. See for example, the Weekly Journal of the Scottish Temperance League, Glasgow, Jan. 9, 1858, for correspondence dealing with the attack on Cough by the Rev. James Stirling of Kirriemuir for his high charges of £45-£20 a lecture. Scrapbooks, V.
abstinence were new to me." American critics were more fulsome:

"He has had unparalleled success in the old country," stated the Evening Telegraph of Boston, "and has been instrumental in waking up the people of England and Scotland to the alarming evils of intemperance. The prohibitive law question is agitated all over the United Kingdom." His popularity as a speaker was undoubted, and the cause of temperance was put over in a dramatic and popular fashion to a degree that it had never before been done. But the temperance organization itself received little internal benefit from Gough's visit. Unable to agree over the issue of legal and moral suasion, the two groups remained as deeply divided as they had been. Indeed the formation of the United Kingdom Alliance in 1853 and the amalgamation of the London and Scottish Temperance Leagues in 1856 served only to point up these divisions.

Gough, as the agent of the latter societies, was largely committed to the conservative wing — to those advocating the spread of temperance by 'moral suasion'; and though the issue did not greatly intrude on his first visit, it was to be a major factor during his second.

If the first visit was a largely successful one, the same cannot so readily be said of the second. Before leaving in 1855 he had made an agreement with the London and Scottish Temperance Leagues to return in two years to deliver two hundred lectures a year for three years at ten guineas a lecture. But not only was the visit marred by the widespread publicity attendant upon some disparaging remarks made by

2. Evening Telegraph, Boston, August 16, 1855, Scrapbooks V.
3. They too, profited financially from it, however. Burritt said of Gough's work that "over £17,000 have been taken for his lectures and all the temperance societies have been put in funds and he will carry back a considerable sum." MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol.20, July 20, 1855.
4. See Introduction.
Gough on the efficacy of the Maine Law, remarks which involved him in a libel suit with F.R. Lees, a radical temperance writer, but the demand for his services was perhaps a shade less pressing.

Sailing from Boston with his wife and a party of friends, they arrived in Liverpool on July 26, 1857 where they remained for a few days before travelling up to London. There and at Houghton, the home of George Brown, a noted temperance worker, the Gough’s remained, resting except for one speech by Gough at Exeter Hall, until they began their travels at the beginning of September. Speaking from Manchester and Preston they travelled north to Scotland where they remained until the end of January, save for a short visit to London at the beginning of December for a series of five lectures in Exeter hall. This time Gough lectured mainly in the smaller towns which he had been unable to visit on former occasions, travelling as far north as the Orkneys.

Coming south to London via the west coast Gough began a tour of the provinces at the beginning of February, 1858, mainly in the east coast towns. After a ten day rest in London, March saw him travelling through Yorkshire with visits to Birmingham and Wolverhampton. April was spent partly in London and the towns of county Durham: May was divided between London, Wales and the adjoining English counties. June and July were relatively free of engagements, Gough being occupied in preparing for his libel suit with Lees, the trial taking place on June 21, the time thereafter being mainly spent visiting friends such as George and Potto Brown, Samuel Bowly of Horsepools and William Wilson of Sherwood Hall.

1. See Frederic Lees, Dr. F.R. Lees, London, 1904.
2. The record of Gough’s journey is again taken from the MS. Journals.
In August he resumed his lecture tours, once more visiting Wales. The next four months saw the Goughs once again touring Scotland, save for a brief visit to London and a few nearby towns in December.

February and a part of March were spent mainly in Devon and Cornwall; then after a rest in London came a tour of the provinces until the end of July, broken by frequent returns to London to rest and to deliver a few addresses.

On July 22 he left London with his wife and their friends for a holiday in France, Switzerland and Germany, returning to London on August 13, and resting there for the rest of the month. In September, using London as his headquarters, he made short journeys to various parts of the kingdom, setting out for a three week tour of Ireland at the beginning of October. The five weeks following were spent in Scotland, while December saw a return to his practice of living in London with even briefer visits to one or two nearby towns.

January 1, 1860, for the first time saw the Goughs bringing in the New Year in England and not in Scotland, a change explained by his series of engagements along the south coast and into Wales. Throughout February Gough was mainly in London, making visits to towns such as Leicester and Rugby, and travelling to Glasgow at the end of the month for a farewell visit. From there he took the boat to Ireland where he undertook a further series of lectures; then came visits to East Anglia, Yorkshire, Lancashire, the Midlands, Devon and Cornwall, pausing for rests in London and returning to many of these towns where he had secured return engagements, the climax coming at a huge farewell in Exeter Hall on August 8 before the final departure from Liverpool three days later.

But whatever triumph Gough may have enjoyed much of it was
overshadowed by the much publicised controversy over the Maine Law which greeted him on his arrival in England, a controversy out of which grew the somewhat Gilbertian libel suit which Gough brought against F.R. Lees. On the surface the facts seem innocuous enough: Gough had written from America some time before his arrival, a letter to his friend G.C. Campbell in which he expressed the opinion, accurate enough, that "the Maine Law as it stands is a dead letter."

On April 11, 1857, the Alliance Weekly News, organ of the United Kingdom Alliance, published in full the text of the letter:

"The cause in this country (the United States) is in a depressed state, the Maine Law is a dead letter everywhere: more liquor sold than I ever knew before in Massachusetts, and in other states it is about as bad ... Were it not that I feel desirous of laboring with you again I should feel inclined to ask for the loan of another year to labor here. I have never had so many and so earnest applications for labor, and the field is truly ready -- not for the sickle but for steady persevering tillage, but we shall leave our dear home in July with the expectation of laboring with you for the next three years.... I see Neil Dow is to be in England. I am glad. You will all like him; he is a noble man--a faithful worker. He can tell better than any other man the state of the 'Maine Law' movement here and the cause of the universal failure of the law to produce the desired results." 1

This at once aroused a heated press campaign: the Alliance Weekly News on April 16 published a defence of the Maine Law, heatedly attacking Gough. 2 The Christian News took up the cause, as did other

---

1. The quarrel assumed a truly Anglo-American context in the controversies raised by the visit of Peter Sinclair of Edinburgh to the United States. Sinclair, who was in America at the same time that Gough made his second visit to Britain, faced many attacks and charges of dishonesty due in some part to the fact of his being a member of the United Kingdom Alliance, and a firm advocate of prohibition. See P.T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers, 4 vols., London, 1892, vol.III. p.104.

2. Scrapbooks V.

3. Ibid., May 9, 1857. The American papers also took up the quarrel; cf the Maine Journal, Dec. 10, 1857; The Temperance Visitor, Boston, Dec. 10, 1857, which supported Dow and the Congregationalist, Boston, Nov. 27, 1857, which supported Gough. Winskill, op. cit., vol.III, p.104.
papers including the Glasgow Commonwealth which printed an extremely
scurrilous article on Gough. Matters came to a head at the beginning
of 1858 when Gough brought a suit for libel against F.R. Lees for
letters written by Lees to William Wilson of Sherwood Hall, a wealthy
temperance advocate of Nottingham, and a firm friend of Gough,
declaring that Gough took drugs. Gough applied for a writ of criminal
information, but this was disallowed by the Court of Queen's Bench on
the grounds that rumour was not a sufficient basis for the court's
intervention. A civil suit was consequently brought instead, but the
matter never came to a public trial as the action was settled out of
court by the withdrawal of the slander by Lees' lawyers — a retraction
denounced by Lees, but generally welcomed at the time by the press, if
not by Lees' friends.

The real significance of this whole episode, however, lies in
the complex state of affairs existing in the British temperance
movement at this point. We have seen that the British movement, like
its American counterpart, was divided throughout the 1850s between the
legal and moral suasionists — a division broadly represented by the
London and Scottish Temperance Leagues who supported moral suasion, and
the United Kingdom Alliance which was agitating for adoption of the

1. Scrapbooks V.
2. For an account of the trial see the London Times, June 22, 1858. A
pamphlet reprinting all Lees' letters as well as other documents
relating to this controversy was also brought out: Extracts from the
Recent Correspondence between Dr. F.R. Lees and Mr. W. Wilson, and
others; with a Report of the Trial of the Action of Gough versus Lees,
London, 1858.
3. See Scrapbooks V: Weekly Record, April 14, 1858; Christian News,
May 1, 1858; Alliance Weekly News, June 24, 1858; Examiner and Times
(Manchester), June 25, 1858; Glasgow Examiner, June 26, 1858;
Bradford Review, June 26, 1858; The Commonwealth, (Glasgow), June 26,
1858.
Maine law. This latter group while active and powerful, represented the radical wing of the movement, since the idea of legal methods to enforce temperance drew opposition from many quarters in Britain. Thus prohibition was attacked not only by those groups who would most feel the effect of sumptuary laws, but also by a larger number who felt that governments had no right to pass laws of such a nature. The breach between the two groups was very marked at this period, and serious friction was constantly in evidence between the two parties. This was especially evident between the Scottish Temperance League and the United Kingdom Alliance because of the English leadership of the latter group, a factor which apparently irked the Scots. The visit of Neal Dow, closely followed by that of Gough, together with his attack on the Maine Law, set off these conflicts in a yet more violent form, and the American reformer became the focus of these issues. Gough, whose position with regard to the Maine Law was somewhat ambiguous, allied himself firmly by 1857 with the moral suasion school, the party of the respectable, genteel and socially fashionable; and the whole libel

1. "No government has a right to pass such a law: no political majority has a right to dictate to a minority its own theory of morals and physics. When we find, moreover, as is clear from the tone universally adopted by "temperance" lecturers that they desire to see the traffic in spirituous liquors suppressed by law without allowing a farthing of compensation for the many millions' worth of property thus to be destroyed, we can only characterise their proposition, as one combining the folly of fanaticism, and the wickedness to despotism with the reckless contempt of the principles of common honesty worthy of the most fanatic disciples of the worst schools of communism."


3. Ibid., pp. 275-279, in which the author quotes remarks of Gough's showing his support of the Maine Law. See also Winskill, op. cit., vol. III, p. 94.
suit indicates the bitterness with which partisans on both sides regarded the question.

But Gough's disruptive influence was not to have a permanent effect on the whole movement. In 1878 he reported that the two movements were now working in harmony, and if the Maine Law never became a model for British legislators, the various Licensing Acts passed after 1870 served to some slight degree to answer the temperance advocates' call for a ban on drink.

The most important effect of Gough's visit, however, lies not in the internal disputes which he created within the movement, but in the increased publicity and popularity he created for the temperance cause. It is exceedingly difficult to speak of this in any more than general terms, but it is clear that Gough's fame as a speaker was widely recognised and drew many who might not otherwise have gone to hear a less well known speaker. In a long and over eulogistic article the Weekly Record gave a summary of the two visits of Gough to Britain which gives a very clear idea of some of the contemporary opinions of him:

"When Mr. Gough was first invited to this country, in 1853, the temperance cause was in a most unpromising state. It was inactive,

2. Writing in 1860 the Morning Star claimed that temperance had encouraged educated men to speak out, and "the sound increased in volume till the more susceptible portions of respectability were compelled to hear. The speaking out of plain men on their peculiar wrongs and wants became listened to with respect, and now it has almost become a fashion, in all but the most old fashioned circles, to profess the loudest interest in what the unrefined classes either say or think. The temperance movement has been one important agent in securing this change and Mr. Gough will ever be esteemed one of the most eminent trophies of this disruption of that insipid conformity to schools, and the return to that higher standard of nature's eloquence, of which his own style is at once a result and one of the most eminent examples." August 10, 1860, Scrapbooks, IV.
inoperative, and almost powerless: nearly everywhere its societies were discouraged and despairing, if not entirely disorganised. They showed little real purpose, and exercised a feeble influence. In every town good men stood aloof from total abstinence, suspecting it as a presumptuous rival to the higher influences of religion, incredulous of its efficacy as a social movement, and repulsed by the extravagances of some of its promising advocates.

Thus disorganised and enfeebled within its own ranks, and scorned and derided by the highest social influences of the commonwealth, the cause of temperance was notoriously languishing, and but little prospect of future life and power appeared. It was in such a state of things that some of the most zealous and devoted adherents ventured to call Mr. Gough to labour among us....

