

Greetings, prospective Special Subject students for 2020-21!

This file contains the (sprawling) reading list for 2018-19, the last year in which this Special was taught. There may be a few tweaks to particular topics for next year, and I strongly suspect I will cut back on some of the required reading (especially in the later weeks) to help you focus your reading on a slightly shorter range of primary sources. But this list should give you a good idea of the topics you'll be engaging if you take 'Empires and the American Imagination'.

Happy choosing!

Nick Guyatt
March 2020

Update May 2020

We still don't know how the Covid crisis will affect teaching arrangements in 2020-21, but students should be assured that we'll adapt this Special Subject quickly and creatively to any challenges and constraints we may face. This may include new ways of interacting in addition to the usual seminar slot, including mini-lectures and a variety of group tasks which will keep everyone informed and engaged beyond our weekly meetings.

Empires and the American imagination, c.1763 – c.1900
Nicholas Guyatt

For decades, American historians have argued about whether the United States should be considered an empire, or about when its transition to imperial status took place. Much less attention has been paid to how Americans themselves understood and encountered imperialism, especially during the high-water mark of European empires in the nineteenth century. This course invites students to examine imperialism through the observations and engagements of Americans both at home and overseas. Through close scrutiny of a wide range of primary sources, we will consider how other people's empires affected American ideas about how the world should be governed. We'll also try to determine how American journalists, missionaries, businessmen, diplomats and politicians – not to mention the readers of U.S. magazines and newspapers – came to see a role for the United States within a world in which empire seemed normative.

The course begins with a consideration of the imperial crisis which produced the United States, and asks whether the American Revolution should be viewed as a truly anti-imperial moment. (Put more crudely: did Americans rebel against British mismanagement of empire, or the concept of empire itself?) Other seminars will consider American vantages on a wide range of imperial activity. In the early and mid-nineteenth century, we'll examine how Americans assessed the claims and actions of the Spanish in Latin America, the Ottomans in the eastern Mediterranean, and the British and French in Africa, Asia and beyond. We'll also look at how Americans applied imperial technology and precedent within North America, along with fledgling plans for U.S. colonies or protectorates in Liberia and the Caribbean. The course concludes by considering the fierce public debate over the U.S. acquisition of overseas territories in the 1890s. We'll compare this 'imperial awakening' with U.S. perspectives on Britain's (nearly contemporaneous) involvement in the Boer War, and with American views of European imperialism more generally.

Sources range from private letters and journals to published travelogues, newspaper and magazine articles, government reports and documents, and congressional speeches. Although the majority of our sources were written by white men, the question of empire engaged female missionaries and suffragists, black nationalists and abolitionists, Cuban and Puerto Rican exiles in New York, and a variety of other voices. The readings will incorporate these diverse viewpoints, and students will be invited to consider how the production of ideas about empire in the United States was inflected by race and gender.

The course will be taught through sixteen seminars, running through Michaelmas and Lent terms. The first seminar will introduce the themes and approaches of the course; the following seminars will focus on specific American engagements with empire from the American Revolution to the end of the nineteenth century. In Lent Term (week 5), an additional two-hour seminar will be offered to prepare students for the Long Essay.

Two further seminars in the Easter Term will focus on source/gobbet work, and the final seminar will be directed towards general consolidation ahead of the examination.

1. American imperialisms

This week we'll consider our terms: what do historians mean by 'empire', and how do U.S. understandings of the concept relate to uses in other national historiographies? Julian Go's book offers some ideas about how to compare the rise of the British empire with the development of American settlement/colonization through the mid-19th century. Emily Conroy-Krutz's essay attempts to place recent historiographical interest in empire within a longer tradition of what might be termed American imperial innocence. She also introduces two problems we'll consider at greater length in subsequent meetings:

1. Did Americans have any justification for thinking that their state-building experiment looked any different from other forms of European overseas expansion?
2. How could an anti-imperial revolution produce an imperial nation?

This week is unusual in offering two secondary sources as assigned reading. You'll be relieved to discover that the other reading is a primary source: Benjamin Franklin's famous 1751 projection of the course of British colonial expansion in North America. As you read Franklin's ambitious agenda, you might want to consider whether imperialism is already an ideology in North America, or perhaps a political language to be deployed knowingly by propagandists like Franklin.

Assigned reading

Julian Go, *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 1-54

Emily Conroy-Krutz, 'State of the Field: Empire and the Early Republic,' H-Diplo Essay No. 133, September 2015

Patrick Wolfe, 'History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, from Marx to Postcolonialism', *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (1997): 388-420

Benjamin Franklin, 'Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind' (1751), Founders Online

2. A revolution against empire? Critiques of Britain, c. 1763-1783

Did American colonists rebel against Britain because they objected to empire as a political form? Or did they simply seek to escape from British control, without passing judgement on the merits of empire as a form of governance? These are surprisingly underdeveloped questions in the historiography of the imperial crisis and the American Revolution, and we'll consider them through two classic works of colonial protest literature – and one famously caustic reflection by an American loyalist who fled from the new United States. It's worth thinking not only about the anti-imperial dimensions of Otis's and Hamilton's writing, but also about what, exactly, they thought 'empire' was supposed to be.

Most of you will already know Thomas Jefferson. His essay here built on nearly a decade of colonial political writing which presented empire as a horizontal compact of states, rather than a vertical system of control by the mother country. James Otis was one of the pioneers of this form of thinking about American rights. You can find a very good introduction to his life and thought at the American National Biography (ANB) website – NB that he's the only person we'll study to be killed by lightning. (I think.) In 1764, when he wrote this pamphlet, Otis imagined that Britain might easily scale back the more invasive taxation regime that it had introduced in America after the Seven Years' War. When this ultimately proved a vain hope, he threw in his lot with the Patriot side in the American Revolution.

A colonial protester who went the other way when the shooting started was Joseph Galloway of Pennsylvania. Galloway was a friend of Benjamin Franklin, and a member of the first Continental Congress – the colonial protest assembly that eventually morphed into the Congress of the United States. Galloway tried to find a plan that would reconcile Britain and its American colonists in 1774; the plan was narrowly defeated, and Galloway had soon resigned from Congress and moved behind British lines. (In 1778, when the British ended their occupation of Philadelphia, Galloway prepared to relocate to London, where he spent the rest of his life.) The extract here from Galloway's memoir – which he wrote, bitterly, in exile from America – gives a sense of his hopes and frustrations as he tried to find a compromise that could keep the North American colonies within Britain's orbit. NB that the "loyal part" who drew up the Plan of Union was, of course, Joseph Galloway.

If you're completely new to this story, the Peter Marshall reading in the supplemental section is a great introduction to the problems facing Britain as it attempted to consolidate its empire before (and during) the American Revolution.

Assigned reading

James Otis, *Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* (Boston; reprinted London, for J. Almon, 1764), 35-77

Thomas Jefferson, *Summary View of the Rights of British America* (Williamsburg, repr. London: G. Kearsly, 1774), 4-21

Joseph Galloway, *Historical and Political Reflections on the Rise and Progress of the American Rebellion* (London: G. Wilkie, 1780), 65-132

[Joseph Galloway], *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain and the Colonies* (New York: James Rivington, 1775), 53-54

Supplemental reading

Eliga Gould, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)

P.J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America, c. 1750-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Sankar Muthu, ed., *Empire and Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Kariann Akemi Yokota, *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America Became a Postcolonial Nation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010)

3. The 'empire of liberty' and the American interior

We'll spend most of this paper in the company of Americans overseas. At different moments, though, we'll consider the domestic context of (elite) debates over empire and state formation. Thomas Jefferson's famous vision for the new United States – that it should be an "empire of liberty" – seems a contradiction in terms. This week's readings offer a variety of perspectives on the project of creating the new republic, and especially on the question of how territorial expansion might affect the reputation and character of the United States. Letters from Washington and Madison, and the Confederation Congress's plan for the western territory, give us insight into how expansion was woven into the fabric of early U.S. statecraft. The Louisiana Purchase of 1803, by which Napoleon ceded a vast portion of North America to the United States, created an even larger canvas for imagining a republican (or imperial?) future. In addition to letters from the Founders, the sources include writings by two of the most celebrated historians of the early United States: Mercy Otis Warren and David Ramsay. NB that Warren's history recalls the post-1783 moment from the vantage of 1805, when both the Louisiana Purchase and the problematic nature of Indian 'civilizing' policies had changed the original post-independence calculus of expansion.

Sources on the lived reality of expansion are considerably more diffuse; if you have the time it's worth considering the bottom-up reality of western settlement captured in the work of Beth Saler and Honor Sachs. Both would argue that elite visions of settlement and empire looked very different from the ground up, for white settlers as well as Native Americans.

Assigned reading

James Madison, 'Federalist No. 10', in *The Federalist*, 2 vols (New York: J and A. McLean, 1788), 1: 52-61

George Washington to James Duane, 7 September 1783, Founders Online

'Report of the Committee on Temporary Government of the Western Territory', 1 March 1784, Founders Online

James Madison to Thomas Jefferson, 20 August 1784, Founders Online

David Ramsay, *An Oration on the Cession of Louisiana to the United States* (Newport: Oliver Farnsworth, 1804)

Mercy Otis Warren, *History of the Rise, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution*, 3 vols. (Boston: Manning and Loring, 1805), 3: 300-337

Jefferson to Benjamin Chambers, 28 December 1805, Founders Online

Jefferson to Madison, 27 April 1809, Founders Online

Supplemental reading

'Editorial Note: Plan for the Government of the Western Territory,' *Founders Online*, National Archives

Alison L. LaCroix, *Ideological Origins of American Federalism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010)

Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000)

Peter S. Onuf, 'Imperialism and Nationalism in the Early American Republic,' in Ian Tyrell and Jay Sexton, eds., *Empire's Twin: U.S. Anti-Imperialism from the Founding Era to the Age of Terrorism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), 21-40

Honor Sachs, *Home Rule: Households, Manhood, and National Expansion on the Eighteenth-Century Kentucky Frontier* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015)

Beth Saler, *The Settler's Empire: Colonialism and State Formation in America's Old Northwest* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015)

Andy Doolen, *Fugitive Empire: Locating Early American Imperialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 39-74)

John Craig Hammond, *Slavery, Freedom and Expansion in the Early American West* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 9-54

4. 'Universal empire' and its opponents: France and Haiti

To many Americans, the French Revolution initially seemed a confirmation of their own political achievement – and as evidence that the cause of liberty would now spread quickly through Europe (and beyond). When the Revolution soured, and Europe fell into war, the first American party system (Federalists versus Republicans) developed partly around conflicting views of what had happened in France. Alexander Hamilton decried the “pernicious fascination” of some Americans with the French Revolution; Thomas Jefferson, on the other side of the argument, was unrepentant: “Rather than it should have failed,” he wrote in 1793, “I would have seen half the earth desolated. Were there but an Adam & Eve left in every country, and left free, it would be better than as it now is.”

