ELLEN GINZBURG MIGLIORINO

The Image of the Revolution in Abolitionist Patriotism

An examination of abolitionist literature reveals frequent references to the ideals of the Founding Fathers and to the basic principles evoked in the Declaration of Independence. Imbued with a deep sense of patriotism and of dutifulness toward their country of birth, abolitionists indeed reviewed the first years of American history with a profoundly critical eye. Their intense love of the Union did not diminish their awareness of its inconsistencies. They recognized the ambiguity between republican ideals and the existence of slavery, and felt it was their responsibility to denounce it.

Their writings reveal a keen sense of idealism which they were anxious for their country to live up to. We are often confronted with their disappointment and disillusionment toward a government which did not fulfill the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. Since democracy and freedom could not coexist with slavery, abolitionists repeatedly denounced the ambivalence which characterized the American system. Some went so far as to advocate revolution as the only remedy to eradicate a government which oppressed a part of its population. Others openly favored a dissolution of the Union, and argued that it was the only way to end the oppression of so many people.

These reformers were firmly convinced that the Enlightenment principles so forcefully proclaimed during the Revolution had not been put into practice, but had only been enunciated. It was therefore their responsibility, as humanitarians, to see that those ideals be realized. William Lloyd Garrison was

extremely explicit on this point when he stated in the first issue of *The Liberator* that the self-evident truth proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal" meant that he would contend for the immediate enfranchisement of slaves, in order to put into practice the ideals set forth in the document ([1]).

Similarly, at its national convention held in Buffalo in 1843, the Liberty Party solemnly avowed that it was the party of 1776, dedicated to carrying out the revolutionary principles enunciated at that time. Participants promised that the Declaration of Independence was to become "a solemn and practical reality" ([2]). With the creation of the Liberty Party in 1840, it was hoped that whites, as well as blacks, would no longer support the Whig and Democratic parties, which were so overtly pro-slavery. As Gerrit Smith very appropriately asked: "What right has a colored man to belong to the Whig of Democratic or National Presbyterian or other National Church party? Just as much as he has to buy a rope and hang himself with it ..."([3]). The Liberty Party aimed instead at helping blacks, by furthering the ideals pronounced in 1776.

Many years before the creation of the Liberty Party, an English immigrant to the United States, Morris Birbeck, in an oration delivered on July 4, 1822 had argued that the words contained in the Declaration of Independence be applied to black slaves, and not just to white Americans. The Founding Fathers, he contended, were to be admired for having done so much to break the chains of slavery, but it was up to their successors to continue the work that had been begun ([4]).

In December 1833, at the Anti-Slavery Convention in Philadelphia, delegates solemnly affirmed that their task was, in fact, to complete the work begun by the Founding Fathers. They differed from the latter, however, in the explicit rejection of physical force to achieve their purpose. Slaves were even urged not to use weapons to obtain their freedom, but rather to rely solely on spiritual means ([5]).

Angelina Grimké confided to Abby Kelley in 1837 that she considered the doctrines propagated by the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS) much more ambitious and "comprehensive" than

those embraced by the Founding Fathers many years earlier. She believed that contemporary antislavery principles transcended those of the Revolution in aiming not only at the downfall of slavery, but also at elevating "the free people of color to an *equality* with the whites"([6]).

The abolitionist, James Birney, openly admitted that the principles for which the Founding Fathers had fought during the Revolution were the sames ones the slaves had a right to vindicate. If physical force had been accepted for the colonists at that time, he saw no reason why it could not be approved of for slaves in their struggle to achieve equal rights and human dignity ([7]).

Birney was not alone in comparing the situation of the colonists with that of the slaves. An article published in 1853 by the Rochester Ladies Anti-Slavery Society went considerably farther in evaluating the wrongs inflicted on both groups. It listed the grievances which had justified resistance in 1776 and compared them to the oppression still suffered by slaves. Furthermore, it emphasized that in 1776 the rights enjoyed by the colonists were hardly even mentioned. In reviewing them, the author recalled that none of them could be exercised by slaves. If then bloodshed and war were justified during the Revolution, they were all the more so for slaves, who were the victims of wrongs many times worse. It followed that if it was right to revolt in 1776, it was all the more justified to do so in 1852. Consequently, if a person condemned the actions of slaves, he would also have to condemn his ancestors, considering them guilty rebels. Rather than encouraging slave insurrections, the purpose of the article was to take precautions to avert the danger.([8])

At the tenth anniversary of the AASS in 1844, the condition of slaves was also compared to that of the colonists. On that occasion, it was emphasized that the despotism to which slaves were subjected was "incomparably more dreadful than that which induced the colonists to take up arms against the mother country" ([9]).