At this period the public advocacy of the temperance movement was in the hands of men whose advocacy was less persuasive than denunciatory. Clearly perceiving that total abstinence is a positive and universal cure for drunkenness, wherever it can be applied, they forgot to make proper allowances for the narrow prejudices of early education, for the contagion of social example, and for the force of habit. Impatient of dissent from a truth so self-evident, they wasted their influence and power in useless crimination and idle invective. They reproached men for want of Christian sympathies, and spoke contemptuously of the Christian profession of those who differed from them. The intemperance of Temperance reformers then became a proverb, and though there were, happily, many exceptions, yet men of a more dignified and enlightened tone suffered in the general loss of public favour by these excesses.

Mr. Gough's advocacy was happily untainted by any such defect, and he came among us under circumstances of great advantage.... We believe that his liberal and temperate tone has been the real secret of his success; for with the English people no brilliancy of talent can atone for the exhibition of uncharitable sentiment or arrogant dogmatism.... He never speaks harshly of the victim of intemperance, but reserves the full blast of his indignation for the drink that destroys him.... But in his operation on the higher and more intelligent classes of society Mr. Gough has been most eminently successful. With these he pleads that they will throw their experience and wisdom, their influence and piety, into a movement that is to save the drunkard, and place a hedge of protection around the young and innocent. Through the upper ranks Mr. Gough has gained converts in all directions—clergymen, ministers of every denomination, philanthropists, ladies of education, and high social position have yielded to the power of his persuasion, have become personal abstainers, and, what is more, are now, in many instances, zealously labouring in extending the practice they have adopted. Many new and flourishing societies in various parts of the country were first originated, and are now principally sustained, by converts of Mr. Gough. In many of these places before Mr. Gough's visit the cause was almost dead; but afterwards new and active organisations have sprung up under the new
auspices and directions, and the good done in this manner would
be difficult to calculate, so that, in a just estimate of Mr.
Gough's labours, we must embrace the indirect as well as the
direct results....

He has indeed gained for temperance the esteem of all
classes. Rank and fashion, beauty and wealth, men of intellectual
power, of moral worth and social influence have listened to him,
and are now giving their time and influence to promote the great
cause of temperance.... It is gratifying to observe that wherever
Mr. Gough has gone, men of the highest social position have
gathered round him and presided at his meetings. Besides this
distinguished patronage, there have been numberless instances in
which clergymen, who were not themselves total abstainers have
invited Mr. Gough to hold meetings in their several parishes, in
the hope that he would be able to effect some change in the habit
of insobriety, which everywhere proved the source of domestic and
social discomfort, and a scandal to religion....

These happy memorials of his visit are seen in the families
he has made happy, and in the societies whose slumbering energies he
has rekindled. We are no longer disjointed, inactive,
uninfluential, but our organisations are complete, our societies
are inactive operation, and our prospects are most encouraging.
We have entered on a new era: we have undertaken new and
enlarged responsibilities; higher demands are now made upon our
seal and patriotism, our philanthropy and judgment. We must
accept the higher position to which our movement has been raised,
with its additional claims upon our energies and devotions. A
higher standard of advocacy has been introduced, and we must not
lower it. A loftier tone pervades our movement, and we must
allow no degeneracy. A comprehensive policy has been
inaugurated, and under its banners we must win new triumphs."

Gough stands in a somewhat different category to Garrison and
Burritt. He was purely a temperance orator, not interested in forming
new societies or in supporting other causes. He was a professional
in the sense that they never were. Coming from very different stock--
immigrant, as compared to the Yankee background of the other two--he
conducted his work on a businesslike basis, with his own operations
and not the activities of a society as his central theme. It is
partly for this reason that Gough's influence is somewhat difficult
to assess. A paid agent of British temperance societies, he was never

1. The Weekly Record, London, August 11, 1860, Scrapbooks, IV.
intimately bound up with their internal politics in the way that Garrison and Burritt were for anti-slavery and peace; and though his second visit at any rate raised further divisions among the temperance societies, this was not due to any wish on his part. His hold on the public imagination appears to have been considerable, however. He was a gripping if melodramatic speaker for a cause which did not lack melodrama in putting forward its appeal. Gough's accounts of his orations give some idea of his dramatic skill, a skill to which Lyman Abbott for one was prepared to bear witness. Indeed, the fame which Gough won for himself abroad is a further token of his ability when we remember that from many quarters in Britain there was opposition to American temperance reformers for much the same reasons that Americans objected to British anti-slavery speakers.

In both Britain and America the temperance movement grew in influence and strength throughout the nineteenth century, and as a force it is alive today to a degree that anti-slavery and peace in no sense are. The part Gough played in bringing this about is limited. He was too much an individualist in his work, and not enough connected to any of the temperance societies of both countries to bear any credit for advancing the organisation of the movement. But he was none-theless a product of the Anglo-American zeal for reform, and well illustrates the close ties which bound the two countries together, not least over the question of temperance reform. If we cannot say that he had any lasting impact on the temperance societies of Britain this is a small matter, for the real significance of Gough's work in Britain is that he helped to make temperance popular.

1. e.g. Addresses, Boston, 1861; Sunlight and Shadow, Hartford, Connecticut, 1882; Platform Echoes, Hartford, Conn. 1883. 2. Martyn, op. cit., p.164.
CHAPTER VI

GEORGE CHEEVER'S BEGGING MISSION TO BRITAIN.

Hitherto we have considered the work of reformers who were labouring on behalf of specific reform movements. A great many American reformers, however, came to Britain to advocate personal causes which were only loosely linked to the humanitarian societies. George B. Cheever, a New England Congregational minister, is one of the most noted of this latter group, and at the same time his visit brings to an interesting close the work of a generation of Anglo-American reformers. Loosely connected as his cause was with anti-slavery, it in fact illustrates more clearly the close ties between the two countries, between their churches, and the repercussions which humanitarian work had in every sphere of contemporary life.

During the last few months of 1860 and the first half of 1861 Cheever toured Britain lecturing, preaching and collecting funds on behalf of his church, the Congregational Church of the Puritans in Union Square, New York City. Various factors, combine to make this visit of special significance: it was in the first place one of the most publicised and discussed missions ever to take place. George Cheever had a genius for collecting publicity and stirring up controversy, and the begging mission was probably the highlight of his career. It was made, too, at a time when the fight against slavery—the moving force behind his work—was reaching its climax, and was a leading subject for discussion on both sides of the Atlantic; and it came at a period when Anglo-American relations were in a highly critical and uncertain position. The Cheever mission, therefore, was more than just the plea of an itinerant preacher for funds, but became linked in men's minds, in both Britain
and America, with far more important issues: with slavery; with the war; and above all with the attitude and feeling of Britain for America and vice versa.

The facts behind the mission, however, may well seem inconsistent with, or at any rate unworthy of the prominence which was given to them. Cheever, the Congregational minister of a fairly well to do New York City church, had entered the ranks of the outspoken anti-slavery speakers at the time of the Dred Scott Decision, and had preached a series of sermons on the Decision which received unusual prominence in the New York papers. This attack alarmed many of the wealthy members of his congregation who asked for his resignation. By somewhat highhanded methods Cheever overcame this demand, but in doing so he split his church into two bitterly opposing factions quarreling over an issue in which slavery and Cheever's dogmatic methods as a minister were inextricably entwined. Cheever became more and more embroiled in the anti-slavery struggle, attaching himself definitely to neither of the two wings of the abolition movement, but rather standing as the champion of anti-slavery feeling among the Northern churches. Internal difficulties in his church continued; the ground rent of his church was being increased, and many of the wealthier members of the congregation were withholding financial aid from the pastor. Determined not to be starved into submission, Cheever and a few others in February, 1959, authorised Miss Elizabeth Johnstone to collect funds for the church while on a visit to Britain.

1. For a detailed account of Cheever's controversy with his church see, R.M. York, "George B. Cheever, Religious and Social Reformer," University of Maine Studies, 2nd Series, no. 69, pp. 147 ff.
By the beginning of 1860, however, matters inside the Church of the Puritans had come to a head. Cheever's support of John Brown, his authorisation of the Johnstone mission, his treatment of those opposing him, all led to further sharp disagreements, and alienated yet more of his congregation. By a narrow margin Cheever and his supporters retained control, but it was felt that Cheever himself should go to Britain to collect funds which were so urgently needed. These quarrels, however, had received unusual prominence in the American papers. The affair was exhaustively discussed, and both factions within the Church of the Puritan published their side of the story. The British were not slow to reprint many of these happenings, so that by the time Cheever arrived in Britain the public there might well be puzzled whether to treat Cheever as a dictatorial, unscrupulous and violent man working largely for his own ends under a cloak of fanatical abolitionism\(^1\), or as a courageous servant of God standing boldly for the truth despite attacks from all sides.

On the surface his mission began fairly well. He was showered with letters of welcome and invitations to speak from several societies.\(^2\) His lines of communication having so to speak been laid by Miss Johnstone, Cheever had none of the initial difficulties of gathering together a group of supporters, and after a short time in London he left for the Continent on a brief holiday. On his return he travelled to Scotland where he

---

1. The object of the Johnstone mission was further complicated in that many subscribed under the impression that they were helping in the publication of Cheever's book on slavery. See letter from George Johnstone to G.B.C., Edinburgh, April, 1860, Cheever Family Papers; or the testimony of Miss Johnstone herself when she repudiated her share in the mission: Clipping from the *New York World*, May 6, (1860?) in *Ibid*.

2. See letters from Eliza Wigham, July 1860; Thomas Binney, July, 1860; the Secretary of the Scottish Reformation Society, Edinburgh, July, 1860; and others, all in *Ibid*.
received an enthusiastic welcome. He was supported by many of the Free Church dignitaries and introduced to other leading figures by Lord Kinnaird who throughout remained a firm friend. Even so, Cheever found that money was slow in coming, and on returning to London in February, 1861, the situation became yet more serious. His troubles at home had followed him abroad, and attack and counterattack from the Church of the Puritans were printed in the British and American papers; sallies which grew more unfavourable to Cheever as it became clear that the financial success of his mission was in doubt.

Cheever's fortunes and the cause of peace in his country declined together with equal rapidity. As hopes of reconciliation between North and South gradually faded in the United States, so in Britain hopes of financial success receded for the Cheever mission. The death of the Duke of Sutherland robbed him of a valuable supporter, and put an end to a soiree for Cheever which should have been held at Stafford House. ^

Quarrels with others of his supporters over methods of collection arose, and the sympathy of many of the London Committee which had been formed to aid him was alienated. ^ English support was clearly not forthcoming as

---

1. Scotland was always extremely favourable to Cheever's cause. See letters written from Glasgow by L. Johnstone to G.B.C., in the Spring of 1860; a letter from Lord Kinnaird to G.B.C., January, 1860, Cheever Family Papers; of the pamphlet: Demonstrations in favour of Dr. Cheever in Scotland. Letter of sympathy from distinguished clergymen and other gentlemen. Speeches at meetings in Edinburgh and Glasgow by Drs. Candlish, Guthrie, Alexander, Buchanan and Smyth. And a statement of Dr. Cheever's case by Rev. H. Batchelor. Letter of Dr. Guthrie to the 'Presbyterian'. New York, 1860.

2. York, op. cit., p. 179.

3. See letter from W. Wilson to G.B.C., Mansfield, 27 July, 1861, in which he states that the general opinion is that: "it is most difficult you from your unwillingness to be helped in any but a way of your dictating.

4. See letters from M.A. Garvey, the Secretary of the Committee, to Cheever at this time, Cheever Family Papers.
as various letters of the time go to show;\(^1\) and finally with the outbreak of the war all pretence at a public show of sympathy was abandoned. The public meeting planned was given up when Lord Brougham refused to preside on the grounds that as a Member of Parliament he must retain a strictly neutral attitude;\(^2\) the London Committee disbanded,\(^3\) and the British public, confused over the attitude to adopt towards the events in America, officially adopted a policy of neutrality towards both the United States and George Cheever.

Cheever remained in Britain for a few more months, working not only to collect money, but also to win British support for the northern cause.\(^4\) The failure of the begging mission was now clearly apparent, and led Cheever into making many strong observations about Britain and the British clergy in particular.\(^5\) What effect he had in shaping the course of public opinion is not so clear. He was certainly one of the best known American speakers in Britain during the early days of the war,\(^6\) and

5. G.B.C. to his sister, Elizabeth Washburn, London, 21 June, 1861: "In Scotland we have succeeded beyond our expectations but in England we meet with nothing but empty compliments or ill concealed impatience and refusal of aid. There is little or no sympathy with our causes here the moment it is known it is unpopular... there is a dreadful cowardly and time serving spirit manifested in England at the present time; people fearful to whisper a word against slavery, lest they shall commit the government and the country to a stand against the Southern confederacy! They are afraid even of a public meeting; I cannot get men of any influence to consent to lend their aid or even their names for the purpose of getting up a lecture to present the claims of the enslaved... Bad as the clergy of the United States have been in their compliance of slavery, and their defence of it I believe they would be outdone by the ministers of England in sycophancy, time-serving and the betrayal of the cause of the enslaved," Cheever Family Papers.
spoke in defence of the North before ever George Francis Train\(^1\) or Henry Ward Beecher\(^2\) took up the charge. But Cheever himself was such a figure of controversy, and the events of the time so confused in men's minds, that it is doubtful if he won more than a handful of pledged supporters to the North.