This week’s readings explore the destabilising effects of the French Revolution on American ideas about regional and global order. The first set of readings explore the Haitian Revolution, the bloody and protracted process by which Europe’s most lucrative slave system to the first black republic in the western hemisphere. Abraham Bishop and Samuel White were relatively unusual voices of sympathy for the cause of Haiti’s rebellious slaves and free blacks; Bishop was an antislavery reformer from Connecticut, while White was a U.S. Senator from Delaware. More typical was the doleful commentary of the *Literary Magazine* – there’s a good deal more of this, if you’re interested. (Try the John Carter Brown library’s collection of Haitian primary material.) Finally on Haiti, you might want to dip into Leonora Sansay’s fascinating novel, *Secret History*. The daughter of a Philadelphia tavern keeper, and a fixture in the city’s social and (after hours) political scenes, Sansay married a white French planter refugee from Saint Domingue (as Haiti was known before 1804) and journeyed with him to the Caribbean in the summer of 1802 as he hoped to recover his plantation. (A French invasion force had landed in Saint Domingue, and the initial leader of the Haitian Revolution, Toussaint L’Ouverture, had been arrested and sent to France.) Her novel draws on her experiences during this trip, and remains (despite its lightly fictionalised elements) one of the very few first hand extended accounts of the Haitian Revolution by an American. You’ll want to focus on her presentation of black Haitians, of course, but her understanding of the Creoles – the white Europeans who’d been born in the Caribbean – is particularly interesting.

In addition to the readings on Haiti, there’s some material here on American understandings of France itself. Hamilton’s famous 1798 essays lay out the case against the French Revolution. The *Monthly Register*’s 1807 article – a favourable review of a book by a South Carolina newspaper editor critiquing Napoleon’s rise – explores the meaning of Napoleon’s “universal empire” and considers the threat posed by imperial France to the order of Europe and the wider world. Robert Walsh, born in Baltimore in 1784, travelled in Britain and France during the early 1800s before becoming a writer in Philadelphia in 1809. His 1810 *Letter* was ardently anti-French, but also concerned (like the *Monthly Register* article) with questions of geopolitics. NB that by 1810 even Jefferson had abandoned hope that France could renovate the kingdoms of Europe. He and Walsh would later become cordial acquaintances, when Walsh tempered his Anglophilia and began to argue (after the War of 1812) for an American literary nationalism.

Assigned reading

Haiti

Abraham Bishop, 'Rights of Black Men', *Argus* (Boston), 22 and 25 November and 6 December 1791

'A Sketch of the War of St. Domingo,' *Literary Magazine and American Register*, 2 (1804): 605-13

Samuel White, 'Speech in the Senate of the United States', 20 February 1806

[Leonora Sansay], *Secret History; or, the Horrors of St. Domingo* (Philadelphia: Bradford & Inskeep, 1808), 21-97

France

Alexander Hamilton, 'The Stand' essays in *New York Commercial Advertiser*, March-April 1798, nos 1, 3, 4, 6

'An Inquiry into the Present State of the Foreign Relations of the Union,' *Monthly Register* (Philadelphia), 1 January 1807, 93-103

'Historical Reflections', *Balance and State Journal*, 1 June 1810, p. 2

Supplemental reading

Philippe R. Girard, "Haiti and the Early United States", *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), np

Donald R. Hickey, "America's Response to the Slave Revolt in Haiti, 1791-1806", *Journal of the Early Republic*, 2, no. 4 (1982): 361-79

Marlene L. Daut, *Tropics of Haiti: Race and the Literary History of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1789-1865* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015)

Alec Dun, *Dangerous Neighbors: Making the Haitian Revolution in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016)

Elizabeth Maddock Dillon and Michael J. Drexler, eds, *The Haitian Revolution and the Early United States: Histories, Textualities, Geographies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016)

François Furstenberg, *When the United States Spoke French: Five Refugees Who Shaped a Nation* (New York: Penguin, 2014)

Rafe Blaufarb, 'The French Revolutionary Wars and the Making of American Empire, 1789-1796,' in Susanne Desan et al., eds., *The French Revolution in Global Perspective* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), 148-64

David Patrick Geggus and Norman Fiering, eds., *The World of the Haitian Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009)

Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010)

5. Provinces of Freedom: Sierra Leone and Liberia

From the first months of the American Revolution, British governors and commanders encouraged the slaves of American Patriots to cross the lines and join the British war effort. Although around half of the fifteen thousand African Americans who took up the offer died during the Revolutionary War – mostly from disease – the other half were finally evacuated by the British, ending up in the Caribbean, Canada or Britain. It was the thousands of “black loyalists” in London who inspired the Quaker reformer Granville Sharp to campaign in 1786 for the creation of a “province of freedom” on the West African coast.

The colony that Sharp founded in 1787 – Sierra Leone – was, depending on your point of view, either a ‘benevolent’ exercise in self-determination or a gigantic scheme for racial segregation. (Its advocates may not have seen a contradiction in those terms.) But it caught the attention of white American reformers who wondered if the United States might found a colony of its own. Thomas Jefferson was only the most famous white American to insist on both the evil of slavery and the difficulties (even the impossibility) of black and white coexistence after emancipation. Black colonization became a popular way for white reformers to imagine how slavery would end: black people would be freed from their chains, and then relocated beyond the bounds of the United States.

The first group of sources focus on William Thornton, an eccentric but influential young man who grew up on the island of Tortola in the Caribbean, and who settled in the United States in the 1780s having failed to persuade the island’s planters (and his parents) to embrace emancipation. Thornton developed his ideas about colonization in the mid-1780s in conjunction with leading European antislavery theorists like Jacques Pierre Brissot and Granville Sharp. He may also have lectured on colonization to Paul Cuffe, a black Massachusetts sea captain who is the subject of the second set of sources. Cuffe was asked by the African Institution, the London charity that promoted Sierra Leone in the 1800s, to open a correspondence between the British colony and the African American population in the United States. On either side of the War of 1812 (which pitted Britain and the U.S. against each other, and restrained American shipping), Cuffe sailed to Sierra Leone and promoted the cause of colonization in the United States.

Cuffe’s support was keenly sought by the architects of the American Colonization Society, a ‘benevolent’ organisation founded in 1816 by the New Jersey clergyman Robert Finley. Finley’s short essay pitching his new society is included here, along with an appreciative assessment of its potential by the (white) editor of the *North American Review*, one of the nation’s leading magazines. The final source is the searing attack on the colonization movement/concept by the radical African American writer David Walker. The arguments raised here by Walker played a crucial role not only in converting ‘moderate’ antislavery thinkers like William Lloyd Garrison to the cause of radical abolition, but of persuading white and black radicals that colonization was part of the problem rather than the solution.

There’s lots to look out for in these sources, but you might keep an eye on the ways in which they imagine/construct Africa’s present and future; and on whether black involvement in, or endorsement of colonization in West Africa has any bearing on the imperial matrix within which these plans were devised and implemented.

Assigned reading

Selected letters from C.M. Harris, ed., *Papers of William Thornton, 1782-1802* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995):

To John Coakley Lettsom, 18 November 1786, 15 February 1787, 26 July 1788, 15 November 1788, 30-35, 43-47, 70-75, 77-79

‘General Outlines of a Settlement’, 1786, 38-41

To Jacques Pierre Brissot de Warville, 29 November 1788, 80-84

Granville Sharp to Lettsom, 13 October 1788, 90-96

Thornton to Sharp, 13th November 1789, 113-14

Selected letters from *Captain Paul Cuffe’s Logs and Letters, 1807–1817: A Black Quaker’s “Voice from Within the Veil,”* Rosalind Cobb Wiggins, ed. (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1996):

James Pemberton to Paul Cuffe, 8 June 1808, 77-78

Cuffe to Pemberton, 14 September 1808, 78

Pemberton to Cuffe, 27 September 1808, 79-80

Paul Cuffe’s memorial (petition) to the U.S. Congress, June 1813, 252-53

Cuffe to Nathan Lord, 19 April 1815, 341-43

William Allen to Paul Cuffe, November 1815, 405-408

Cuffe to Allen, 1 April 1816, 408-412

Cuffe to Robert J. Finley, 8 January 1817, 492-93

James Forten to Cuffe, 25 January 1817, 501-503

Cuffe to Forten, 1 March 1817, 509

[Robert J. Finley], *Thoughts on the Colonization of Free Blacks* (n.p., n.d [Washington, 1816]), 1-8

Jared Sparks, ‘Sixth Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Color of the United States,’ *North American Review*, 18, no. 17 (January 1824): 40-90

David Walker, *Walker’s Appeal, in Four Articles...to the Colored Citizens of the World* (Boston: Printed for the Author, 1829), 45-75

Supplemental reading

James T. Campbell, *Middle Passages: African American Journeys to Africa* (New York: Penguin, 2006)

Bronwen Everill, *Abolition and Empire in Sierra Leone and Liberia* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2013)

James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Nicholas Guyatt, *Bind Us Apart: How Enlightened Americans Invented Racial Segregation* (New York: Basic Books, 2016)

Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick, eds., *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2017)

6. Barbarous Masters: Ottomans and the Greek revolt

For nearly four centuries after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Greece was under the rule of the Ottoman empire. Although the Ottomans had a reputation for allowing religious self-determination across their vast empire, Greeks complained about the levels of taxation and military harassment they experienced from Ottoman administrators and soldiers. Isolated disputes after 1815 led to a rising Greek insurgency and eventually a full-blown revolt. The Ottomans waged a counter-revolutionary campaign to destroy Greek resistance, and by 1823 tens of thousands had been killed – including Muslim civilians living in Greek territories, and Greek civilians subject to Ottoman reprisals.

The resulting war for Greek independence drew the attention of ‘benevolent’ observers and statesmen in Britain, the United States and elsewhere. Lord Byron remains the most famous of the “philhellenes”, the (mostly wealthy) European and American volunteers who flocked to Greece in the early 1820s to support the vaunted descendants of Homer and Plato. “We are all Greeks,” wrote Percy Bysshe Shelley in 1821. “This is the age of the war of the oppressed against the oppressors.”

These sentiments proved extremely popular in the United States, even if the full context of the Greek struggles against the Ottomans were more complicated and murky than the “philhellenes” made out. This week’s readings introduce the American debate over whether the U.S. government should formally recognise the Greek cause. Sereno Edwards Dwight was the son of the president of Yale, and a former chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives. His oration is one of many local outpourings of sympathy for Greece during the early 1820s. The debates in Congress in January 1824 featured a number of speeches expressing similarly pro-Greek sentiments; though the more sceptical members of the House of Representatives reflect a broader range of thinking on key questions of international law and humanitarian intervention. Did the American Revolution oblige the U.S. government to support the cause of freedom wherever it was threatened? Would recognising the independence of Greece extend the principles of 1776, or create a dangerous precedent for U.S. entanglement in the wider world? And how much did domestic issues – slavery, in particular – distort the debate over American commitments and ideals on the world stage?