But the significance of the Cheever mission does not rest here. Much wider issues, it must again be stressed, were involved and come clearly to the forefront. The whole question of begging missions was brought up and furiously discussed on both sides of the Atlantic. In America where British anti-slavery feeling was taken, and often rightly, as a sign of Anti-Americanism, Cheever was attacked\(^3\) before he left the United States even by independent papers who felt that it was 'degrading' to solicit money from Britain. Others attacked the begging mission on precisely the grounds that it was fostering anti-Americanism in Britain:

"We are glad that Dr. Cheever's plan of visiting England in order to obtain funds to support his church, is almost universally condemned. Every dollar he obtains abroad makes a prejudiced enemy of the United States in the person who gives it."\(^4\)

This feeling was still very much present on his return:

---


3. But of the letter from Henry Cheever to Elizabeth Washburn, July 4th, 1860, in which he begs her to "do something in the circles in which you move to obtain British gold. Few (think) we cannot get rid of slavery in this country without the moral and pecuniary aid of Great Britain." Cheever Family Papers.

"Dr. Cheever since his return from Europe, has been labouring with might and main to accomplish the destructive ends of his patrons in England for whom he received money to keep up his church." And again;

"No one will be at a loss to know who is responsible for so calamitous a state of things. Under the tutelage of an aristocracy in Great Britain, jealous of the success of American institutions, the Garrisons, Tappans, and Leavitts, of thirty years ago, began those machinations which under Greeley, Beecher, Raymond, Cheever, Wendell Phillips and others, culminated in a party which denounced the Constitution as a league with hell and a covenant with death," and never relaxed its incendiary efforts until the slaveholding states had been goaded into overt acts of treason. Northern fanaticism, fostered by British gold, and the discontent and rebellion in the south which it engendered, are the source of all our evils, and both are still seeking at the present hour to reap the fruits of their iniquitous labors...

Cheever might not have won many supporters for America in Britain, but he certainly served to foster anti-British feeling in America.

In Britain, too, the feeling against American collectors was strong. The London Patriot, a Congregational paper, in welcoming Cheever wrote: "We shall be sorry if he comes on a money begging expedition", and this was to be the opinion of most of the English public. This view, it is interesting to note, was not simply due to an over-abundance of causes to support, but also to more specifically economic anti-American reasons. A letter from Birmingham states:

1. Extract from Bennet's Herald reprinted in the National Anti-Slavery Standard, September, 1861, clipping in the Cheever Family Papers.
2. Extract from Bennet's Herald, n.d., Ibid.
"Birmingham is suffering more extremely and severely (sic) from the last American tariff than it has done for very many years. Yesterday only I heard of one Exporting House here whose business has been contracted to the extent of 200£ per week from the (mean ?) above referred to, and our manufacturers are suffering to an unprecedented degree by this diplomatable Tariff."1

The writer thus concludes that it would be of little use for Cheever to attempt a collection in the city.2

That Scotland was to be the general exception to this rule is no accident. Americans have always stressed the closer links which they feel towards Scotland3, and American nineteenth century reformers in particular had added that Scotland was always more favourable to their pleas than England ever was.4 Cheever, moreover, was an old friend. He had twice before visited Scotland,5 and maintained a correspondence with various Scottish ministers. He had close links with the Free Church, and on his first visit had spoken boldly on the subject of voluntary support and the need to dispense with state supported churches, using the American churches as his example.6 For this contribution to what was then one of the main controversies in Scottish life he had won the friendship of Drs. Candlish, Guthrie and Buchanan, who were later to become some of his staunchest supporters.7

1. Letter from Joseph (Sturge ?) to G.B.C., Birmingham, 18 May, 1861. Cheever Family Papers.
2. cf. a rather obscure passage in a letter from Henry Batchelor to G.B.C. Glasgow, June 11, 1861: "The apathy on the slave question here is dreadful. Only a small circle are really interested in the welfare of the enslaved. New (York ?) friendships and business connections are very much felt here." Cheever Family Papers.
4. See above, Ch. II.
5. In 1838 and 1845.
7. Demonstrations in Favour of Dr. Cheever, etc. op. cit.
His situation, too, was rather more likely to appeal to a Presbyterian country, especially one where memories of the Disruption were still fresh. A minister speaking out boldly on a controversial subject despite attacks from his congregation might be expected to appeal: a minister in conflict with his congregation would be explicable to a Scottish community in a way that it would never be to members of the English Establishment. Moreover, the Scottish Free Church might well feel that it had a debt to pay to American churches and slavery. The Scottish Free Church collection in America in 18451 had some affinities to the Cheever collection in 1860, and it might well be that the Free Church felt the need to clear itself finally of the charge of pro-slavery and come generously to the aid of one persecuted in his struggle against slavery. None of this is clearly expressed by the Scottish divines who appear content to thunder denunciations against slavery and firm support for Cheever in the path he had taken; but it is interesting to note that the events of 1845-6 had not been forgotten by Cheever himself, and writing in his private journal early in 1861 he declared that "the Scots ought to cry 'Send back the Commissioners' (the southern delegates seeking British support) as in earlier years they had cried 'Send back the money'."2

One final point needs to be mentioned: the influence which his British journey had on Cheever in driving him firmly over to the side of the radical abolitionists. Cheever had come to the field of anti-

---

slavery relatively late, and until 1860 had disassociated himself from the ranks of the Garrisonians. They were neither respectable nor 'good' Christians, and Cheever preferred the socially more conformable role of spokesman for the Church militant. In Britain, however, where anti-slavery was far more respectable cause than it was in America, Cheever was led, as were many Americans before him, into yet more outspoken denunciations of slavery. Attacks on him in the Anti-Slavery Reporter, and an apparent disagreement with Chamerovzow, the Secretary of the B.F.A.S.S.,\(^{1}\) drove him yet further into the ranks of the radicals. The friendship of George Thompson and Julia Griffiths Croft, and of bodies such as the Glasgow Emancipation Society confirmed him in this position, and by the first part of 1861 we find him eulogising Garrison at a public meeting.\(^{2}\) Never one to abandon a position, Cheever maintained his extremist views on his return to America, becoming one of the most radical speakers of the day and a noted critic of the Lincoln administration.\(^{3}\)

In itself the Cheever mission was an unimportant episode that ended in failure. It ruined Cheever's career to a very great extent, and apparently served no useful purpose, for the Church of the Puritans was founded on leased ground and was to be pulled down a few years later as the city expanded. But the interest and reaction it aroused bears no relation to its intrinsic importance. The Cheever mission was a notable landmark in the field of Anglo-American

2. Ibid., p. 179.
humanitarian endeavour, and a significant guide to relations between the two countries at this juncture. Illustrating the close links which existed between the two nations, the antagonisms and rivalries, Cheever and his cause amply demonstrate the far reaching significance of Anglo-American humanitarianism.
CHAPTER VII.

AMERICAN REFORMERS, DEMOCRATIC AND WORKING CLASS MOVEMENTS IN BRITAIN.

The importance of democracy as an issue entering Anglo-American relations in the nineteenth century has never been denied. Britain was always intensely conscious of the United States as the great exponent of the democratic experiment, and if many Britons attacked the American form of government, there were yet others who looked to America for guidance in bringing about a more democratic government at home. This group consisted largely of middle class radicals and Chartists, who, in the years between the passing of the first and second Reform Bills, sought to persuade Parliament to broaden the existing franchise. Not surprisingly, of this number a great many were also prominent in that other sphere of Anglo-American co-operation, humanitarian activity. As we have already seen, most leading British radicals, Richard Cobden, John Bright, George Thompson and Joseph Sturge, to name only a few, were all warm admirers of the United States, and had close contact with American humanitarian reformers. These men, too, were usually actively


sympathetic to working class demands for the franchise; working class leaders, on the other hand, were in varying degrees interested in the humanitarian causes, and were almost without exception keenly interested in American affairs and institutions. Both middle class radicals and Chartist leaders, then, could find common ground in their admiration for American democracy; both groups, too, could reach some measure of co-operation in their enthusiasm for humanitarian causes. Humanitarian activity and middle and working class movements for Parliamentary reform have thus an interesting connection, and moreover, may also be studied with value within the framework of Anglo-American relations.

We have already seen how, linked by the common bond of reform, many Americans and Britons in the nineteenth century overcame the strong hostility and prejudice which marked Anglo-American relations at this juncture, and formed a mutually sympathetic community. Having examined the work and influence of certain Americans on British humanitarian circles, the other aspect of this Anglo-American partnership must now be touched upon: the influence of these American reformers on working class and other movements which aimed at the spread of democracy in Britain. Between 1832 and 1867 there were several of these movements in Britain which failed largely because of inability on the part of working class leaders and middle class radicals to find some grounds for co-operation.¹ During the 1840's movements for Parliamentary reform were dominated by the Chartists; in the 1850's middle class reform associations had taken their place and did at least succeed in bringing three abortive reform bills before Parliament. Visiting American

¹. See F.E. Gillespie, Labor and Politics in England, Durham, North Ca., 1927.
reformers, therefore, closely connected with men who were active in both humanitarian societies and radical politics, might be expected to play an active part in these democratic movements. Americans moreover were known to be sympathetic to the British worker, the victim of upper class domination, and would support his claim for a vote, if not for shorter working hours. (Americans at home were not after all noticeably sympathetic to the demands of their own workers for better industrial conditions.1) On closely examining their connection with British democratic movements, especially working class ones, however, several interesting conclusions can be drawn.

Considering first that group of visiting American reformers most used to poverty and hardship, the Negro abolitionists, it is interesting to note that almost without exception they betrayed little sympathy for working class problems. In general indebted to wealthy patrons, they tended to follow upper class practice and shut their eyes to, or gloss over, industrial poverty. William Wells Brown is a good example of this attitude. In his *Sketches of Places and People Abroad* he describes his feelings:

"I have addressed large and influential meetings in Newcastle and the neighbouring towns, and the more I see and learn of the conditions of the working class of England the more I am satisfied of the utter fallacy of the statement often made that their condition approximates to that of the slaves of America. Whatever may be the disadvantages that the British peasant labours under he is free, and if he is not satisfied with his employer, he can make choice of another. He

---

1. e.g. *North American Review*, October, 1835; October, 1847; April, 1861; though it is notable that this article attacks also the industrial conditions in New England. See also *Ibid.*, April, 1852, for a more general attack on American working class conditions.
also has the right to educate his children, and he is the equal of the most wealthy person before an English court of justice."¹

Frederick Douglass, however, the most able and independent of the Negro reformers, was somewhat outside this pattern. His early friendship with Garrison meant that his British helpers were among the less wealthy and more radical wing of the anti-slavery party. He was invited in 1846 to address a meeting of the Complete Suffrage Union,² a body formed largely through the influence of Joseph Sturge to work for democratic reform under middle and working class leadership, and in that year in company with Garrison attended various other reform meetings at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in London,³ a regular meeting place of Chartist leaders.

But in general Negro reformers were loud in their praise of British democracy. All felt keenly the paradox that in democratic America they were slaves, and in aristocratic Britain they were free, and said so on many occasions.⁴ So far indeed were they from furthering democratic

---

¹ Boston, 1855, p.140, cf. also the same author's Three Years in Europe, London, 1858, pp.206-7: Describing the Lake Country scenery Brown declared: "The very labourer with his thatched cottage and narrow slip of ground plot before the door, the little flower bed, the woodbine trimmed against the wall and hanging its blossoms about the windows and the peasant seen trudging home at nightfall with the avails of the toil of his day upon his back, all this tells us of the happiness both of rich and poor in this country. And yet there are those who would have us believe that the labourer of England is in a far worse condition than the slaves of America. Such persons know nothing of the real conditions of the working classes of this country. At any rate, the poor here, as well as the rich, are upon a level, as far as the laws of the country are concerned." cf. also Samuel Ringgold Ward, Autobiography of a Fugitive Negro, London, 1855, pp.237-239.


³ e.g. Liberator, September 18, 1846.

movements in Britain that Horace Greeley, visiting Britain in 1851 when a new reform Bill was soon expected, declared that their attitude was breeding Phariseeism, and that so far from encouraging the spread of democratic ideas in Britain, they were actively discouraging it by implying that nothing needed reforming. Thus he concluded: "I must regard American and especially Afric-American lecturers against slavery in this country as among the most effective upholders of all the enormous political abuses and wrongs which are here so prevalent."¹

Negro reformers, however, might well be expected to prove the exceptions to the rule, and the work of Garrison, Burritt and Gough should possibly be more 'typical' of the American attitude and influence. Even so, on examining their connection with working class and democratic activities, it becomes very difficult to make the easy assumption that American reformers were, ipso facto, champions of British working class rights. Both Garrison and Burritt, it is true, had many friendships with men active in British humanitarian and radical reform movements. George Thompson was a lifelong friend of Garrison's, and during his tour of Britain in 1846 the American abolitionist also became closely acquainted with other radical thinkers and workers, including William and Mary Howitt, and William H. Ashurst,² who under the pseudonym of Edward Search wrote for some years for Garrison's Liberator. More valued as allies by Garrison, perhaps, were the Chartists, William Lovett³ and Henry Vincent. Writing in the Liberator Garrison declared:

2. He was also a close friend of Lucretia and James Mott, and later visited Garrison in America. D.N.B.
3. Lovett also became a member of the council of the Anti-Slavery League in 1846, Ibid.
"I shall derive great assistance from the co-operation of William Lovett and Henry Vincent, the leaders of the moral suasion Chartists — the friends of temperance, peace, universal brotherhood. They are true men and will stand by us to the last — men who have been cast into prison in this country, and confined therein, (the former one year, the latter twenty months) for pleading the cause of the starving operatives in this country, and contending for universal suffrage. Such men I honour and revere."1

Burritt, too, was on very close terms with Henry Vincent. He persuaded the Chartist to join the League movement, and became a close friend.2 Vincent attended several of the Peace Congresses, and there was talk of his going to America with Burritt in 1849 to lecture on peace.3

But it is interesting to note that these men were moral force Chartists, and were thus 'respectable', and it does not appear that any American reformer had dealings with those of the physical force group.4 Garrison, indeed, appears to have had little sympathy with George Jacob Holyoake, one of the more radical working class leaders, for which he was soundly rebuked by Harriet Martineau;5 and his friendship with Lovett at least does not seem to have been on any firm basis, as a somewhat aggrieved letter from Lovett to Garrison, printed in the Liberator, goes to show.6

2. MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol. 9, August 27, 1847; September 27, 1847; November 19, 1847; vol. 10, February 24, 25, 1848; vol. 12, September 21, 1849.
3. Ibid., March 15, 1849.
Both Garrison and Burritt extended their interest in working class and democratic movements beyond mere friendship with working class leaders, however. Garrison especially, who threw himself into every reform advocated, dabbled in Chartist politics during his 1846 visit. The Crown and Anchor Tavern in London, a noted Chartist meeting place, was used by him to hold meetings, and he founded there his short lived Anti-Slavery League which was to combat the influence of the B.F.A.S.S. Lovett, it is interesting to note, served on the council of this society. Moreover, on two occasions at least Garrison directly addressed himself to the Chartists. The most important of these was in London at a Chartist meeting presided over by George Thompson and thus described by Garrison:

"Last evening I addressed a large meeting of moral suasion Chartists for the space of two hours, in the National Hall - George Thompson in the Chair and, of course, warmly commending me to the affection and co-operation of the working men of England. I wish you could have been present to see the enthusiasm that was excited ... I did not appear before them in my official capacity, or as an abolitionist, technically speaking, but on my own responsibility uttering such heresies in regard to Church and State as occured to me, and fully identifying myself with all the unpopular defamatory movement in their country. This will probably alienate some 'good society folks' from me, but no matter."2

Garrison had also come into contact with the Chartists at a crowded anti-slavery meeting at Glasgow at which several Chartists were present. In his speech Garrison declared that there were hundreds in Britain

1. D.N.B.
deprived of their just rights and that abolitionists should prove themselves the true friends of suffering humanity abroad by showing that they were the best friends of suffering humanity at home. British workers were in a deplorable situation and should have prompt and ample redress given for their wrongs. But it is interesting that at that meeting the Chartists were not allowed to speak, and Garrison, whose interest was plainly confined to words, later declared that he had no sympathy with any action on the part of the Chartists that sanctioned the use of force.

"Since my return home, the Chartists and Socialists have successfully combined, in several instances, to take violent possession of meetings convened expressly for anti-slavery purposes, and to transform their character and design. Such conduct, though it may admit of some palliation is both dastardly and criminal, and certainly most unwise and politic for themselves. In their struggle to obtain those rights and privileges which belong to them as men, and of which they are now ruthlessly deprived, I sympathise with all my heart, and wish them speedy and complete victory! But I cannot approve of any rude behaviour or any resort to violence to advance their cause. That cause is just and can best be promoted by moral and peaceable instrumentalities - by appeals to reason, justice and the law of God."  

However tenuous was Garrison's connection with the Chartists it yet brought him into disfavour with many of his British anti-slavery friends. John Estlin deplored his speech at the National Hall and declared that this friendship with Henry Vincent would not merely be of little benefit to the abolition cause but would be a positive disservice to it. 

3. J.B. Estlin to S. May, Bristol, October 1, 1846; May Papers, 1844-49, vol. 2, no. 34; the Peace Society was attacked by Samuel Gurney for similar reasons: MS. Journals of Elihu Burritt, vol. 13, June 1, 1849.
Garrison's interest in British working class movements does not appear to have been very profound, however. He noted from time to time in the *Liberator* meetings at which Parliamentary reform was agitated — all, interestingly enough, in Scotland¹ — but took no further personal concern in such movements.

If Garrison's interest in the Chartists consisted mainly of words, Burritt's was not very much greater.² This is all the more surprising in view of the fact of his close friendship with Joseph Sturge, which ensured that he had some insight into Chartist problems. But he does not appear to have taken any part in their councils. Like Garrison his sympathies lay wholly with the moral force group, and he was probably an even closer friend of Vincent than the abolitionist was. He overestimated their chances of success in 1848,³ as he did of all the revolutionary activity in that year, which he seemed to feel with rather naive optimism would bring in an era of universal fraternity and democracy. Indeed all Burritt's contacts with radical reform movements seem to betray a somewhat unrealistic appreciation of the forces with which he was dealing. Thus he held several conversations with young Communists in Paris in 1848;⁴ he wrote a highly revolutionary sounding pamphlet entitled "The World's Working men Strike against War,"⁵ he frequently urged the British working class to throw off the National

---

¹ *Garrison's work was not without an indirect influence, however: "The agitation which William Lloyd Garrison carried to so successful an issue in America had a potent influence in securing the rights of citizenship for the artisans and agriculturalists in England."* Excerpt from the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, November 16, 1835, reprinted in *Garrisons, op. cit.*, IV, p. 219.


³ *MS. Journals*, vol. 10, April 7, 8, 10, 11 (1848).


⁵ R.d.
Debt as a burden borne mainly by them to support aristocratic wars; he spoke as a workingman, "The Learned Blacksmith", which no other reformer did, and glorified the dignity of labour. But in spite of his radical sounding words Burritt was no revolutionary; his conception of working class actions was in terms of passive resistance never violent activity; and, beyond vague statements of a society free of aristocratic oppression and filled with brotherly love, he made no explicit claim as to what working class aims should be. In short, Burritt spoke from the point of view of a self-employed artisan in the simple economy of a small New England township.

Burritt's friendship with radical Members of Parliament is of some interest, however. He was never more than on the fringes of radical politics, but was still of use to these men chiefly as a source of information. Burritt's literary output was considerable, and much of it was of a statistical and factual character. He was not by any means the first to attack the government's military expenditure, but he was a major publicist of the fact that the enormous sums spent on war were chiefly borne by the unenfranchised classes. If 'Peace, Retrenchment and Reform' became a liberal rallying cry Burritt must at least be given some of the credit for marshalling information to substantiate these demands.

1. A Way Word to the Working men of Christendom; The Christian Citizen, September 12, 1846; The Bond of Brotherhood, February, 1848.
2. e.g. Lecture on the Dignity and Comfort of the Farmer's Life delivered at the annual meeting of a country Agricultural Society in central New York in October, 1858, from Burritt's Lectures and Speeches, London, 1869, pp.130ff. In this lecture Burritt advised farmers to cultivate a sense of their own dignity. "Don't take off your hat in obsequious reverence to the Girards, Astors or any speculating capitalists of the country" for "wealth does not give a superior claim." p.131.
3. See, for example, his lecture on the 'Dignity and Comfort of the Farmer's Life', delivered in America in 1858. Elihu Burritt, Lectures and Speeches, London, 1869, pp.131ff.
Though Burritt's and Garrison's connections with working class and democratic movements show them to be sympathetic but not very active in these causes, this is even more plain in the career of John Bartholomew Gough. Born in England of working class parents, and accustomed in his youth to poverty, he might have been expected to show a special interest in working class movements, but he never associated himself with this class and showed neither awareness of nor interest in the fact that the temperance movement was an important bridge between the middle and working class, and that until a firm alliance between these two groups was cemented, any attempt to extend the suffrage would be impossible. It is true that he visited Britain during the 1850s when the working class was relatively prosperous and quiescent, and that he wrote several sketches on life among the poor, and made several speeches to working class audiences, but his connection with working class and democratic movements was that of a spectator with no profound insight or sympathy, though endowed with a powerful gift of description.

Visiting American reformers, then, as typified by Garrison, Burritt and Gough, did very little positively to further the cause of working class and democratic principles in Britain. They might express sympathy and interest, but never posed as active champions of the unenfranchised, though the democratic cause was one which received some of its main impetus from America. Yet ironical, this at the same time points up the close ties of sympathy binding British and American humanitarians. Thus it is once again made plain that humanitarian activity was

---

1. e.g. at Ipswich when Gough stressed the need of thrift among the poor, though admitting that they had full right to receive what was due for their labours. Ipswich Journal, n.d., clipping from Scrapbooks, Vol. V. Far more typical, however, are Gough descriptions of the British poor in Sunlight and Shadow, Hartford, 1882.
essentially led by middle class leaders both in Britain and America, and though American reformers might have a better appreciation of egalitarian democracy than their British friends, yet, like their British allies, they were not in the last resort prepared to support any movement which violently assailed the established order.

But if British working class and democratic movements gained little direct help from the visiting Americans, indirectly they profited to a greater extent. Individuals like Henry Vincent found their friendship with American reformers of use when visiting the United States;¹ more important, however, it gave them an opportunity to associate with middle class humanitarian movements and thus gain for themselves and their cause some air of respectability. It is very probable that through the agencies of men such as George Thompson and Joseph Sturge, moral force Chartists at least would have been brought into humanitarian movements, but it is clear that Garrison and Burritt especially, less bound by rigid class standards, sponsored their entry. The union of certain working class and humanitarian leaders might seem of little importance, but it should be remembered that some form of understanding between the two classes was necessary if industrial and democratic reforms were to be carried through. The humanitarian movements provided a useful connection for this to take place, and if visiting American reformers only preached to the converted when they extolled American democracy, in some measure at least Garrison and Burritt forwarded the democratic cause in Britain by helping to interest working class leaders in humanitarian activity.

¹. e.g. Henry Vincent to Elihu Burritt, London, (1866?), MS. Letters to and from Elihu Burritt, MS. 21, no. 10, New Britain, Connecticut.
Surveying as a whole the work of these American reformers in Britain, one of the chief impressions gained is that their influence seems chiefly to have been a disruptive one. Garrison, Burritt and Gough all caused disunity in the movements for which they worked, for while there was little disagreement in reform circles over ends, the means by which these were to be achieved were a frequent source of controversy. Garrison is, of course, the most noted for his disagreements with others, and it is largely due to him that we find in Britain the growth of a group of radical abolitionists, out of sympathy with every one save their fellow Garrisonians in America. Burritt made a much less conscious effort to divide the peace movement in Britain; but his work, if it did not split the movement, at least took some of the leadership from the London Peace Society. Making little attempt to work with this conservative group, he founded instead his League of Universal Brotherhood, and his Olive Leaf Circles. These were by no means radical peace groups, but did extend the basis of support for peace, and take it to some degree out of the hands of a small, exclusive Quaker circle. Gough, too, became involved in the divisions within the British temperance movement, and during his second visit especially, almost in spite of himself, became involved in the struggle for power between the conservative and radical societies.