An older secondary literature focused on Americans’ romantic expressions of cultural affinity with an idealised classical Greece. More recent works – including Rodogno and Heraclides/Dialla, on the reading list below – approach the Greek revolt as an early example of liberal interventionism. If you’re completely new to the ‘eastern question’ in European history, it’s worth checking out one or both of these readings to anchor yourself in the complicated (but crucial) geopolitics. Unsurprisingly, these more recent studies conclude that the ‘idealistic’ grounds for European intervention in Greece were hedged by more selfish or transactional calculations of *realpolitik*.

The short piece from the *Christian Watchman*, along with the extract from Samuel Gridley Howe’s memoir/history of the revolt, point towards another question: what kind of empire did Americans see when they looked towards the Ottomans? Were the Greeks justified in their revolt on religious grounds, or for anti-imperial reasons, or because of the distinctive cultural dimensions of Ottoman repression? NB that Samuel Howe was one of the few Americans who joined nearly 500 European volunteers to fight in the revolution. The extract here gives us a sense of his views of Ottoman imperialism, and of the specific features that made Ottoman rule especially objectionable.

Assigned reading

'Turkish Empire', *Christian Watchman*, 3 November 1821, 186-87

Sereno Edwards Dwight, *The Greek Revolution: An Address, Delivered in Park Street Church* (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1824)

Speeches from the debate in the House of Representatives on Greece, *Annals of Congress*, 18th Cong. 1 sess. (19 January 1824)

Daniel Webster (MA), 1084-99

Joel Poinsett (SC), 1104-11

John Randolph (VA), 1111-13

Henry Dwight (MA), 1116-26

Silas Wood (NY), 1132-39

Ichabod Barlett (NH), 1150-55

Alexander Smyth (VA), 1204-13

Samuel Gridley Howe, *An Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution* (New York: White, Gallaher & White, 1828), 367-87

Supplemental reading

Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914; The Emergence of a European Concept and International Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 63-90

Alexis Heraclides and Ada Dialla, *Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), 105-33

Karine V. Walther, *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 33-67

David Mayers, *Dissenting Voices in America's Rise to Power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 56-79

James W. Trent, Jr., *The Manliest Man: Samuel G. Howe and the Contours of Nineteenth-Century American Reform* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), 29-50

William St. Clair, *That Greece Might Still Be Free: The Philhellenes in the War of Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972)

7. Christian imperialism: The American mission to Burma

Between 1810 and 1850, American evangelicals developed a formidable overseas missionary enterprise. Often riding on the coattails of their British counterparts (and British imperial officials), American missionaries established outposts in South and Southeast Asia, China, the Pacific and West Africa. According to historian Emily Conroy-Krutz, these men and women were practitioners of “Christian imperialism”; they “presumed the right to come into foreign spaces and transform them,” she argues, “relying on their own values as they judged those around them.” With the notable exception of Hawaii, however, where they laid the groundwork for the eventual U.S. annexation of the archipelago, American missionaries mostly pursued their spiritual ambitions without reference to a formal U.S. imperialism. Should we see them, regardless, as the advanced guard of American empire? Are they better thought of as junior partners in the British imperial effort, given that they worked in areas that were coming under the formal sway of the British empire during the early nineteenth century? Or should we insist on a clear distinction between political and cultural imperialism?

This week we’ll consider these questions through the writing of Ann Hasseltine Judson, one of the most celebrated American women of the nineteenth century. (Though largely forgotten today.) Judson was born in Massachusetts in 1789, the year of George Washington’s inauguration, and became a schoolteacher in 1807. She married a local seminary student, Adoniram Judson, in 1812, and moved with him to Calcutta that autumn. The Judsons were among the first American missionaries to travel to South Asia, and Anne was expected to play a full role in the establishment of an American mission in Calcutta. But their arrival in India coincided with the outbreak of the War of 1812, which severed relations between Britain and the United States. To complicate things further, the Judsons converted from Congregationalism to Baptism, breaking their connection with the U.S. missionary board that had sponsored their journey. They fled British India for Burma, which was then an independent empire (albeit one with an increasingly fractious relationship with the British Raj). With one or two interruptions, the Judsons lived in Rangoon from 1813 to 1824, when they moved to the Burmese royal capital of Ava. Ann Judson described their life in a series of letters published in the Baptist press in the United States, and then her *Particular Relation of the American Baptist Mission*.

Although the Judsons came to Burma to avoid the restrictions they faced in India in 1812, the British caught up with them in 1824. They were witnesses to – or participants in – the first Anglo-Burmese war (1824-26) a conflict that was crucial to the erosion of Burmese independence and fundamental to the modern history of South Asia. (I’ve put some basic accounts of the political backdrop in the secondary reading.) Adoniram Judson was accused of spying for the British, and imprisoned in Ava; Ann Judson insisted that they were Americans, not Britons, and insisted on the independence of the U.S. mission as the war raged around her. The second reading this week is an account of this period edited by James Knowles, another missionary, which contains letters from Judson’s husband as well as from other American missionaries in Burma. In two long letters from Ann Judson, however, you can see how this American woman made sense of her personal ordeal – and you can compare her wartime reflections and activities with the hopes and judgements she’d registered during her first years in Burma.

Assigned reading

Ann H. Judson, *A Particular Relation of the American Baptist Mission to the Burman Empire* (Washington: John Meehan, 1823), 9-24, 66-106

James D. Knowles, *Memoir of Mrs Ann H. Judson* (London: Wightman and Camp, 1829) 199-261

Supplemental reading

Emily Conroy-Krutz, *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015)

Christine Leigh Heyrman, *American Apostles: When Evangelicals Entered the World of Islam* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2015)

Ussama Makdisi, *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008)

Myint-U, Thant, *The Making of Modern Burma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), esp. 12-20

MaybNicholas Tarling, 'The Establishment of the Colonial Regimes,' in Tarling, ed., *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia, volume 2, part 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1-72, especially 30-37

Michael Aung-Thwin and Maitrii Aung-Thwin, *A History of Myanmar Since Ancient Times* (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), 174-83

Dana L. Robert, 'Evangelist or Homemaker? Mission Strategies of Early Nineteenth-Century Missionary Wives in Burma and Hawaii,' in Wilbert R. Shenk, ed., *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing, 2004), 116-33

Mary Kupiec Cayton, 'Canonizing Harriet Newell: Women, the Evangelical Press, and the Foreign Mission Movement in New England, 1800-1840', in Barbara Reeves-Ellington et al., eds., *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812-1960* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), 69-93

8. Sister republics and hemispheric alliances: Latin America

Soon after Napoleon's conquest of the Iberian peninsula in 1808, the components of what we now call 'Latin America' began to fall from the imperial grasp of Spain (and later Portugal, in the case of Brazil). For U.S. onlookers who'd been frustrated by the course of the French Revolution, Napoleon had become the catalyst for a new set of republican revolutions in the western hemisphere. As the historian Caitlin Fitz has recently argued, the enthusiasm throughout the United States for these revolutions was initially strong, even though the course of liberation struggles from Mexico to Chile was tangled and protracted. In 1825, with independence largely secured across South and Central America, the Venezuelan revolutionary leader Simón Bolívar called for a congress of newly independent nations to meet at Panama the following year. Independence had not solved the internal struggles for power within most of the new American nations, and Bolívar wondered if closer integration might help them to overcome internal and external rivalries. The United States was eventually invited to attend the Panama Congress, even though some Latin American leaders were sceptical about long-term U.S. intentions towards the region. (An anxiety that was to prove prescient.)

The sources this week focus principally on this 1826 U.S. debate over whether President John Quincy Adams should accept the offer of a seat at the table of these hemispheric negotiations in Panama. The question produced a much more protracted debate in Congress (and the country at large) than Adams had expected. His secretary of state, Henry Clay of Kentucky, had long been advocating a *sistema americano* for the Americas to go alongside his 'American system' in the U.S.: a program of managed economic development which, in its hemispheric version, would create a trading bloc to offset the continued economic power of European empires. But congressional representatives fretted over many aspects of the 'Panama mission', from narrowly procedural issues (did Congress have the power to stop the president from dispatching diplomats) to sweeping political questions (would the United States benefit from being part of a political union with its southern neighbours?).

Caitlin Fitz tells the story of Panama mostly through the lens of race: she suggests that southern lawmakers determined both that they didn't want to be in a union with mixed-race peoples of the Spanish-speaking Americas, and that the antislavery instincts of many of the new republics of Latin America were a threat to the power of southern slaveholders. You'll find this perspective in several of the sources; but see if you think there's anything else going on here, when you consider the other points of view in the debate.

One caveat/apology: even one of the new congressmen who spoke up in this debate complained about the length of the speeches. He grumbled, in fact, that congressmen routinely submitted written versions of their speeches to the printer which were three times as long as their (already overlong) orations in the chamber. If you're stuck in a paragraph that seems overly technical or windy, move on to the next one asap!

[Just as a quick guide: there are three speeches in favour of the Panama mission, from John Reed, Francis Johnson and Daniel Webster; and three against, from William C. Rives, Thomas Hart Benton and (most notoriously) John Randolph of Virginia.]

Assigned reading

Simón Bolívar, 'Thoughts on the Congress to be Held in Panama' (1826), in David Bushnell, ed., *El Libertador: Writings of Simón Bolívar*, trans. Frederick H. Fornoff (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 169-70

John Quincy Adams, Message to Congress on the U.S. Mission to Panama, 15 March 1826, in *Appendix to the Congressional Globe*, 29th Cong., 1 sess., 69-73

[Jared Sparks], 'Ensayo sobre la Necesidad de una Federacion Jeneral' [sic], *North American Review*, January 1826, 162-176

Speeches from the debate over the dispatch of a U.S. delegation to the Panama Congress, *Register of Debates*, 19th Cong., 1 sess.:

John Randolph, 1 March 1826 (Senate, VA), 115-32

Thomas Hart Benton, 14 March (Senate, MO), 304-41

William Rives, 6 April (House, VA), 2-65-87

John Reed, Jr., 12 April (House, MA), 2215-24

Francis Johnson, 13 April (House, KY), 2239-54

Daniel Webster, 14 April (House, MA), 2254-77

Supplemental Reading

Caitlin Fitz, *Our Sister Republics: The United States in an Age of Democratic Revolutions* (New York: Norton, 2016), esp. 194-239

Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Towards Latin America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 1-13

Jay Sexton, 'An American System: The North American Union and Latin America in the 1820s', in Matthew Brown and Gabrielle Paquette, eds., *Connections After Colonialism: Europe and Latin America in the 1820s* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2013), 139-59

James E. Lewis Jr., *The American Union and the Problem of Neighborhood: The United States and the Collapse of the Spanish Empire, 1783-1829* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)

Jay Sexton, *The Monroe Doctrine: Empire and Nation in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011)

Salvador Rivera, *Latin American Unification: A History of Political and Economic Integration* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2014), 34-71

Paul D. Naish, *Slavery and Silence: Latin America and the U.S. Slave Debate* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 29-63

9. World orders

The 1830s and 1840s were the decades of ‘manifest destiny’, the fuzzy and decidedly extra-legal concept which held that God had commanded the United States to expand westward, to seize Texas, or to invade the neighbouring state of Mexico. In fact, alongside the more lurid embrace of manifest destiny by excitable journalists and orators, many Americans thought deeply in these decades about the place of the United States within an emerging world order of commerce, law and other ‘civilized’ values. While Britain and other European powers laid the foundations for the expansive understandings of empire and international law that would shape the second half of the nineteenth century. Americans framed their own thoughts about international relations and global order.