But if we cannot deny that visiting American reformers caused divisions in British societies, other factors must at the same time be noted. It is clear that while the visiting Americans
helped to introduce some of their divisions, the ground was already prepared for them, and the American served rather to give these schisms a focus and bring them to a head. We cannot escape the conclusion, too, that British reformers had differences of their own, and that certain visiting reformers, notably the Negroes, were used as pawns by British humanitarians in their quarrels with other factions. Moreover, interestingly enough, the Americans did not automatically become leaders of the more extreme groups in the British movements, — Cheever, indeed, only became a Garrison supporter after his visit to Britain. Garrison, it is true, was an extremist, and Burritt, though by no means a revolutionary, led the more enterprising wing of the peace movement. Gough, on the other hand, allied himself with the conservative forces, as did the majority of the Negro reformers in Britain.

But we cannot attribute only a negative influence to the work of the American reformers in Britain. They might be the cause or occasion of divisions within humanitarian circles, but they served also to stimulate activity and to increase support for reforms. It was, indeed, perhaps their greatest achievement that they helped to attract the attention of groups who might not otherwise have been drawn to humanitarian causes. Their novelty appeal as speakers would guarantee them a larger audience than a British speaker, and it is not surprising, therefore, that visiting American lecturers were in constant demand by British societies. Their value lay as agitators, as agents provocateurs, and if they divided societies it was done with the maximum degree of publicity.
It is, then, as lecturers whose aim it was to rouse the public from apathy that the American reformers may best be described. Though Americans helped in the founding of British societies,\(^1\) this was not their lasting influence. Burritt, it is true, founded many new societies, and Garrison was responsible for originating the Anti-Slavery League, but these were all totally dependent on the personality of the Americans for their existence. The Anti-Slavery League never flourished, and Burritt’s League of Universal Brotherhood became incorporated with the existing Peace Society almost as soon as Burritt had returned to America for what seemed a permanent stay. The organization of British societies in fact owed almost nothing to Americans, and was in many ways superior to that of the American societies, not surprisingly considering the size and development at this point of the two countries. The Americans, indeed, acknowledged their debt to the British in this respect.\(^2\)

But the influence of the humanitarian reformers was not confined to the humanitarian causes for which they worked. As we have seen, those causes had an important place in the social and political history of the day, and the Americans shared in varying degrees in the activity in these other fields, Garrison and Burritt especially having an interesting, if slight, role to play in the history of British nineteenth century movements for social democracy.

---

1. e.g. E. C. Delavan and Nathaniel Hewitt, who were present at the inaugural meeting of the British and Foreign Temperance Society in 1831; or James McCune Smith, a founder member of the Glasgow Emancipation Society.
Ambassadors of their country, these men defended egalitarian democracy;\textsuperscript{1} but again it must be noted that, though radical, they were never revolutionary in their statements, and apart from Burritt their influence had only an indirect, if important, effect on this sphere.

This indirect influence is so clearly seen when we remember that their tours through Britain, and their activities, tended very often to be taken up and used by other groups for their own ends. Anti-slavery reform, the most vocal and controversial, offers interesting examples of this. Thus Daniel O'Connell used Garrison's visits in 1833 and 1840 to urge the political claims of Ireland;\textsuperscript{2} the Chartists used the platforms of all reform movements for their own ends, and especially made use of anti-slavery arguments to forward their cause.\textsuperscript{3} The 1846 visit of American abolitionists with their demand that the Free Church of Scotland should "send back the money", was used by other groups as an attack on the newly founded Free Church.\textsuperscript{4} The peace movement, too, as we have seen, became linked with radical British politics, and Elihu Burritt was under severe attack from conservative critics who feared an assault on upper class privileges.\textsuperscript{5} The temperance movement also came in for

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] Interestingly, Charles C. Cole notes that American evangelists tended to support the status quo at home, and for some it required a visit to Britain to bring out their interest in political equality and liberty! \textit{The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860}, New York, 1954, p. 155.
\item[2.] See above, Ch. III and below, Appendix III.
\item[3.] See Chs. II, VII.
\item[4.] See Ch. III; George Shepperson, "The Free Church and American Slavery", \textit{S.H.B.}, 1951-52.
\item[5.] See Ch. IV; also \textit{Blackwoods Magazine}, March 1852, pp. 369ff; Sept. 1854, p. 13.
\end{itemize}
similar criticism in its early days, and Gough's visit served as an occasion for some acrid denunciations in conservative periodicals. Even the visit of George Cheever, brief as it was, caused marked reactions in other fields.

Agitators and itinerant lecturers, the American reformers in Britain may not always have exerted a constructive influence, but they always served to win for their cause the maximum degree of publicity. If they helped to make their contemporaries to the widest extent possible the ideals and arguments of their cause, their work is yet valuable to us today for revealing much of the scope, significance and importance of British humanitarianism. From the activity of these Americans we see clearly that humanitarian endeavour entered every sphere of Victorian life. Humanitarianism as a factor in nineteenth century British history has not perhaps gained the recognition it deserves, and in the reaction to the visits of the Americans, and in the alliances they formed, we see not only some of its importance as a force at home, but as an international movement.

The work of the American reformers helps also to shed some light on the internal history of the British movements, and brings into prominence a group of reformers whose work has been all too much ignored. Thus they make clear that influence in reform circles was no longer mainly in the hands of wealthy philanthropists - that by the mid nineteenth century the importance had passed of men such as Clarkson, Wilberforce, Buxton, the Gurneys and Frys, and even to some

1. See Ch. V; also Blackwood's Magazine, April, 1853; January, 1856.
extent of Lord Shaftesbury. The visits of the Americans serves to point up the fact that the basis of support for reform had broadened, and to show the new men now dominating the British reform scene, figures such as George Thompson, Samuel Bowly, the Wighnas and Smeals, and above all, Joseph Sturge.

Another factor that the visits of these reformers makes abundantly clear is the regional distinctions which existed in the British reform scene.¹ Too often British reform effort has been considered as a homogeneous force, whilst in fact there are marked differences between the Scottish, the Irish and English societies. Irish contribution to the reform effort is slight, though interesting,² but the Scottish contribution is an extremely important and completely neglected factor. It is clear that the reform scene was in fact divided between the Scottish and London dominated societies, both of which groups tended to be antagonistic to each other. The London based societies were usually the most powerful, and the most conservative; the Scottish groups, more radical in outlook, were usually in the lead, not only in adopting new reforms and innovations, but in being the centre of much of the reform controversy. All of this the visits of the American reformers makes very plain. Americans, as already noted, have always had a special affection for Scotland, and Garrison, Gough and Cheever were probably more successful and influential in Scotland than they were south of the Border.

¹ See Ch. II.
² See Appendix III.
But above all, the work and influence of American reformers in Britain makes plain the strong ties which existed between Britain and America. In spite of the fact that more American reformers visited Britain than the reverse, it is very clear that co-operation over reform was not a one way affair. Reformers of each country gave to the other the type of support it most needed, and from the influence of these visiting reformers we may best understand the nature of this contribution. Thus British reform drew from America a certain impetus and inspiration, while the Americans in turn gained from the British moral support and financial aid.

It is indeed over this last issue - financial aid - that the visits of all the reformers under consideration turned, and serves as a reminder of the great wealth of mid Victorian Britain, and the comparatively undeveloped state of America at this juncture. Garrison, the Negroes, Burritt, Gough and Cheever were all heavily dependent on their British friends for financial support, and they, and many others, came to Britain with the specific aim of collecting money. Indeed, in the donations that crossed the Atlantic from Britain to aid America, we see an interesting reversal of the role of benefactor between the two countries. But while money collecting was an important part of the reformers' work, at the same time it was the least popular of their activities, and one which created ill feelings on both sides of the Atlantic. Britons resented the continual demand on their purses, while the vast majority of the Americans at home were acutely suspicious and resentful of anything savouring of British interference.
But though the work of American reformers might at times temporarily weaken the strength of Anglo-American co-operation, it could not permanently impair it. The nature of this co-operation was to be somewhat changed after the Civil War, but in the period between 1830 and 1860, years which are usually thought of as exhibiting a high degree of Anglo-American ill feeling, the work of the humanitarian reformers yet illustrates the close ties which existed between the two countries. The reformers might do little to improve relations between the people at large, though Burritt's work, especially his schemes for assisted emigration, is an exception. They convinced few, if any, of the superiority or benefit of American ways who were not already friendly towards the United States, but at the same time, they clearly strengthened and made more intense the friendship of those who were already co-operating over reform. While there existed in both countries these mutually sympathetic groups, there was always hope that permanent misunderstandings between the two countries might be avoided. 

1. Neal Dow felt very certain of this:— "It is a source of profound pleasure to me to believe that the extensive personal acquaintance formed, and the knowledge of the English people, of their opinions, convictions and prejudices, acquired on my first tour, enabled me a few years later to help to create a public opinion in Great Britain which proved to be very useful to my country in the great crisis through which our Union passed between my first and second English tours." Neal Dow, Reminiscences of Neal Dow, Portland, Maine, 1898, p. 571. But, conversely, poor relations between the two countries in other fields might also serve to weaken the bonds between reformers in both countries: "Causes of irritation between the United States and Britain tend to diminish the confidence which should subsist between the benevolent in both, in their humane and religious enterprises, and to sunder all their bonds of union, one cause of this being the failure of many American banks and the fall in American credit." R. R. Gurley, Gurley's Mission to England, Washington, 1841, p. 233.
Today the scene has changed, and co-operation over reform no longer exists to quite the same extent. The focus has turned to other fields of activity, and it is possible that in this generation the transatlantic journeyings of the mid nineteenth century reformers have a parallel in the exchange of scholars, the modern vagrantes, who also find the Atlantic no barrier in their common work. The influence of the American reformers in Britain was limited, and some of it cannot be defined with any exactitude; but if it does nothing else it proves the value of examining the bonds existing between Britain and America instead of emphasising the differences between the two countries.
APPENDICES
Tracing briefly the interconnection in the development of other important mid nineteenth century reform movements, we find that the movement for popular education also extended beyond national boundaries. New England educational reformers toured Europe reporting on the various systems of education and recommending what they considered to be their best features. 1 Yet more dynamic was the impact of these reformers and the Massachusetts system upon the movement in England where the conflict between those advocating a secular and those a religious school system was being bitterly waged. Men such as George Combe, 2 W. J. Fox and Richard Cobden 3 came out vigorously on behalf of the American system of secular, state supported schools, and official government interest is seen in the 1867 Report of the Commissioners sent

1. "One of the most influential forces of all those at work on behalf of public education in the United States during the second quarter of the last century... arose out of reports on education in Europe. They came in the form of impressions which education there had made upon travellers." Reports on European Education, ed. Edgar W. Knight, New York, 1930, p. 2. This work contains the reports of John Griscom, Victor Cousin and Calvin Stowe. See also Horace Mann, Report on an Educational Tour, London, 1846.

2. See, for example, a letter from George Combe to Horace Mann, March 24, 1847. Combe Papers, MS. Letterbook IX, or the letter to his brother, Andrew Combe, June 14, 1847: "If you see Horace Mann tell him that he is now doing England capital service... Mr. Lucas, who has drawn up the Lancashire programme, has followed the Massachusetts system as exhibited in my description of it in the Edinburgh Review for July 1841, as nearly as possible; and where he has departed from it, I have correspondence from him and Mr. Ireland brought them back to it, and its merits are daily becoming better known. Mr. Mann is greeted as a first rate authority." Ibid. I am indebted to Mr. A. Grant for bringing this material to my attention.

to examine the common school system in Upper Canada and the United States.¹

In this field Scotland plays a clearly separate role, for the Scottish system of popular education at this date ranked very highly indeed. American reformers were impressed by the high rate of literacy in Scotland as well as by the Scottish system,² finding the English one wanting in many respects. And, indeed, in a letter from George Combe, the noted Scottish phrenologist and reformer, who had close connections with the United States and leading American reformers, we can see a 'New Alliance' of Scotland and New England coming together to aid in the reform of the English system:

"We are in great spirits about education. A Committee of seven persons, of whom five are Scotchmen ... have met in Manchester and drawn up a system for the county of Lancaster exactly resembling the Massachusetts system. ... They have corresponded with me and I have given them every practical suggestion in my power. I have shown their programme to Lord Dunfermline, and he is delighted with it, and says that if they come forward with a powerful demonstration in favour of it they will give an impetus to the right principles that is irresistible."³

1. Report to the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to enquire into the Education given in schools in England, not comprised within Her Majesty's two recent Commissions, and to the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to enquire into the schools in Scotland, on the common school system of the United States and the Provinces of Upper Canada. The Report was very favourable to the American system. See also the review of this Report by Samuel Eliot in the North American Review, Jan. 1868, pp. 128 ff.