The first group of readings this week focus on perhaps the most celebrated theorist of international law in American history, Henry Wheaton. His *Elements of International Law* (1836) were hailed on both sides of the Atlantic as one of the most important contributions to legal theory in the nineteenth century. The *Elements*, along with his 1845 *History of the Law of Nations*, allowed American writers and politicians to present their own authority to rival any European expert on the law of nations. Wheaton’s work, and the responses included here, give a sense of how the emerging global order of the nineteenth century codified the rights of states in an age of imperial ambition.

The second group of readings follow the activities of the American peace movement, which emerged in the mid-1820s and attained considerable prominence in the 1830s and 1840s. The energetic reformer William Ladd led the American Peace Society from its founding in 1828 until his death in 1841. International law enthusiasts weren’t always mainstays of the peace movement, though the Massachusetts senator Charles Sumner helped to connect peace advocates to the powers-that-be in Washington, as well as to experts like Henry Wheaton. Thomas Upham, whose *Peace Manual* is reviewed alongside Wheaton’s *Elements of International Law* in the *North American Review* essay in the first group of readings, was a college professor and a vice president of the American Peace Society. The American Peace Society did not admit female members in the 1830s, though William Ladd insisted in his writing that women were naturally pacific. A number of Ladies’ Peace Societies emerged during this period, however, defining a supporting (but subordinate) role for women in the campaign to end war.

The final readings explore a question that brought abstract issues of law and world order into sharp relief: whether the Royal Navy had the right to stop and search American-flagged vessels that might be illegally participating in the African slave trade. Although Britain and the United States had outlawed the overseas slave trade in 1807 and 1808 respectively, illegal trading continued with the involvement of American ships and investors. (After 1820, the bulk of this trade involved supplying slaves to Cuba and Brazil, rather than the United States.) While U.S. laws against illegal slavers had been tightened in 1820, Britain sought international agreement on a power to stop and search foreign-flagged vessels suspected of involvement in slavery. Was this a piece of benevolence on the part of Britain, or a form of legal imperialism? (Could it have been both?) And to what extent was the U.S. position on stop-and-search influenced by southern slaveholders in government, or the sensitivities of the South more generally? In addition to Wheaton, there are perspectives here from an (anonymous) contributor to the *Boston Recorder*; from the former Michigan governor Lewis Cass, then serving in the U.S. mission to France; from Matthew Maury (writing as Harry Bluff), a former U.S. Navy officer and future leader of the Confederacy; David L. Child, a celebrated abolitionist; and former U.S. president John Quincy Adams.

Required reading

International law

Henry Wheaton, *Elements of International Law* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea and Blanchard, 1836), 70-75, 81-94, 114-118, 137-141

'Elements of International Law', *North American Review*, January 1837, 16-29

'Law of Nations', *Democratic Review*, July 1847, 23-32

The Peace Movement

William Ladd, *The Essays of Philanthropos on Peace and War* (Portland: Shirley and Edwards, 1825), 10-13, 57-64, 138-44

Summary reports of the Boston and Philadelphia Ladies' Peace Societies, *Advocate of Peace*, September 1837, 1-4

William Ladd, 'Practicability of a Congress of Nations', *Advocate of Peace*, October 1838, 97-102

Thomas Upham, 'Influence of War Upon Missions,' *Advocate of Peace*, December 1840, 222-24

Charles Sumner, *The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations: An Address Before the American Peace Society, May 28, 1849* (Boston: American Peace Society, 1854), 57-70

The Right of Search

'The Slave Trade', *Boston Recorder*, 3 December 1841

Henry Wheaton, *Enquiry into the Validity of the British Claim to a Right of Visitation and Search* (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1842), 68-73, 144-51

[Lewis Cass], 'The Right of Search', *Niles' Register*, 26 March 1842, 54-60

Harry Bluff [Matthew Maury], 'The Right of Search', *Southern Literary Messenger*, April 1842, 389-401

David L. Child, 'The Right of Search', *Liberator*, 28 April 1842

'J.Q. Adams on Slavery', *Boston Recorder*, 7 September 1843

Supplemental reading

Jean Allain, *Slavery in International Law: Of Human Exploitation and Trafficking* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 2012), 64-73

Lauren Benton and Lisa Ford, *Rage for Order: The British Empire and the Origins of International Law, 1800-1850* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016)

Peter Brock, *Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 482-522

Benjamin Allen Coates, *Legalist Empire: International Law and American Foreign Relations in the Early Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 15-38

Richard Huzzey, *Freedom Burning: Anti-Slavery and Empire in Victorian Britain* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012)

Leonard Marques, *The United States and the Transatlantic Slave Trade to the Americas, 1776-1867* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016)

Jenny S. Martinez, *The Slave Trade and the Origins of International Human Rights Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Andrew Porter, 'Trusteeship, Anti-Slavery, and Humanitarianism', in Porter, *Oxford History of the British Empire*, 198-221

10. Overgrown powers: Imperialism in practice

The 1830s provided American observers with regular evidence of European imperial ambition. The French began colonizing Algeria in 1830, wresting the region from its Ottoman rulers and beginning the process of transferring French settlers and mores across the Mediterranean. At the other end of the decade, Britain went to war in protest at the Chinese government's attempts to suppress the (illegal) trade in opium. In both instances, thousands of people were killed – mostly Algerians and Chinese – as European powers used violence to increase their commercial or territorial domination. You might expect that these outrages would occasion considerable protest in the United States, and perhaps coalesce into a full-blown critique of imperialism. As we'll see, this isn't exactly what happened.

On Algeria, the readings include short newspaper responses to the French invasion and colonizing effort, along with a longer reflection from 1846 by Robert Walsh. You'll remember we read Walsh's critique of Napoleonic France last term. In the 1840s, he was serving as a U.S. diplomat in Paris, and had a close-up view of French debates about the 'liberal' nature of imperialism as the French presence in Algeria was expanded.

On Britain's treatment of India, there's a speech by the British-born Harvard professor William Adam, who had worked in India for twenty years as a Baptist missionary and later as a teacher and colonial official; an essay by the celebrated abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, introducing a book of lectures by the British abolitionist and campaigner George Thompson; and a brief dispatch written in 1848 by an American missionary living in India. NB that India in these years occupied a curious position in the minds of American reformers: while they were learning about imperial exploitation via the British campaigners who'd recently founded the British India Association in London, they also hoped that a reformed British empire in India might produce enough cotton (under free labour conditions) to bankrupt the slave system in the United States. American antislavery activists forged close links with their counterparts in Britain, hoping that a transatlantic reform alliance might bring pressure on the U.S. government to curb the expansion of American slavery. The role of empire in this calculus

On the First Opium War in China, there's an article by Edwin Crosswell, a prominent Democratic newspaper editor from Albany, New York; a gloss on an extract from the Irish novelist Sydney Owenson's feminist tract *Woman and Her Master* (1840); a (surprising) lecture by former president of the United States, John Quincy Adams, who was usually seen by reformers as one of their own; a rebuttal of Adams's views of the war by William Adam; and an essay by the Baltimore merchant and U.S. diplomat Brantz Mayer, who had spent several years in the Chinese treaty port of Canton in the 1820s.

Algeria

'Algiers', *Christian Register*, 11 September 1830

'Algiers', *Illinois Monthly Magazine*, October 1830, 35-43

'Algiers', *Episcopal Recorder*, 29 August 1835

'Mission to Algiers', *Christian Secretary*, 26 March 1836

Robert Walsh, 'Algeria', *Littell's Living Age*, 1 August 1846, 240-44

India

'British India – Speech of Professor Adam,' *Liberator*, 14 February 1840

William Lloyd Garrison, Preface, in George Thompson, *Lectures on British India* (Pawtucket, R.I.: William and Robert Adams, 1840), iii-xii

D.O. Allen, 'Letter from India,' *Advocate of Peace*, September 1848, 262-64

China

Edwin Crosswell, 'China and England', *Northern Light*, May 1841, 29-31

'The Women of India and China', *Family Magazine*, 1 May 1841, 351-52

John Quincy Adams, 'Lecture on the War with China, Delivered before the Massachusetts Historical Society' (December 1841), *Niles National Register*, 22 January 1842, 326-30

William Adam, 'Great Britain and China', *Christian Examiner*, July 1842, 1-18, 37-39

Brantz Mayer, 'China and the Chinese', *Southern Quarterly Review*, 1-51

Supplemental reading

Benjamin Stora, *Algeria, 1830-2000: A Short History* (Ithaca, 2001), 1-27

D.A Washbrook, 'India, 1818-1860: The Two Faces of Colonialism', in Andrew Porter, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 395-421

Emma Major, *Slavery, Abolitionism and Empire in India, 1772-1843* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012)

Jennifer Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006)

Stephen R. Platt, 'New Domestic and Global Challenges, 1792-1860', in Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom, ed., *Oxford Illustrated History of Modern China* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 37-62

Julia Lovell, *The Opium War: Drugs, Dreams and the Making of China* (London: Picador, 2011)

11. Black nationalism and imperialism at mid-century

For more than two decades after its founding in 1821, the black colony at Liberia occupied an anomalous position in international affairs. The blessing and assistance of [James Monroe's](#) administration had been a prerequisite for the founding of the colony, but it was neither an independent nation nor an overseas possession of the United States. Instead, Liberia was under the control of the American Colonization Society (ACS), a private entity. The delicate domestic politics of slavery within the United States made it virtually impossible for the U.S. government formally to take over the colony, not least because the ACS and Liberia were decried by proslavery residents of the Deep South states as instruments of abolition. (Abolitionists took a very different view of the Society's glacial progress, but in the South it was seen as an antislavery force.) But could Liberia survive in the mid-nineteenth century without a more settled and formal relationship to a sovereign power? The first five readings this week explore this question. The first two readings report the debate among Congressional representatives, government officials and diplomats over the future of Liberia. The following articles follow the progress of Liberia towards its declaration of independence in 1847.