3. George Combe to Andrew Combe, June 14, 1847, Combe Papers, MS. Letterbook IX.
Even the lunatic fringe of educational reform turned on an Anglo-American axis as is clear from the founding of Alcott House at Richmond by a group whose admiration of Bronson Alcott and his methods led certain of them to return with Alcott to America after his visit to Britain in 1842, and to join with him in his ill-fated Fruitlands venture.¹ Alcott himself, interestingly enough, saw no future for his methods in the conservative but unsettled atmosphere of England.²

The movement for women's rights, too, was essentially an Anglo-American venture. The Scotswoman, Fanny Wright, was an early feminist champion in the United States; whilst Elizabeth Blackwell did pioneer work for the feminist movement in medicine on both sides of the Atlantic.³ In both countries, too, the anti-slavery movement had a twofold impact on the women's cause.⁴ On the one hand it gave an ideological impetus, for its cry of liberty and freedom for mankind was soon logically extended by advanced thinkers to apply to womankind as well. On the other hand, by allowing women to take an active part in anti-slavery activity it gave them an experience in organisation, and indeed organisations within which to work. Women

¹ See F. B. Sanborn, Bronson Alcott, Iowa, 1908; Odell Shephard, Pedlar's Progress, London, 1938; The Journals of Bronson Alcott, ed. Odell Shephard, Boston, 1938.
² "Britain with all her resources and talent is not the scene for the education of humanity: her spirit is hostile to human welfare, and her institutions averse to the largest liberties of the soul. Nor should an enterprise of such moment be endangered by the revolutions to which all things are here exposed, and which threatens, as I think, the speedy downfall of the realm. Our freer, but yet far from freed land is the asylum, if asylum there be, for the hope of man." F. B. Sanborn, Bronson Alcott, p. 17.
³ Elizabeth Blackwell, noted for her pioneer work in gaining recognition for women doctors both in Britain and America, has the distinction of being included in both the Dictionary of National Biography and the Dictionary of American Biography.
played an important part in anti-slavery circles: on his return to America James Miller McKim, editor of the *Pennsylvania Freeman* commented:

"It was a fact that ought to be noticed, that abroad, as well as in this country, the most active abolitionists were, with a few exceptions to be found among the women. In Bristol, Leeds, Edinburgh, Belfast, the principle work was performed by ladies and on them everywhere the cause seems to depend for its life and vigor."

These societies, interestingly enough, belonged to the radical wing of the anti-slavery movement, and William Lloyd Garrison, who championed the women's cause so firmly, was a hero to British feminists no less than to American.

It is, too, the 1840 Anti-Slavery Convention which marks a high point in the early stages of the women's rights' movement. It drew from Garrison's biographers the comment that "it was the ironical fate of the Convention to stand rather as a landmark in the history of the women question, than in that of abolition." Not only did it give the American women delegates a chance to meet and converse with each other, a meeting which was to bear fruit in the Seneca Falls Convention, but it also had a marked influence on the British women associated with the Convention, who were greatly impressed and influenced by the example of the American delegates.

1. Extract from the *American Baptist*, reprinted in the *Liberator*, Nov. 25, 1853.
3. But see Oliver Johnson, *William Lloyd Garrison and his Times*, London, 1882, p. 254. "One special sign of the rapid progress of the cause from 1835 to 1838 was seen in the increasing activity of women on its behalf. The reports current among us of the mighty work which had been done by the women of England, especially in the way of petitioning Parliament for the immediate emancipation of the slaves of the West Indies, had awakened a deep interest and created no little enthusiasm. American women were learning to imitate the example of their sisters in Great Britain; and the 'Seneca Falls Convention' of 1848, attended by women delegates, was the direct result of the agitation which had been carried on by British women."
Julia Pease and Lady Byron are among the most notable examples, but the British women's debt to the Americans is most vividly expressed by the obscure Mrs. Sarah Shearman, an Englishwoman at the Convention. In a letter to William Lloyd Garrison, handed to him as he sat in the gallery of Freemason's Hall with the American women and their champions, she explained that she had long been interested in anti-slavery but had no public voice nor pecuniary capacity to speak out:

"Well, now, we have ladies from America here, who know how to do the work. Why cannot we have a convention of women only? There are many women of business and leisure in England, who would assist, but they want to be put in the way. I am quite sure that many of them would do more work than the men; but not being immediately surrounded by slavery, we do not know well how to set about what we very much want to perform. Let our American friends teach us. Would they not be much better occupied than in listening to the arguments of the men about that which they have already settled, and is consequently but first principles. Oh! do not let this opportunity pass without teaching mothers and daughters, and sisters, in England, how they may express their abhorrence of the diabolical treatment of their coloured sisters, and their unhappy offspring! We are ready to do, only tell us what. Yes, you must do more - show us how to get over the difficulty which education and custom have thrown around us, so that we do not know our own powers. I feel now, I have felt before, a perfect horror at being still in this warfare with such a monster as slavery. Yet custom forbids us even the expression of feeling while the men enjoy the noisy demonstrations which are annoying to American ears, and which, indeed, are little suitable to our wounded hearts. Yes, Englishwomen can only weep. But you can teach them how to follow up these tears with work - and it only wants a beginning."

---

With regard to the lesser known reform movements, we may point to the interest of humanitarians in both countries for care of the mentally ill, an interest which was furthered by the visit of Dorothea Dix to Britain. Visits of reformers to both countries show the close links in the movement for prison reform, while as far as the fringe movements are concerned, the establishment at Malvern in England of a centre for diet reform by the American, Thomas Lowe Nicholl, and his wife, may perhaps be matched by the success of the visits to America of the Scottish phrenologist, George Combe.

1. See D.A.B.; Alice Felt Tyler, Freedom's Ferment, Minneapolis, 1944, ch. 12.
3. See D.A.B.
4. See Ph.D. thesis to be submitted to the University of Edinburgh by Mr. A. Grant.
This is not an exhaustive list. It does not include, for example, many active but less well known reformers who came over to Britain merely to attend the great international conventions held at various times by the anti-slavery, peace and temperance movements. It must also be remembered, too, that many of these men took part in the activities of not just one reform movement but of several.

**ANTI-SLAVERY REFORMERS.**

By far the greatest number of American reformers in Britain were connected with the anti-slavery movement. This was due in part to the sympathetic response given abolitionists in Britain, so different to their treatment in America. In addition there was a long tradition of joint activity between the two countries on the subject of anti-slavery, the British public were deeply interested in the question, and most visiting Americans were led into making some public pronouncement on the subject. Probably the greatest number of abolitionists to visit Britain came in 1840 when at least sixty came as delegates to the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London.

**HENRY WARD BEECHER.**

Son of a famous New England Congregational minister and himself a noted preacher, brother of Harriet Beecher Stowe, Henry Ward Beecher visited Britain in 1863 making a number of abolition speeches and defending the North in the face of much opposition.
GEORGE BRADBURN.

A Massachusetts Unitarian minister and champion of women's rights, Bradburn was a delegate at the 1840 Convention.

JAMES GILLESPIE BIRNEY.

A noted abolitionist who ran for President as head of the anti-slavery Liberty Party, Birney was born in Kentucky, but left the South to become an abolitionist. He became a leading champion of the moderate wing of the movement, and as such helped to carry the division in the American ranks to Britain in 1840 as a delegate to the Convention. After this meeting he made a lecture tour of Britain, writing there his best known book, *The American Churches the Bulwark of American Slavery*.

REV. ROBERT J. BRECKENRIDGE.

A minister from Baltimore, Maryland, he was in Britain in 1837 and lectured, among other societies, to the Glasgow Emancipation Society.

ARNOLD BUFFUM.

A Quaker abolitionist, Buffum visited Britain on business twice between 1825 and 1831, where he met Thomas Clarkson. He visited Britain again in 1843 to attend the second Anti-Slavery Convention.

JAMES NEEDHAM BUFFUM.

Born in Maine, he was with Frederick Douglass and William Lloyd Garrison in 1846 in Britain, and worked with them in the dispute with the Free Church of Scotland.
DAVID LEE CHILD.

Massachusetts journalist and an early member of the anti-slavery movement, he had correspondence with British anti-slavery leaders on this subject. He came with his wife as a delegate in 1840.

LEVI COFFIN.

Quaker merchant of Cincinatti, he attended the foundation of the Glasgow Freedman’s Aid Society. He worked ceaselessly for the Negro especially for the underground railway, and later the Freedman’s Aid Society. It was to collect funds for this that he visited Britain in 1864.

JOHN A. COLLINS.

Born in Vermont, he was an agent of the A.A.S.S. and was sent by them to Britain in 1841 after the split in the American movement. He found that British reaction to this schism caused him to have little success, though he collected $1000 just in time to save the Anti-Slavery Standard from collapse.

REV. NATHANIEL COLVER.

A Baptist clergyman of Boston, he was a defender of the moderate wing of abolitionism. He came as a delegate to the 1840 Conference.

ELLIOTT CRESSON.

Sent by the American Colonization Society to Britain in 1831 to counteract any influence the proposed new American Anti-Slavery Society might exert on the British, he met with strong opposition
from Charles Stuart, William Lloyd Garrison and his friends.  
(See Ch. III).

WILLIAM DAWES.

He came to Britain in 1839 on a begging mission for Oberlin College, Ohio, with John Keep. He attended the Anti-Slavery Convention, but the begging mission seems to have roused some resentment in British and American anti-slavery circles judging from their correspondence with Birney.

REV. ELON GALUSHA.

A prominent American Baptist minister, he supported the moderates when he came as a delegate to the 1840 Convention.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Massachusetts born radical anti-slavery orator and journalist, and one of the most famous of American reformers, he visited Britain in 1833; in 1840, when he was prominent in the move to admit women as delegates; in 1846, taking part in the agitation against the Free Church of Scotland; in 1867, when he was typified as the crusader against slavery in the public rejoicings at the success of the abolition movement; and finally in 1877, when he was too old to do more than appear occasionally in public. (See Ch. III).

BERIAH GREEK.

Connecticut born reformer, he established a school at Oneida, New York, where children of all colours should be admitted and mix as equals. He was a delegate in 1840.
REV. R. R. GURLEY.

Born in Connecticut, Gurley was a philanthropist and a leading member of the Colonization Society. He was in Britain in 1840 seeking to get converts to the colonization scheme. (See Ch. III).

FRANCIS JACKSON.

A leading Massachusetts abolitionist and staunch friend of William Lloyd Garrison, he was a delegate in 1840.

JOHN KEEP.

A New England Congregational minister, he became active on behalf of Oberlin College, Ohio, and came to Britain in 1839 with William Dawes on a begging mission on behalf of the College. He was also a delegate in 1840.

REV. H. H. KELLOGG.

A Presbyterian clergyman and delegate of the Illinois Anti-Slavery Society to the Convention in 1843, he was active in temperance circles also, and helped to persuade John B. Gough to go to Britain in 1853.

JOSHUA LEAVITT.

Massachusetts born but settled in New York where he was known for his reforming zeal, he was a founder of the A.F.A.S.S.; he attended the Convention in 1843 but had other dealings with the British, notably in his work for Free Trade for which he was awarded a gold medal by the Cobden Club in 1869.
ELLIS GRAY LORING.

A lawyer and abolitionist of Boston, he was a Garrison supporter which cost him much social prestige. He came to Britain in 1840 as a delegate to the Convention.

JAMES MILLER McKIM.

Born in Pennsylvania and very active in anti-slavery work, he worked chiefly with Garrison supporters on his visit to Britain in 1853.

REV. E. MATTHEWS.

A missionary from Wisconsin he was active in the societies supporting Garrison during his visit to Britain during the early 1850s. He was a friend of the Estlins, and worked with them in attacking the churches' ambiguous attitude to slavery.

SAMUEL J. MAY.

Massachusetts born Unitarian minister who settled in Syracuse, New York, he was a delegate in 1840 and visited Britain again in 1859. His cousin, Samuel May of Leicester, Massachusetts, also a Unitarian, had close ties with John B. Estlin.

JAMES MOTT.

From an old Quaker family he underwent much social and economic hardship in his work for anti-slavery. He came to Britain in 1840 with his wife Lucretia, as representative of the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society.
REV. AMOS A. PHELPS.

A New England Congregational minister he was active in anti-slavery circles, but broke with Garrison. He attended the 1843 Convention.

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

From a prominent Boston family, he was a delegate to the 1840 Convention with his wife, Ann. He played a leading role in the movement to admit women as delegates. He had many British friends among the British supporters of Garrison.

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Massachusetts born reformer and an active abolitionist of the Garrison school, he came to Britain in the 1850s and was a prominent speaker on platforms of the radical British abolitionists.

NATHANIEL P. ROGERS.

Born in New Hampshire he was a friend of William Lloyd Garrison and attended the 1840 Convention, helping Garrison in his tour of Britain after this meeting.

GERRIT SMITH.

New York philanthropist and lawyer, he was active in moderate anti-slavery circles. He came to Britain in 1840 as a delegate to the Convention.
HENRY E. STANTON.

Born in Connecticut he was a lawyer and journalist. Converted by Finney to abolitionism he was on the side of the moderates, and defended the A.F.A.S.S. during his tour of Britain in 1840, which he made after the Convention to which he had been sent as a delegate with his wife, Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

ARTHUR TAPPAN.

Wealthy New York merchant and philanthropist, he attended the 1843 Convention.

LEWIS TAPPAN.

Brother of Arthur and sharing his anti-slavery sympathies, he also came to Britain in 1843 as a delegate to the Convention.

JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER.

New England Quaker and poet who aligned himself on the whole with the New Organization, he attended the 1840 Convention. He had many friends among British abolitionists.

ISAAC WINSLOW.

Quaker merchant of Portland, Maine, he was a delegate at the 1840 Convention and an ardent champion of William Lloyd Garrison.

ELIZUR WRIGHT.

A Connecticut born Professor he disliked the political activity of the A.F.A.S.S., but disliked even more Garrison's fanaticism. He visited Britain between 1841 and 1845, lecturing on slavery and selling copies of his translation of La Fontaine to pay his way.
HENRY CLARK WRIGHT.

Congregational pastor of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and close friend of Garrison he was sent to Britain by the Nonresistance Society in 1841. He was the first to denounce collection of money from the South by the Free Church of Scotland, and worked with Garrison and Douglass in this campaign. When in Britain he met many moral suasion Chartists; finally returning to the United States in 1847.

NEGRO ANTI-SLAVERY REFORMERS.

American Negro reformers form in their own right a specially interesting group. A surprisingly large number came to Britain considering the disabilities they were under in America. The following is a fairly full account of American Negroes in Britain up to the time of the Civil War.

IRA ALDRIDGE.

An actor, he won much popularity in Britain, and sometimes spoke on anti-slavery platforms.

WILLIAM G. ALLEN.

A college Professor, he left America in 1853 with his wife, a white student whom he had married after much public outcry. He settled in Britain and never returned to America.

JOHN ANDERSON.

A fugitive slave, he had killed a man during his escape and subsequently made his way to Britain. Because of his crime he was being claimed under Article X of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.
notice of his deportation appears, however.

**JEREMIAH ASHER.**

Born in New Haven, Connecticut, of free parents, he later became the minister of the Shiloh (coloured) Baptist Church of Philadelphia, and visited Britain in 1849 to collect money for his church.

**HENRY BIBB.**

A fugitive slave he came to Britain after the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law.

**HENRY 'BOX' BROWN.**

A fugitive slave from Richmond, Virginia, he escaped from slavery in 1849 by being sent from Richmond to Philadelphia in a box. Escaping again to Britain because of the Fugitive Slave Law he arrived in Liverpool almost penniless. He and another man travelled through Britain showing a panorama of scenes of slavery.

**JOHN BROWN.**

A fugitive slave, he came to Britain about 1853, and toured and lectured the country under the auspices of the B.F.A.S.S.

**WILLIAM WELLS BROWN.**

A fugitive slave from Kentucky, he worked during his bondage with Elijah P. Lovejoy, the first anti-slavery 'martyr'. Escaping to the North he made a name for himself as an abolitionist speaker before coming to Europe in 1849. In that year he represented the United States at the Peace Congress of Paris. He remained abroad
until 1854 working for the anti-slavery cause. He was the author of several works and histories championing the Negro.

**DIMMOCK CHARLTON ALIAS JOHN BULL.**

A fugitive slave and possibly British because he was captured in a British man o' war, he was in Britain in the late 1850s.

**F. L. CARDOZO.**

A Reconstruction office holder, he was educated at the University of Glasgow.

**WILLIAM AND ELLEN CRAFT.**

The couple made a sensational escape to freedom, but with the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law soon after this, they were forced to make their way to Britain where they soon became popular lecturers. They were taken under the wing of the radical British abolitionists and later the Stafford House group, among whom Ellen especially was a great favourite. In 1854 they began to attend school through the generosity of J. B. Estlin and others. They never returned to America.

**ALEXANDER CRUMBELL.**

One of the only four episcopally ordained coloured clergymen in the United States, he was educated at Cambridge through the help of the Earl of Shaftesbury. He was prominent in anti-slavery circles in Britain for some years after 1848, usually speaking on the platforms of the B.F.A.S.S.
WILLIAM H. DAY.

A free man, coming from Northampton, Massachusetts, he became a minister in Boston. He arrived in Britain in 1861 to help persuade the public of the rightness of the federal cause.

MARTIN R. DELANY.

An explorer and joint editor for a time of the North Star, he was connected with attempts to promote Negro emigration to both the Niger area and Haiti. He visited Britain in the early years of the Civil War.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

Anti-slavery orator and journalist, he was born a slave in Maryland, becoming active in anti-slavery circles after his escape. He came to Britain in 1845 after a determined attempt to recapture him, and worked there during 1846 with Garrison. Returning to America in 1847 a free man, thanks to the generosity of British friends, he began publication of his own paper, the North Star. He was a noted figure, active in politics and on behalf of the Negro. (See Ch. III).

ROBERT DOUGLASS.

A portrait painter, he came to London for further study. During his stay in Britain he attended the 1840 anti-slavery convention as a delegate.

WILLIAM DOUGLASS.

Speaking for the cause of abolition in Britain in the early years of the 1850s, he was described by William Wells Brown who heard him, as "a man of fine native talent."
FRANCIS FEDERIC.

Another escaped slave, when in Britain he published his autobiography, Slave Life in Virginia and Kentucky, London, 1863.

HENRY HIGHLAND GARNET.

Born a slave in Maryland, he escaped to New York where he entered school and later the ministry. He spoke for the A.A.S.S. and was a serious rival of Frederick Douglass. His fame as a speaker having spread to Britain, he was invited in 1850 to make a tour of the country, remaining for three years lecturing and attending the Frankfort Peace Congress. He then went to Jamaica as a missionary for the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

STEPHEN H. GLOUCESTER.

Little is known of him except that he came as a speaker to Britain about 1847.

MOSES GRANDY.

He visited Britain with his wife, also a slave, in 1842.

GEORGE GREEN.

Escaping from slavery he first went to Canada then crossed to Liverpool where he arrived in 1832; settling finally in Manchester he remained there, rising to a position of respectability.

JULIA GREENFIELD.

Known as the 'Black Swan', she was much praised by the Stafford House Circle for her singing.

REV. BABRA GROSS.

A money collector, he received a cool welcome from the

REV. JOSIAH HENSON.

He visited Britain several times after 1850 mainly on behalf of the manual labour school at Dawn, Ontario. He was very popular in Britain, rousing much public interest as the original 'Uncle Tom'. He was received at Windsor by Queen Victoria.

DAVID HOLMES.

A penniless, fugitive, he was wandering about Britain in 1853.

WILLIAM ANDREW JACKSON.

The escaped coachman of Jefferson Davis, he became the protege of George Thompson on his arrival in Britain in 1862, becoming thereafter a leading speaker in anti-slavery circles.

REV. J. H. JONES AND MISS JONES.

A coloured missionary he preached in Britain in 1866 accompanied by his daughter who entertained the audience by her singing.

REV. J. SELLA MARTIN.

He visited Britain in the 1860s speaking for the northern cause and anti-slavery.

REUBEN NIXON.

An itinerant beggar he wandered around Britain in the mid 1850s collecting money on false pretences.

REV. NATHANIEL PAUL.

In Britain in the early '30s he worked with Garrison during his first visit to this country. (See Ch. III).
DANIEL ALEXANDER PAYNE.
A Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church he visited Britain in 1867.

REV. J. W. C. PENNINGTON.
Born a slave in Maryland, he escaped when he was twenty one, and later became a minister in African Congregational Churches. He represented Connecticut at the Anti-Slavery Convention in 1843, and was again in Britain at the time of the passing of the Fugitive Slave Act. Due to his origins this Act placed him in some difficulties until friends raised sufficient money to pay for his purchase. He was then sold to a third party who liberated him.

CHARLES LENOX REMOND.
A free born man, a native of Salem, Massachusetts, he attended the 1840 Convention, supporting Garrison; he remained in Britain until 1841 speaking for anti-slavery societies. (See Ch. III).

SARAH PARKER REMOND.
Sister of Charles, she lectured in Britain in 1859 and 1860 where she received several public addresses. She was again in Britain during the Civil War, finally settling in Florence where she obtained a medical degree in 1871.

MOSES ROPER.
Born in North Carolina he escaped from slavery, and visited Britain in 1835 where he published a narrative of his life.
DR. JAMES McCUNE SMITH.

Studying at the University of Glasgow during the 1830s he was a member of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and attended the 1840 Convention.

LEWIS SMITH.

A collector he received a cool welcome from the B.F.A.S.S. in 1861.

JAMES FRANCIS THOMAS.

A seaman, his manumission was arranged by the B.F.A.S.S. in 1856.

SAMUEL RINGGOLD WARD.

Born in Maryland of slave parents who escaped shortly after his birth, he was educated in New York, and helped by the Tappans and others of the A.A.S.S. Sent to Britain in 1853 by the Anti-Slavery Society of Canada because of the part he had played in the escape of fugitive slaves, he was active in abolition circles until about 1855 when he left for Jamaica.

PEACE REFORMERS.

The Peace Congresses attracted great numbers of American peace supporters to Europe. Beginning with a small trickle - about seven in 1843, and four in 1848 - the volume increased with twenty three coming in 1849, twenty two in 1850 and fifty in 1851.
GEORGE C. BECKWITH.

Secretary of the American Peace Society, he worked in Britain in the 1830s dealing comprehensively with the whole non-resistance question. He was at the 1843 Peace Convention in London and at the 1851 Congress held there also.

ELIHU BURRITT.

Perhaps the most famous of the American reformers in Britain where he did much of his best work in support of the Peace movement and in promoting Ocean Penny Postage. He was in Europe from 1846 to 1856, and again from 1863 to 1869, this time as U.S. Consul to Birmingham from 1865 to 1869. (See Ch. IV).

HENRY CLAPP.

He was active in the British peace and temperance movements in the late 1840s but apparently did not agree with Elihu Burritt.

J. B. MILES.

A travelling agent of the American Peace Society, he was sent to Britain in 1871 during the Alabama Arbitration by that society to arouse interest in the plan of a group of Americans for the codification of International Law. He had previously visited Britain as a delegate to the 1843 Peace Convention.

AMASA WALKER.

New England business man and economist he was a delegate to the Peace Conferences of 1843 and 1849.
ICHABOD WASHBURN.
A business man from Worcester, Massachusetts, he attended the 1851 Congress while on a business visit to Britain.

TEMPERANCE REFORMERS.
Surprisingly few American temperance reformers visited Britain considering the marked influence which the American movement as a whole had on its British counterpart. This may possibly be due to some jealousy on the part of the British, and even more to the fact that temperance orators usually had a good reception in America, a very different position to their anti-slavery counterparts. It should not be forgotten, however, that most American reformers even when they came primarily on behalf of other causes, defended the temperance movement.

E. C. DELEVAN.
Reformer and publisher he was born in New York State and was active in temperance work there. He was present at the inaugural meeting of the British and Foreign Temperance Society in 1831, and lectured in Britain in the 1830s.

NEAL DOW.
Born in Maine, and the most famous figure in the temperance movement, he visited Britain in 1857 at the request of the United Kingdom Alliance and lectured on the Maine Law. He returned in 1866 to 1867 and again from 1873 to 1875.
JOHN BARTHOLOMEW GOUCH.