As we saw last term, Liberia and the ACS were viewed with considerable scepticism by many African Americans. Although [David Walker](#) may have been exaggerating in his accusation that the Colonization Society was a proslavery conspiracy – intended to remove free blacks from the United States while riveting the chains of American slaves – the ACS struggled to convince most free blacks (and even slaves) that Liberia offered a hopeful vision of the future. However, African Americans continued to debate the merits of other forms of black nationalism and emigration, especially after the passage of the notorious Fugitive Slave Act in 1850. The FSA introduced a much harsher regime of policing for runaway slaves, effectively forcing magistrates and local officials in northern (free) states to acquiesce in the rounding up of suspected runaways. To free blacks in the North, this measure considerably increased the danger that they might be wrongfully arrested and effectively kidnapped into southern slavery. Many free blacks who had previously dismissed the idea of colonization/emigration now began to explore a new wave of schemes for creating a black nation beyond the bounds of the United States. In 1854, a national convention of free black leaders debated the merits of these schemes, and made a formal commitment to emigration. (Led by the charismatic [Martin R. Delany](#).) Their statement on the “political destiny” of African Americans is by turns a rejection and an appropriation of European imperialism. Several of the signatories would continue to promote black emigration – to Haiti, Central America, and even to Africa – until 1862 or 1863, when the U.S. Civil War took a decisive turn towards the abolition of slavery.

Did emigration necessarily imply racial separation? One black activist who initially argued against this position was [Mary Ann Shadd Cary](#), a pathfinding activist and newspaper editor from Delaware who left the United States for Canada after the passage of the FSA. Her 1852 pamphlet promoting black emigration to Canada insisted that African Americans could help to forge a racially integrated society north of the United States under the auspices of Britain; though she also acknowledge the power of black emigration to other (imperial?) spaces along the lines envisaged by Martin Delany. The extracts I've asked you to read here raise fascinating questions about the relationship between nationalism, segregation/separation and imperialism; while reminding us that Britain continued to offer Americans both a blueprint for imperialism throughout the nineteenth century and a geopolitical alternative to U.S. rule.

The final source this week is from the Missouri politician [Frank Blair](#). In 1856, when he won a seat in the U.S. Congress, Blair became one of the very few representatives from a slave state to support the principle of ‘free soil’ – which held that slavery should be banned from any new territories which came into the American Union. Along with his father, [Preston](#), and his brother, [Montgomery](#), Frank Blair became a crucial political ally of [Abraham Lincoln](#) – and a close friend of the president. Blair, like Lincoln, was convinced in the late 1850s that the days of slavery were numbered. It was the Blair family, however, who worked to convince Lincoln that the end of slavery made the need for black resettlement much more pressing. Many Republicans (Lincoln included) would make soaring speeches on the need for racial separation in the late 1850s and early 1860s; Lincoln was still pushing this line in the summer of 1862. Frank Blair’s speech of 1859, which he wrote with his father, remains one of the most striking expressions of the colonization argument. NB that this was delivered – to great acclaim – in Boston, the seat of America’s most radical antislavery campaigners.

Assigned reading

Report of the House of Representatives Commerce Committee, 28 February 1843, in ‘African Colonization’, Rep. No. 283, House of Representatives, 27th Cong., 3 sess., 1-7
‘Important Correspondence’, *Maryland Colonization Journal*, new series, 2, no. 12 (July 1844): 194-202

‘What Ought We To Do?’, *African Repository*, August 1845, 237-42

‘Great Britain and Liberia’, *African Repository*, October 1845, 312-16

‘The Republic of Liberia’, *New York Evangelist*, 16 December 1847

Joseph Henry Allen, ‘Republic of Liberia’, *Christian Examiner*, September 1848, 175-94

Martin R. Delany et al., ‘Political Destiny of the Colored Race on the American Continent’, in *Proceedings of the National Emigration Convention of Colored People held at Cleveland, Ohio...25th and 26th of August, 1854* (Pittsburgh: A.A. Anderson, 1854), 33-70

Mary Ann Shadd Cary, *A Plea for Emigration, or, Notes of Canada West* (Detroit: George W. Pattison, 1852), iii-iv, 17-28, 30-44

Frank P. Blair, Jr., *The Destiny of the Races on this Continent* (Boston: Buell & Blanchard, 1859), 1-28, 33-37

Supplemental reading

Tunde Adeleke, *UnAfrican Americans: Nineteenth Century Black Nationalists and the Civilizing Mission* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1998)

http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=44CAM_ERDB388190&context=L&vid=44CAM_PROD&search_scope=default_scope&isFrbr=true&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US

Richard Blackett, ‘Martin R. Delany and Robert Campbell: Black Americans in Search of an African Colony’, *Journal of Negro History*, 62, no. 1 (Jan. 1977): 1-25

Floyd J. Miller, *The Search for a Black Nationality: Black Emigration and Colonization, 1787-1863* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975)

Ousmane Power-Greene, *Against Wind and Tide: The African American Struggle Against the Colonization Movement* (New York: New York University Press, 2014)

http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=44CAM_ERDB401705&context=L&vid=44CAM_PROD&search_scope=default_scope&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US

Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick, eds., *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2017), especially essays by Brandon Mills and Bronwen Everill

Eugene S. Van Sickle, 'Reluctant Imperialists: The U.S. Navy and Liberia, 1819-1845', *Journal of the Early Republic*, 31 (Spring 2011): 107-134

12. The 'Slave Power'

In 1846, the United States went to war with its southern neighbour, Mexico, in a dispute which was widely held to have been manufactured by the U.S. government for the purpose of territorial aggrandizement. At the war's end two years later, the United States annexed the northern third of Mexico, including California and much of what is now the U.S. Southwest. As Europeans were celebrating, protesting or lamenting the revolutions (and counter-revolutions) of 1848, Americans debated the relationship between territorial expansion and national greatness. The Mexican War had enjoyed strong support from many northerners, who drew upon the romantic vocabulary of 'manifest destiny' to project the expansion of the American republic from Canada to South America. But it was bitterly opposed by opponents of slavery, who suspected that the opening of new western territories was a Southern attempt to extend the bounds of slavery.

From 1848 until 1861, arguments about territorial expansion were the catalyst for an increasingly bitter struggle over slavery in the United States. Some historians have argued that white southerners incubated their own vision of a slaveholding empire during these years, effectively hijacking the course of American history until the rise of Abraham Lincoln and the onset of Civil War. These historians would remind you that Lincoln's challenge to the South in 1860 wasn't an appeal for abolition, but an insistence that slavery could not be allowed in any new territories acquired through expansion. From this perspective, even if one concedes that Lincoln was far from an abolitionist on the eve of the Civil War, one can present him as the radical opponent of the 'Slave Power' and its toxic formulation of proslavery imperialism.

This interpretation has become popular in recent years, but there are a few reasons to be cautious of its claims. First, many northerners were happy to embrace territorial expansion, and even antislavery campaigners saw virtue in expansion in the West or the Caribbean. Second, the South did not speak with a single voice on questions of slavery, expansion and empire. Third, very little additional expansion took place between 1848 and 1861. With the exception of another (relatively small) cession of Mexican land in 1853, there were no additions to U.S. territory between the end of the Mexican War in 1848 and the purchase of Alaska in 1867. The political crisis over slavery played a major role in preventing further U.S. expansion during these two decades. But Americans – northerners and southerners – also found it hard to agree on a blueprint for a greater United States. In their discussions and disputes, we can see a diverse set of views on the logic and appeal of imperialism.

The first group of readings offer general southern perspectives on the place of the United States in the world. William H. Trescot was a lawyer and diplomat from Charleston. His 1849 pamphlet offers a distinctive vision for the U.S. within a broader world of empires; the 1850 review in the *Southern Literary Messenger* offers some important qualifications to that vision. Leonidas Spratt was also a South Carolinian, and a fervent defender of the centrality of slavery to the future of southern states. His 1853 essay (reprinted across the South and North) proposed the re-opening of the foreign slave trade, which had been closed since 1808, and the consolidation of American political power around the twin goals of slavery and expansion. Spratt is Exhibit A for historians who argue that proslavery imperialism was the dominant worldview in American corridors of power during the 1850s; though NB that even many prominent slaveholders dismissed both his views on the slave trade and his expansionist agenda.

The second group of readings focus on Cuba, perhaps the most likely (and controversial) prospect for further U.S. expansion in the 1850s. Along with Puerto Rico, Cuba was the last redoubt of Spanish imperial power in the western hemisphere. Spain had invested

considerable effort in ‘reforming’ the island after the Haitian Revolution, and by the middle of the nineteenth century Cuba boasted a ‘modern’ network of sugar factories and railroads, along with a mixed labour force of black slaves and Chinese indentured workers. Around 40% of Cuba’s population was white, a much higher figure than had been common in the French and British slave systems of the Caribbean. The combination of a significant Spanish creole population and apparently modern forms of agriculture and industry persuaded some observers in the United States that Cuba was an improved version of the U.S. South. This led Northern and Southern commentators in the United States to promote the annexation of the island to the American republic, albeit for different reasons.

Alongside an unsigned 1850 editorial in the leading Southern magazine *De Bow’s Review*, the sources offer a variety of perspectives on Cuba. [Jane McManus Storms Cazneau](#) was a New York journalist who worked alongside John O’Sullivan, the inventor of ‘manifest destiny’. (Her biographer has argued that it was McManus who actually came up with the phrase.) In the late 1840s McManus became involved with a variety of schemes to annex an even larger section of Mexico to the United States, and then to grab Cuba. Working alongside Cuban radicals in New York, who were keen to end Spanish imperial control over the island, McManus used her newspaper columns (and the pamphlet here) to promote the transfer of Cuba from Spain to the United States. Edward Bryan, by contrast, was a South Carolinian of the Leonidas Spratt variety. His 1854 essay on Cuba raised the spectre that the island might follow Haiti and become an independent black nation – an insult and a threat to the assumptions of black inferiority which underpinned the southern economy and social system. [William Seward](#) was a U.S. senator from New York, and one of the most prominent antislavery politicians in Washington. (He would become Abraham Lincoln’s secretary of state in 1861.) Seward’s speech here is taken from a Congressional debate over Cuba in 1859, following President James Buchanan’s request for congressional authority to negotiate a treaty to acquire the island from Spain. Most observers thought there was little chance of Buchanan persuading Spain to sell, and a very great chance that his initiative would simply inflame international tensions. Seward took this line in his speech, signaling carefully that his opposition was to Buchanan’s manoeuvre rather than to the more general question of a future U.S. embrace of Cuba.

The final source, an essay written by magazine editor [James De Bow](#) a month after the formation of the Confederate States of America, offers a short commentary on the appeal of expansion to proslavery southerners on the other side of secession.

American (southern?) destinies

William Henry Trescot, *A Few Thoughts on the Foreign Policy of the United States* (Charleston: John Russell, 1849), 3-24

‘Our Foreign Policy’, *Southern Literary Messenger*, January 1850, 1-6

Leonidas W. Spratt, ‘Destiny of the Slave States’, *De Bow’s Review*, September 1854, 280-84

Cuba

Cora Montgomery [Jane McManus], *The Queen of Islands and the King of Rivers* (New York: Charles Wood, 1850), 3-27

‘The Late Cuba Expedition’, *De Bow’s Review*, August 1850, 164-77

Edward B. Bryan, 'Cuba and the Tripartite Treaty', *Southern Quarterly Review*, January 1854, 1-17

William Seward, Senate speech on the acquisition of Cuba, 35th Cong., 2 sess. (24 January 1859), 538-40

James De Bow, 'Cuba: The March of Empire and the Course of Trade', *De Bow's Review*, January 1861, 30-42

Supplemental reading

Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Matthew Pratt Guterl, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008)

Linda S. Hudson, *Mistress of Manifest Destiny: A Biography of Jane McManus Storm Cazneau* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2001)

Matthew Karp, *This Vast Southern Empire: Slaveholders at the Helm of American Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016)

Rodrigo Lazo, *Writing to Cuba: Filibustering and Cuban Exiles in the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005)

Robert E. May, 'Lobbyists for Commercial Empire: Jane Cazneau, William Cazneau, and U.S. Caribbean Policy, 1846-1878', *Pacific Historical Review*, 48, no. 3 (Aug. 1979): 383-412

Robert E. May, *The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, 1854-1861* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2002)

Robert E. May, *Slavery, Race, and Conquest in the Tropics: Lincoln, Douglas, and the Future of Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

13. Imperial and Republican expansion: Mexico and the Caribbean

This week's readings contrast the French invasion and occupation of Mexico from 1862 to 1867 with the renewed interest of Americans in expansion into the Caribbean after the U.S. Civil War. As Patrick Kelly describes in his article on 'The North American Crisis of the 1860s', the collapse of the United States in 1861 created an opportunity for Britain, Spain and France to extend their influence into the heart of North America. Their joint mission to collect debts from Mexico's flagging Liberal government soon became an exclusively French mission to establish a puppet monarch - the Austrian nobleman Maximilian - as Emperor of Mexico. A French monarch, Napoleon III, had installed another European as supreme ruler of the United States' southern neighbour. You'll find a number of newspaper and magazine articles (mostly) decrying this, along with one or two which are more sanguine at the prospect of a "strong" ruler in place of persistently weak Mexican regimes. It's worth looking closely at what these American commentators think they're defending in Mexico, and at their hopes for U.S.-Mexican relations when the 'crisis of the 1860s' is eventually resolved.

Within months of the defeat of the Confederacy in 1865, American politicians and journalists were writing excitedly about the prospects of U.S. expansion into the Caribbean. Their enthusiasm was partly fuelled by a triumphalism which accompanied the defeat of slavery; but partly by the instability that had once again gripped the region. Spain had taken advantage of the distraction of the U.S. Civil War to re-annex the Dominican Republic in 1861, but had been forced to withdraw in early 1865 – its occupation almost perfectly spanning the course of the fighting between the Union and the Confederacy. In Cuba, meanwhile, independence advocates launched a new struggle to throw off the Spanish yoke. In 1868, Cuba was in open revolt, and Santo Domingo (as Americans called the Dominican Republic) was the site of a fierce power struggle between rival political groupings. With Cuban independence advocates keen for U.S. support in their war with Spain, and Dominican factions open to a U.S. alliance which might consolidate their own grip on power, the United States found no shortage of suitors on the other side of the Florida Straits.

Although many business interests and reformers urged support for the independence movement in Cuba, Congress and the new presidential administration of Ulysses S. Grant (1869-77) settled on Santo Domingo as the next front for American expansion. The second set of readings this week follow the debate over whether the United States should annex the Dominican Republic. We begin with an 1867 letter from Thaddeus Stevens, the celebrated abolitionist, celebrating the prospect of American expansion into the Caribbean. Initially, Washington commentators assumed that Cuba, Haiti or Santo Domingo might become protectorates of the United States – with the U.S. borrowing a trusted imperial technique from its European rivals.

Ulysses Grant seems to have decided on Dominican annexation soon after entering the White House in March 1869. His extraordinary memo on this subject was found in his papers – undated, but presumably written in 1869 or early 1870. Grant hatched his plan with the support of many prominent businessmen, but also with the blessing of a variety of reformers including – most strikingly – the legendary black abolitionist Frederick Douglass. But the antislavery community soon found itself divided on the question of annexation. Charles Sumner, William Lloyd Garrison and Carl Schurz – all luminaries of the antislavery struggle – came out against annexation, for a variety of reasons. Henry Blackwell and Douglass spoke energetically in favour of the idea. The debate is fascinating for a host of reasons: Charles Sumner, avowed enemy of the 'caste principle' in politics, claimed that the United States should stay out of the Caribbean because the region belonged to black people. (As one of his

former allies in the abolitionist movement pointed out, this seemed to imply that the United States should belong to white people.) Carl Schurz, a German exile from the revolutions of 1848, not to mention a distinguished newspaper editor, Civil War general and politician, insisted that the “laws of climate” made it inadvisable for the United States to expand southwards. On the other side, the reforming journalist Henry Blackwell insisted that Santo Domingo might hold the key to solving the problem of integrating African Americans into U.S. society; and Frederick Douglass offered remarkable reflections on the importance of “composite nations” in a world in which power was the principal determinant of international affairs. Spoiler alert: for a host of reasons, the effort to annex the Dominican Republic ultimately failed. But the debate offered a fascinating snapshot of U.S. thinking about race, nationalism and imperialism in the afterglow of slavery’s demise.

Required reading

Mexico

‘Mexico’, *Christian Advocate and Journal*, 27 February 1862

‘France and Mexico’, *Independent*, 23 October 1862

‘Have we given up the Monroe Doctrine?’ *Independent*, 5 March 1863

‘United We Stand’, *Littell’s Living Age*, 22 August 1863

‘The New Empire of Mexico’, *Merchants’ Magazine*, 1 July 1864

‘Maximilian in Mexico’, *The Round Table*, 16 July 1864

William Seward [secretary of state] to Marquis de Montholon, 6 December 1865, in Executive Documents, 1st Session, 39th Congress (1865-66), 450-51

‘America for Americans’, *New York Times*, 7 January 1866

‘Our Lesson in Mexico’, *The Round Table*, 6 June 1868

Santo Domingo

‘Views of Thaddeus Stevens’, *New York Times*, 31 October 1867

Ulysses S. Grant, “Reasons Why Santo Domingo Should be Annexed to the United States” (1869-70), in *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant*, ed. John Y. Simon, 30 vols. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967–2008), 20: 74–76

Charles Sumner, *Naboth’s Vineyard: Speech of Hon. Charles Sumner on the Proposed Annexation of “The Island of San Domingo”* (Washington: n.p., 1870), 3-16

Carl Schurz, speech to the U.S. Senate, 11 January 1871, *Appendix to the Congressional Globe*, 41 Cong., 3 sess., 25–34

Henry Blackwell, ‘Santo Domingo – The Case Stated’, *Independent*, 20 April 1871

Frederick Douglass, ‘Santo Domingo’, typescript of a lecture written and delivered in 1871, Frederick Douglass Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, DC

Supplemental reading

Don Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015)

Nicholas Guyatt, 'America's Conservatory: Race, Reconstruction and the Santo Domingo Controversy', *Journal of American History* 97 (March 2011): 974-1000

Howard Jones, *Abraham Lincoln and a New Birth of Freedom: The Union and Slavery in the Diplomacy of the Civil War* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002)

Patrick J. Kelly, 'The North American Crisis of the 1860s', *Journal of the Civil War Era*, vol. 2, no. 3 (2012): 337-368

Robert S. Levine, *Dislocating Race and Nation: Episodes in Nineteenth-Century American Literary Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008)

Eric T. L. Love, *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004)

Eugenio Matibag, *Haitian-Dominican Counterpoint: Nation, State, and Race on Hispaniola* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Thomas D. Schoonover, ed., *Mexican Lobby: Matías Romero in Washington, 1861-1867* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986)

Jay Sexton, "'The Imperialism of the Declaration of Independence' in the Civil War Era', in Tyrrell and Sexton, *Empire's Twin*, 59-76

Allison L. Sneider, *Suffragists in an Imperial Age: U.S. Expansion and the Woman Question, 1870-1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

14. The Belgian Congo

We tend to think of the ‘Scramble for Africa’ in the late nineteenth century as an exclusively European endeavour. In fact, the United States played an important role in the carve-up of the continent. The most famous explorer of the era, Henry Morton Stanley (1841-1904), was born in Wales but moved to the United States at the age of fifteen. He fought in the Civil War – on both sides, incongruously – and became a foreign correspondent after 1865. Working for the *New York Herald*, Stanley grabbed the scoop of the century in 1871 when he discovered the long-lost British missionary David Livingstone in Tanzania. He continued to file sensational stories throughout the 1870s, keeping what he called the “dark continent” on the front pages of newspapers and magazines across America.

Stanley’s most critical role, however, was in the exploration and annexation of the central African region that became known as the Congo Free State. Accepting a commission from the Belgian emperor Leopold II in 1879, Stanley spent five years in Central Africa helping to establish Leopold’s claim to the region. Drawing on his personal experience, and a variety of scientific and religious arguments, Stanley told European and American readers that the Congo should be exempt from the rivalries and imperial struggles that were multiplying across the continent. His views in this respect dovetailed neatly with a number of U.S. businessmen, politicians, missionaries and philanthropists who saw a ‘free state’ in Central Africa as a useful vehicle for American influence. At the notorious Berlin Conference of 1884, the United States sided with Leopold over Britain as the carve-up of Africa was worked out. Laundering Leopold’s claims that the ‘free state’ would be governed by a philanthropic organization – the International African Association – rather than by the Belgian state, the American representatives in Berlin and the administration of Chester Arthur helped to deliver Central Africa to its imperial overlord. For the most part, this manoeuvre received enthusiastic support from American newspapers, magazines and religious groups.