A noted temperance orator, he was in Britain from 1853 to 1855; 1857 to 1860; and made a final visit in 1878. (See Ch. V).

NATHANIEL HEWITT.

A member of the American Society for the promotion of temperance, he was present with Delavan at the inaugural meeting of the British and Foreign Temperance Society in 1831.

AMERICAN MINISTERS AS VISITING REFORMERS.

American ministers form an important part of the reformers coming to Britain. Not only do their visits illustrate the close links between the churches of the two countries, but as spokesmen of their communities their attitudes are especially interesting.

REV. DR. ROBERT BAIRD.

A noted missionary and evangelist. Dr. Baird worked in Europe in the 1830s and was especially active in the cause of temperance. He was in Europe again during 1846 and 1847, attending the Evangelical Alliance in 1846. He returned to Britain in 1851, attending the Peace Congress and preaching throughout the country. Europe was his chosen field for missionary work, and he made several other visits during the 1850s, making his final visit in 1861 when he defended the cause of the North.

LYMAN BEECHER.

New England Presbyterian minister and reformer, and father
of several children, most of whom were also prominent in the reform world, Beecher came to Britain as a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance and the Temperance Convention in 1846.

JAMES CAUGHEY.

He came to Britain in 1841 for five years during which period he conducted a number of revivals with a varying degree of success.

REV. DR. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

New England born Congregational minister, he visited Britain in the 1830s when he spoke in Scotland against a state church. His most noted visit, however, was his begging mission from 1860 to 1861. (See Ch. VI).

DR. SAMUEL HANSON COX.

A Presbyterian minister in New York, he was in Britain in 1833 at the anniversary meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Though possessing strong anti-slavery views he defended his country at this meeting. He was a delegate in 1846 to the Evangelical Alliance and the Temperance Convention, later touring Britain and Ireland. To win over slaveholders he modified his abolitionist views at the Evangelical Alliance and Temperance Convention, which led him into a vigorous controversy with Frederick Douglass.

CHARLES GRANDISON FINNEY.

Of New England stock Finney was a revivalist and educator, associated with the early history of Oberlin College. He conducted
revivals in Britain in 1849 to 1850 and again from 1859 to 1860.

**EDWARD PAYSON HAMMOND.**

A Connecticut born evangelist he completed his theological course at the Free Church College in Edinburgh in 1861, holding several influential religious meetings there.

**REV. EDWARD NORRIS KIRK.**

Born in New York state he became a Congregational minister, visiting Europe from 1837 to 1839 studying conditions and preaching. He attended the Evangelical Alliance and Temperance Convention in 1846, and was involved in the quarrel with Douglass because of Kirk's equivocal attitude to slavery. He was much liked in temperance circles, however, and was a special friend of Gough.

**STEPHEN OLIN.**

A Methodist Episcopal clergyman, born in Vermont, he attended the Evangelical Alliance in 1846.

**WALTER AND PHOEBE PALMER.**

Methodist preachers; Palmer and his wife came to Britain in 1859 and remained five years touring the country holding religious meetings.

**THEODORE PARKER.**

Famous New England Unitarian minister, he was in Britain in 1841.
GEORGE O. PECK.

Born in New York State he became a Methodist Episcopal clergyman, and was a delegate at the Evangelical Alliance in 1846.

REV. S. J. PRIME.

A Presbyterian minister from New York State Prime was also a delegate in 1846 to the Alliance.

SAMUEL S. SCHMUCKER.

A Lutheran minister from Maryland he also attended the Evangelical Alliance.

MISCELLANEOUS REFORMERS.

Other American reformers came to Britain intent on reforms which had no immediate connection with the churches, anti-slavery, peace or temperance. The following list is again not an exhaustive one.

BRONSON ALCOTT.

New England educator with original if extreme views Alcott visited Britain in 1842 to see Alcott House, the school set up at Richmond by some admirers. He expressed great sympathy for the Chartists during his visit, and had a somewhat unsuccessful meeting with Thomas Carlyle.

JOSEPH CHESSBOROUGH DYER.

Born in Connecticut he made frequent visits to Britain, finally settling in the country in 1811 and engaging in several industrial and political enterprises. He was Secretary of the Parliamentary
Reform League in the '30s, closely associated with the Anti-Corn
Law League and a founder of the Manchester 'Guardian'. Interested
in reforming the educational system he helped in establishing the
Royal Institution and the Mechanics' Institution at Manchester.
He cherished a strong hatred of slavery and wrote several pamphlets
on the subject.

HORACE GREELEY.

Noted American journalist and reformer, he was born in New
Hampshire but settled in New York where he made his name as the
editor of the New York Tribune. He visited Britain in 1851 and
while interested in all British reforms, one of the most important
acts of his visit was to give evidence before a Parliamentary Com-
mittee on cheap newspapers.

HORACE MANN.

New England educationalist, he toured Britain in 1843 to
investigate British educational systems.

THOMAS LOWE NICHOLS.

New England born, a pioneer dietician and hydrotherapist,
together with his wife, MARY SARGEANT NEAL GOVE, also a water
cure physician, he came to Britain after the outbreak of the
Civil War as both were strongly pacifist. They established at
Great Malvern a hydropathic institution and wrote many articles
advocating hygiene and healthful, temperate living. He invented
many health foods also.

**CALVIN ELLIS STOWE.**

New England educational reformer, he was sent to Europe in 1836 by the state of Ohio to investigate the public school systems of Europe. He returned in 1837, publishing his *Report on Elementary Instruction in Europe*. He visited Europe again with his wife, Harriet Beecher Stowe, in 1853, 1856 and 1859.

**GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN.**

A Boston born merchant and individualist, in his business ventures in England he showed all the tactics of the 'go-ahead' American capitalists of his day. Working in the Liverpool offices of Train and Co. in 1850 when barely twenty one, he organised American shippers into a committee and thus forced the Port authorities to agree to night work. He returned to Liverpool in 1852 for a few months and was once again in Britain from 1856 to 1857. Because of his writings and activities he became typified for Europe as "Young America;" in 1860 he was again in Britain, campaigning for horsecar street railways. He got permission to open a route in Liverpool, and then in London, but they were very unpopular with the general public, and feeling against them was increased by the fact that at this time Train began to be known as a vigorous defender of the North in the early years of the Civil War. He returned to America in 1862.

**WOMEN REFORMERS.**

American women reformers no less than the men played their part
in the Anglo-American community of social reformers. The follow-
ing list shows their interest in a wide number of reforms.

**LOUISA MAY ALCOTT.**

From a New England reforming family and herself interested
in reforms in addition to her writing, she made visits to Europe
in 1865 and 1870 to 1871.

**ELIZABETH BLACKWELL.**

Born in England but brought up in New York and Cincinatti,
Ohio, the "first woman doctor of modern times" visited Britain
on gaining her medical degree in 1849; and in 1869 she decided
to settle permanently in England, where, as in America, she aimed
to secure free and equal entrance of women into the medical profes-
sion. In 1875 she became Professor of Gynaecology in the London
School of Medicine for Women which had just been established.

**MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.**

New England abolitionist; she was a delegate to the Convention
in 1840. Following the death of her husband she went to Europe with
her children and lived abroad from 1848 to 1855 where she was active
in anti-slavery circles of the Garrison school.

**LYDIA MARIA CHILD.**

A New England abolitionist of note she was a delegate with
her husband to the 1840 Convention.
DOROTHEA DIX.

A humanitarian of New England ancestry she was noted for her work for proper treatment for the insane. She visited Britain about 1840, and after a period of active work in America she again travelled in Europe between 1854 and 1857.

MARY GREW.

A delegate with her husband at the 1840 Convention.

LUCRETIA MOTT.

Of an old Quaker family, the wife of James Mott, she was one of the leading women delegates at the 1840 Convention, and her influence on many of the women there was to be considerable in the history of the women's rights movement.

ELIZABETH Cady Stanton.

Prominent in American reform movements, especially in campaigning for women's rights, she was present at the 1840 Anti-Slavery Convention, a meeting which proved to be a seed bed for much of the later campaigns for women's rights in Britain and America.

HARRIET BEECHER STOWE.

Coming from a famous New England family of reformers she was one of the best known of American women in Europe because of her book, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin'. She made much publicised triumphal tours of Britain in 1853, 1856 and 1859.
APPENDIX III

THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT IN IRELAND.

The anti-slavery movement in Ireland was a surprisingly influential and powerful one. Never large, the most important societies were to be found in Dublin, Cork and Belfast, all having close personal contact with each other. Indeed, it was claimed that at the 1840 Anti-Slavery Convention the Irish abolitionists formed the most numerous and close knit faction there.¹

On the whole the Irish anti-slavery societies were supporters of the Garrison party. This was especially true of the Dublin group led by R. D. Webb and his family, and Richard Allen, all Quakers, and James Haughton, a Unitarian. The other anti-slavery groups were largely women's societies and were among the most active in contributing to the Boston Bazaar, the annual gala of Garrison's New England women supporters. Indeed, the friendships between the Irish abolitionists, notably R. D. Webb and his wife, Maria Jennings of Cork and Mary Ireland of Belfast, with Maria Weston Chapman and her sisters, illustrate the closest friendships in anti-slavery circles.

Much of this sympathy for the New England school of abolition was kept alive by visits of the anti-slavery speakers of the Garrison party. Garrison, Charles Remond and Frederick Douglass, all visited Ireland in the 1840s, and made a notable impression. Indeed, there are indications that the Negro reformers, Remond and Douglass, appeared to find Ireland one of the most congenial places to work in.²

---

¹ Weston Papers, vol. 22, no. 26; see also Anti-Slavery Letters to Garrison, MS.A. 1.2., vol. 9, no. 60.
² See above, Ch. III.
But though the Irish anti-slavery movement was an influential one, it did not have universal backing throughout Ireland. On the whole its main supporters came from the small Quaker and Unitarian minority groups. They were not wealthy,¹ and only once is there any record of any large scale Catholic support: in the petition signed by six thousand Irish Catholics which Remond took back to America in 1841.² But Irish anti-slavery activity was never a negligible force, and when we remember the twenty years of loyal support which it gave to the movement in America, it may well be claimed that "Irish support of abolitionism may not have been extensive materially; yet undoubtedly it played its part in strengthening the movement in America."³

But the anti-slavery topic was too public and controversial an issue not to enter into other fields. Moreover the connection between Ireland and America was already very strong, and it is not surprising, therefore, that we find the anti-slavery question entering two very important spheres: the emigration of Irish to the United States, and the fight for repeal of the Union.

With regard to the issue of Irish emigration, it is interesting to note that so little influence had the Irish abolition movement at home that few emigrants took with them any deep and lasting sympathy for the slave when they settled in America. Once in their new home,

2. For the reaction in America to this petition see the Liberator, March 25, 1842.
these immigrants faced serious economic difficulties, and were among the most active opponents of the anti-slavery movement. This was recognised by Irish abolitionists, and in their letters to American friends we find continual efforts being made to 'educate' the Irish workers before they left for America.¹

Equally interesting is the connection between the anti-slavery movement and the struggle for repeal. As in the working class agitation the connection between Irish "slavery" and Southern slavery was too obvious to be ignored,² and the Irish repeal movement did not hesitate to draw on anti-slavery vocabulary in its propaganda. Daniel O'Connell was a leading figure in the British abolition scene, possibly as much for political as for humanitarian reasons. The reaction of British and Americans to this connection is interesting. On the whole Irish abolitionists were conservative and condemned O'Connell;³ American reaction varied, however. In general Americans were sympathetic to the claims of the Irish in their fight against 'English despotism'. Daniel O'Connell was a much admired figure in American circles,⁴ and it is clear that Americans were drawn into Ireland's struggle for independence. But it is interesting to note that Remond on his tour of Ireland, possibly for fear of offending his hosts, found it politic to declare that he was interested only in American slavery.⁵ Even more interesting is the fact that in

1. May Papers, vol. 2, no. 32; Weston Papers, vol. 22, nos. 64, 115.
the South the cry for repeal of the Act of Union was taken up to win the political support of the American Irish, and, as Garrison claimed, to gain money to silence O'Connell on slavery.\(^1\) Anti-slavery, then, was not merely the occupation of middle class Protestant Irish; it is clear that it played a small but significant part in the main events in Irish nineteenth century history, and was an important factor in relations between Ireland and the United States.

---
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