How did Americans find themselves playing a supporting role in one of the greatest crimes of European imperialism? This week’s readings explore this question from a variety of perspectives. The first group of sources focus on Stanley and the popularization of African exploration in the late 1870s/early 1880s. Charles Daly’s 1878 feature in the popular magazine *Leslie’s Monthly* shows how Stanley’s supposed heroics were used to ‘open’ the continent to American readers. (Daly, a New York judge, spent nearly thirty-five years as president of the American Geographical Society, and counted Stanley and Leopold II among his correspondents.) The cult of personality surrounding Stanley informed newspaper commentary throughout the period; the supposed imperative of ‘civilizing’ Africa, meanwhile, was promoted by missionary organisations and a variety of public figures. The 1884 lecture here by Joseph Cook gives a good sense of the reach of the debate over Africa: Cook was one of the most celebrated figures on the wildly-popular late-nineteenth-century lecture circuit, and was comfortable declaiming on the mission of the United States and Europe despite lacking any first-hand knowledge of Central Africa or the Sahel. (NB that Cook here mentions General Charles George Gordon, the notorious British commander who attempted to defend Britain’s client regime in Khartoum in 1884 and 1885. Gordon drew almost as much interest as Stanley in the mid-1880s, especially after Khartoum fell to its local attackers and Gordon himself was killed.)

The second group of sources focuses on the debate over the creation of Congo Free State, and on the political and ‘philanthropic’ calculations of Americans who took a view on the question. John T. Morgan, the U.S. senator from Alabama, was the principal author of a Senate Foreign Relations Committee report defending Leopold’s right to rule the Congo Free

State personally (through the ‘benevolent’ vehicle of a faux-NGO, the International African Association). Morgan had a number of commercial motives for promoting Leopold’s rule; incredibly, he also held out the hope that the Free State might induce African Americans to move ‘back’ to Africa. Morgan was a committed defender of racial supremacy in his home state, and worked tirelessly until his death in 1907 to ensure that the promises of the Reconstruction period were denied to black Alabamans. That he was also one of the most prominent voices in the debate over the ‘benevolence’ of Leopold II’s designs on Central Africa is worth thinking about. The alliances between Stanley, Morgan and figures like Charles Daly and Alvan Southworth (secretary of the American Geographical Society, and an African explorer himself) suggest that prominent public figures in the North and South could easily come together less than two decades after the Civil War to promote a shared vision of racial engineering. Surprisingly, it’s hard to find much criticism of this from northern newspapers, even those closely associated with the antislavery/reform cause. It’s worth noting that this was also a moment in which African American missionaries began operating in Congo Free State. Lulu Fleming, one of the first African American women to undertake missionary work in Africa, wrote many letters back to Baptist magazines in the United States on the progress of her evangelizing efforts. As you’ll see from her October 1887 letter, Fleming’s views were presented by her American editors as a simple endorsement of the missionary contribution to ‘civilizing’ the “dark continent”.

The final group of readings focus on George Washington Williams, an African American who was born free in Pennsylvania in 1849, and who joined the U.S. Army to fight the Confederacy at the age of sixteen (following Lincoln’s decision to permit black enlistment in 1863). Williams was already an extraordinary figure by the mid-1880s: in addition to his military service, he’d become a Baptist minister, a popular public speaker, a newspaper editor, and the first African American to be elected to the Ohio state legislature. Oh, and he’d written his *History of the Negro Race in America*, one of the first sustained pieces of historical scholarship by a black author in the United States. In 1889, reporting on an antislavery conference in Brussels for an American newspaper, Williams met Leopold II and decided to investigate the Congo Free State for himself. He reported his findings in an open letter to Leopold, and a parallel message to the U.S. president Benjamin Harrison. You can read both here, along with the *New York Times* response to Williams’ accusations. Finally, there’s a short report in the *Independent* – one of the most radical newspapers in the antislavery and black rights struggles of the 1860s – on the news that the London-based Aborigines’ Protection Society had criticized the Congo Free State.

Required reading

Stanley and the ‘Dark Continent’

Charles Daly, ‘Stanley’s Exploration of the Congo’, *Frank Leslie’s Popular Monthly*, May 1878, 514-23

‘Opening of the Congo’, *Christian Advocate*, 17 May 1883, 305-306

‘The Great Subject’, *New York Herald*, 30 December 1883

‘Joseph Cook’s 166th Lecture’, Feb 25, 1884’, *Christian Advocate*, 6 March 1884, 11-12

The politics of ‘benevolence’

Report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Occupation of the Congo Country, 48th Cong., 1 sess., Report No. 393 (26 March 1884), 1-12

Charles Daly, 'Recent Developments in Central Africa and the Valley of the Congo', *Journal of the American Geographical Society*, 16 (1884): 89-122

John T. Morgan, 'The Future of the Negro', *North American Review*, 139, no. 332 (July 1884): 81-84

'The Question of West Africa,' *New York Times*, 11 December 1884

Alvan S. Southworth, 'The New State of Congo', *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly*, May 1885, 532-46

Critiquing colonialism

George Washington Williams, 'Letter to King Leopold II', 18 July 1890, reprinted in John Hope Franklin, *George Washington Williams: A Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 243-54

George Washington Williams, 'Report to the President of the Republic of the United States of America (n.p.: n.d. [1890]), 3-23

'Stanley's Service to Humanity', *Independent*, 15 January 1891

'Col. Williams's Charges', *New York Times*, 14 April 1891

Supplemental reading

Peter Duignan and L.H. Gann, *The United States and Africa: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 133-139

John Hope Franklin, *George Washington Williams: A Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985)

Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998)

Sylvia M. Jacobs, 'Three African American Women Missionaries in the Congo, 1887-1899: The Confluence of Race, Culture, Identity, and Nationality,' in Barbara Reeves-Ellington et al., eds., *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812-1960* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2010), 318-41

Jeanette Eileen Jones, *In Search of Brightest Africa: Reimagining the Dark Continent in American Culture, 1884-1936* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011)

Walter LaFeber, *The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 78-83 (chapter five)

Karen Morin, *Civic Discipline: Geography in America, 1860-1890* (New York: Routledge, 2011), chapter 6

Steven Press, *Rogue Empires: Contracts and Conmen in Europe's Scramble for Africa* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2017)

15. Gender and imperialism

Even the most minimally progressive academic will confess to a kind of dread about the appearance of “gender week” on a reading list: silo-ing women and/or gender issues within a single theme is usually an admission that the rest of your course is horribly skewed towards the experience and actions of men. With luck, we should have spent at least some time thinking about women and gender in previous weeks, but this theme gives us a chance to consider an important question: did American women view the struggle for gender equality and the struggle against imperialism as mutually reinforcing?

Since the pioneering work of Leila Rupp in the 1990s, we’ve been aware that the late nineteenth century saw the formation of numerous international women’s organisations advancing a wide array of reform causes: temperance, women’s suffrage, anti-imperialism, international peace, and so on. American women played a leading role in these organisations, even as they battled at home to promote female suffrage. In the 1890s, as newspapers and magazines renewed the debate over whether the United States should expand beyond the North American mainland, only a handful of states had granted women the right to vote. (Women’s suffrage wouldn’t become widespread in the U.S. until the final phase of World War I; in 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment placed votes for women in the Constitution, though the disqualification of African Americans under racist state laws meant that ‘universal suffrage’ wouldn’t become a reality until the 1960s.) When the US-initiated wars of 1898 terminated Spanish imperial rule in the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Cuba, female suffrage campaigners were presented with a choice: Should they advance their claims to political rights through patriotic support for a new American imperialism? Or did the ‘imperial moment’ (and the controversy over whether the United States should retain the spoils of 1898) offer a clear opportunity to align anti-imperialism with the struggle for suffrage?

This week’s readings offer multiple perspectives on these questions, and invite us to consider whether American women’s responses to the imperial moment of the late nineteenth century reflected tactical considerations or underlying assumptions and prejudices. (For example: the historian Allison Sneider argues that imperialism allowed women to insist that citizenship and suffrage involved the federal government, rather than the states; whereas Louise Newman suggests that the elite and middle-class white women who led the suffrage movement harboured the same assumptions of racial supremacy as their husbands.) The readings also remind us that women attempted to define themselves and their objectives within fiercely gendered contexts.

The first set of readings focus on three female journalists. All wrote for the *Independent*, the venerable New York newspaper, which had been one of the most progressive publications in the United States since the Reconstruction era. Janet Jennings was a sharp observer of the build-up to the wars of 1898, as her columns of February and March of that year suggest. Denied the opportunity to travel to Cuba that summer as a war correspondent – only men were given clearance to do so – Jennings used her contacts to sail to the Caribbean on a Red Cross ship, only to find herself abruptly volunteering as a nurse (without any formal training) in supremely challenging circumstances. In a matter of months, Jennings was hailed on the front pages of American newspapers as an ‘angel’; virtually every report of her bravery completely omitted the fact that she was a journalist, rather than a nurse. Elizabeth Stuart Phelps of Massachusetts was a novelist, spiritualist and feminist; Mary C. Francis, like Janet Jennings, was a newspaper reporter who struggled to reach Cuba in 1898, eventually finding her own way to the island.

The wars of 1898 – and the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1899 and 1900 – produced considerable commentary in American newspapers and magazines about the potential of the United States to improve other peoples and spread the values of ‘civilization’ around the world. As we’ll see next week, this moment also tested the assumption that ‘Anglo-American’ values might be advanced in a joint pursuit of empire by Britain and the U.S. The *Harper’s Bazaar* article offers a sense of how American women were sold the idea of empire; Mary Endicott’s essay on nursing reinforces both a gendered vision of imperial service and a shared sense of purpose among Anglo-American women. NB that Endicott came from a powerful Massachusetts family, but married the British politician Joseph Chamberlain in 1888. Chamberlain played an important role in overseeing the British campaigns against the Boers in South Africa; Endicott was hailed by American newspapers as the quiet force that had converted Chamberlain to the notion that an American empire in the Caribbean might advance a shared set of ‘civilized’ interests.

The final readings focus on suffragists and empire, featuring essays and addresses by many of the leading figures in the American campaign for women’s suffrage.

Required reading

Newspaper women

Janet Jennings, ‘Our Washington Letter’, *Independent*, 10 & 17 February, 17 March 1898

‘The Work of the Red Cross Society at Santiago’, *Harper’s Bazaar*, 6 August 1898

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, ‘The Red Summer’, *Independent*, 2 June 1898

Mary C. Francis, ‘How I Carried the Flag to Cuba’, *Independent*, 2 March 1899

Imperial roles

Mary Endicott Chamberlain, ‘An Obligation of Empire’, *North American Review*, 170, no. 521 (April 1900): 493-503

‘What World Power Means to Women’, *Harper’s Bazaar*, 4 August 1900, 898-899

Suffragists and empire

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, ‘Significance and History of the Ballot’, 15 February 1898, in *Report of Hearing Before the Committee on Woman Suffrage* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898), 21-24

‘To Entertain Woman Suffragists’, *Grand Rapids Herald*, 19 February 1899

Anna Garlin Spencer, ‘Our Duty to the Women of Our New Possessions’ (and discussion following), Grand Rapids, Michigan, April 1899, in Susan B. Anthony and Ida Husted Harper, eds., *The History of Woman Suffrage*, 4 vols. (Rochester, N.Y.: Susan B. Anthony, 1902), 4: 328-34

Jane Addams, ‘Democracy or Militarism?’, in *The Chicago Liberty Meeting held at Central Music Hall, April 30, 1899* (Chicago: Central Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 35-39

'Remarks by Mrs Mary A. Livermore', *Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the New England Anti-Imperialist League* (Boston: New England Anti-Imperialist League, 1903), 33-35

Supplemental reading

Laura Briggs, 'Gender and U.S. Imperialism in U.S. Women's History,' in Jay Kleinberg et al., eds., *The Practice of Women's History: Narratives, Intersections, Dialogues* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2007), 146-160

Nupur Chaudhvir and Margaret Strobel, eds., *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Indiana University Press, 1992)

Dana Cooper, 'From New England to Old England: The Anglo-American Life of Mary Endicott Chamberlain Carnegie, 1864-1957', *Massachusetts Historical Review*, 13 (2011): 96-125

Alice Fahs, *Out on Assignment: Newspaper Women and the Making of Modern Public Space* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011)

Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)

Kristin L. Hoganson, "'As Badly Off as the Filipinos": U.S. Women's Suffragists and the Imperial Issue at the Turn of the Twentieth Century', *Journal of Women's History*, 13, no. 1 (Summer 2001): 9-33

Erin L. Murphy, 'Women's Anti-Imperialism, "The White Man's Burden," and the Philippine-American War,' *Gender and Society*, 23, no. 2 (April 2009): 244-70

Louise Michele Newman, *White Women's Rights: The Racial Origins of Feminism in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Leila J. Rupp, *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Patricia A. Schechter, 'Feminist Historiography, Anti-Imperialism, and the Decolonial', in Tyrrell and Sexton, *Empire's Twin*, 153-166

Allison L. Sneider, *Suffragists in an Imperial Age: U.S. Expansion and the Woman Question, 1870-1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Ian M. Tyrrell, *Woman's World, Woman's Empire: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in International Perspective, 1880-1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991)

John E. Walsh, 'The Story of Janet Jennings and the Seneca', *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, 81, no. 4 (Summer 1998): 267-93

16. Anglo-Saxonism in comparative perspective

In 1898, the United States finally went to war with Spain over Cuba – more than fifty years after American statesman had first tried to acquire the island. Not for the first time, American politicians insisted that they wanted to free Spain’s subject peoples from the burden of imperialism. But as the wars of 1898 moved into Puerto Rico and the Philippines, Americans began a vigorous debate over the propriety of a U.S. imperialism that might succeed and improve on its Spanish predecessor. With politicians and lawyers crafting bespoke colonial arrangements for Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, a broad anti-imperial movement emerged across the United States.

The first set of readings focus on the first phase of the debate over American imperialism. The *Independent* newspaper offers a series of extracts from religious newspapers on the war in Cuba. Albert Beveridge, a lawyer from Indiana, became one of the most influential and ubiquitous advocates of imperialism in 1898 and 1899. His endorsement of President McKinley’s expansive vision of overseas conquest helped him to become U.S. Senator for Indiana in 1899, and during more than a decade in the Senate he played a key role in designing and buttressing the nation’s imperial architecture. Ranged against him here are a variety of anti-imperialists: the politicians William Jennings Bryan and George Boutwell; the former politician, journalist and businessman Carl Schurz; and the social reformer Felix Adler. You’ll also find an essay on the mechanics of “governing dependencies” by the Yale international lawyer Theodore Woolsey.

The second group of readings explore how Americans in this imperial moment confronted the awkward fact of Britain’s repressive war against the Boers – white Dutch settlers – in South Africa. Britain had formally acquired the Dutch Cape Colony in 1814, and for much of the nineteenth century Boers had been leaving Cape Colony to establish new settlements (on indigenous lands) in neighboring regions of South Africa. With the discovery of huge mineral reserves in these Boer-controlled areas in the 1860s and 1870s, British officials were determined not to lose ground in the struggle for empire. War originally broke out between Boers and British troops in 1880, after Britain declared that it would annex Transvaal, one of two self-declared Boer republics. The conflict ended in a stalemate, with Britain formally declaring its control over Transvaal but Boers remaining in charge of their affairs. The Second Boer War, which broke out in 1899, was a much bloodier affair. Both Boer republics (Transvaal and Orange Free State) joined together to repel a British invasion, with around 60,000 Boer soldiers ranged against a much larger British force. (Perhaps half a million soldiers eventually fought for Britain, including tens of thousands of black recruits.) The fighting was prolonged and grisly; the British tactics were often ruthless. (British commanders introduced “concentration camps” to suppress the Boer civilian population, for example.) Although the war finally ended in 1902 with a British victory, confirmed in 1910 by the creation of a unified South Africa as a British dominion, it destroyed any notion of British rule as benevolent. It also cast a long shadow on the racial politics of twentieth-century South Africa.

You might imagine that a war with nakedly imperial origins and horrific outcomes would unite Americans in horror and opposition. This didn’t happen. Some newspapers and commentators were outraged by what took place. Webster Davis, a Missouri politician who had been assistant secretary of the interior in the McKinley administration, travelled to South Africa in 1898 and became a vocal advocate of the Boer cause within the United States. The extracts here from *John Bull’s Crime* summarise his feelings after his trip, and reproduce the speeches he delivered to American audiences. The articles from the *New York Tribune* and

Harper's give a more representative sense of the Boer War's slippery status in American public life. James Bryce, the British social scientist, was a popular author in the United States in the 1890s; his book *The American Commonwealth* was one of the most popular studies of American political ideas since Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. Bryce's essay in the popular *Century* magazine gives some sense of the lure of British imperial know-how at this distinctive moment in American history. A stark example of the predicament of anti-imperialists comes from the writing of Mark Twain, who was both a first-hand witness of British rule in South Africa and a dedicated anti-imperialist. You can read an extract here from Twain's travelogue, based on his experiences in the Cape Colony in 1895; and you can see Twain agonizing over the Boer War in two letters written in 1900, when the outlines of what Britain planned for South Africa were already becoming clear.

The final readings offer African American perspectives on the aftermath of 1898. The legendary historian, sociologist and activist W.E.B. Du Bois was already an established commentator and social critic in 1899, when he delivered these thoughts on the 'global colour line' in a public lecture in Washington. At that moment on the other side of the world, Rienzi Lemus, a soldier in the 25th Infantry of the U.S. Army, was fighting the Filipino uprising against U.S. annexation. (The 25th was one of four African American regiments in the (segregated) U.S. army.) Lemus's two dispatches to the popular Boston *Colored American* magazine are quite different in tone. The first piece, from 1902, breezily describes the subdued islands under U.S. rule. The second, from 1903, returns us to a familiar assumption about how empire might 'solve' America's race problem.

Required reading

Imperialism and its opponents

'The Cuban Question: Opinions of the Religious Press', *Independent*, 31 March 1898

Albert J. Beveridge, 'The March of the Flag', in Beveridge, *The Meaning of the Times and Other Speeches* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1908), 47-57

Theodore S. Woolsey, 'The Government of Dependencies', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 13, Supplement 12 (May 1899): 3-18

William Jennings Bryan, 'America's Mission', in *Republic or Empire?* (Chicago: The Independence Company, 1899), 33-39

George S. Boutwell, *The President's Policy: War and Conquest Abroad, Degradation of Labor at Home* (Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900)

Felix Adler, *Can We Afford to Rule Subject Peoples?* (New York: Anti-Imperialist League of New York, 1900), 3-11

Carl Schurz, 'Address Delivered at Cooper Union, Sept. 28, 1900', in *Speeches, Correspondence, and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, 6 vols. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 6: 215-256

Britain and the Boer War

James Bryce, 'British Experience in the Government of Colonies', *Century Magazine*, March 1899, 718-728

'Sympathy with the Boers', *New York Tribune*, 29 November 1899

'Whom Do We Want To See Win?', Edward S. Martin, *Harper's Weekly*, 23 December 1899
George F. Becker, 'Rights and Wrongs in South Africa', *Forum*, March 1900, 31-37
Webster William Davis, *John Bull's Crime; or, Assaults on Republics* (New York: Abbey Press, 1901), introduction (i-iii), 108-112, 189-210, 213-225
Mark Twain, *Following the Equator: A Journey around the World*, 2 vols. (Hartford, Conn.: American Publishing Company, 1901; originally published 1897), 2: 379-91
Mark Twain to W.D. Howells, 25 January 1900, and to J.H. Twichell, 27 January 1900, in *Mark Twain's Letters*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1917), 2: 692-95

Empire and the global colour line

W.E.B. Du Bois, 'The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind' (originally delivered 27 December 1899), in Nahum Dimitri Chandler, ed., *The Problem of the Color Line at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: The Essential Early Essays* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), 111-24
Rienzi B. Lemus, 'The Philippine Islands', *Colored American Magazine*, March 1902, 259-68
Rienzi B. Lemus, 'The Negro and the Philippines', *Colored American Magazine*, February 1903, 314-18

Supplemental reading

Stuart Anderson, 'Racial Anglo-Saxonism and the American Response to the Boer War', *Diplomatic History*, 2, no. 3 (July 1978): 219-36
Julian Go, 'Anti-Imperialism in the U.S. Territories after 1898,' in Tyrell and Sexton, *Empire's Twin*, 79-96
Willard Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975)
David C. Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789– 1941* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009)
Paul Kramer, 'Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910', *Journal of American History*, 88, no. 4 (2002): 1315-1353
Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
Gretchen Murphy, *Shadowing the White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line* (New York: New York University Press, 2010)
William N. Tilchin, 'The United States and the Boer War', in Keith Wilson, ed., *The International Impact of the Boer War* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), 107-22

Sample long essay questions

1. Did the patriot side view the American Revolution as an anti-imperial struggle?
2. Was the idea of an “empire of liberty” an expression of American exceptionalism?
3. Is black emigrationism best understood as a form of imperialism?
4. Why didn’t the United States acquire extensive colonies or protectorates before 1898?
5. Did religion play a greater role in driving or undermining imperial ideas among Americans?
6. How did Americans understand the concept of “universal empire” after 1783?
7. “The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism.” (Edward Said) Discuss.
8. Did the racial diversity of the United States work against the onset of a full-blown American imperialism?
9. Were social reformers – abolitionists, suffragists, Native rights campaigners – natural opponents of empire?
10. Did ‘Anglo-Saxonism’ allow Americans to see empire as normative?