Lydia Maria Child also broached the subject of judging the actions of the Revolutionary Fathers in connection with the freedom of slaves. In a letter to her close friends Francis and

Sarah Shaw, both active abolitionists, Child asked whether they considered it fair for the Revolutionary Fathers to have forced "men to do right" with their refusal to use taxed tea and stamped paper. She emphasized that if one agreed at that time with those choices for freedom, it was certainly right to do just "as much, if not more" for the freedom of slaves ([10]).

The use of physical force by the abolitionist Owen Lovejoy in 1837 was amply justified by the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society (PASS) on the basis of the same principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. Lovejoy's defense was viewed as a patriotic sacrifice, similar to those made by the Revolutionary Fathers. Seen in that light, his actions deserved profound respect. The Society concluded that those who eulogized the Declaration of Independence and the events of the Revolution, but claimed to be shocked by Lovejoy's resort to arms, were to be considered "hypocritical", "malign" and "insensitive". Lovejoy was seen as a philanthropic and pious man, who had sacrificed his life for the cause of liberty ([11]).

Though the point of view expressed by the PASS was not shared by a number of abolitionists, some admitted in their private correspondence, or on other occasions, that a resort to physical force might ultimately be inevitable. For example, a staunch Garrisonian like Lydia Maria Child expressed her doubts on the effectiveness of moral suasion in ending slavery. During her stay in Northampton, Massachusetts, at that time an important resort for Southerners during the summer season, she became directly acquainted with the "slave-holding spirit", and in a letter to Abby Kelley privately confided her certainty that "moral influence" would never "reach these haughty sinners". Though she deprecated violence, she bitterly concluded that emancipation could only be achieved through the use of force ([12]).

Gerrit Smith admitted in 1851 that in the past he had believed slavery could be ended peacefully. However, the persistence with which members of the Whig and Democratic parties supported the institution had induced him to abandon all hopes for a speedy and bloodless end of slavery.

> *Time was, when I confidently expected a peaceful termination of American slavery. But, in view of the tenacious clinging to our nation, and because national, proslavery, political and ecclesiastical parties, there is far more reason to fear that it will have a violent, than there is reason to hope, that it will have a peaceful termination. These parties are the great props of slavery. Were they dissolved, it would fall by its own weight, and die a natural death. But, if they are maintained, though it will still die, its death will, nevertheless, be violent and violent too, in proportion to the succor and support which these parties give it* (13).

Similarly, in 1857 Frederick Douglass did not dismiss the idea of violence to bring about the end of slavery, but rather emphasized that the struggle might entail the use of moral, as well as physical force (14).

The Dred Scott decision in 1857 caused Charles Lenox Remond, up to that time a fervent Garrisonian, to abandon his long-time faith in the tactics of moral suasion. At a Convention of Colored Citizens of Massachusetts in 1858, he suggested that an address to the slaves be written, urging them to organize an insurrection. A vote was taken, but the motion did not pass (15).

William Nell unequivocally wrote of the necessity for a second revolution to bring about the creation of universal liberty. Since black Americans had contributed significantly to furthering the cause of 1776, it was all the more important for them to labor *in stimulating public opinion in the direction of universal* brotherhood. Nevertheless, Nell felt that "all of every complexion, sect, sex and condition, can add their mite, and so nourish the tree of liberty, that all may be enabled to pluck fruit from the unbending branches;..." (16).

Even the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society in its Annual Report of 1852 evaluated the idea of a slave insurrection, or the "occasional slaughter of a slave catcher", as means of directing public attention to the subject of slavery. Though both ideas were dismissed for moral reasons, it is noteworthy that they were even brought up for discussion by an antislavery society (17).

Some years earlier, Henry Highland Garnet had pronounced a vehement address to the slaves at the Colored National Convention

held in Buffalo. On that occasion he had argued that slaves were entitled to all the rights granted to other Americans, and that there was little hope that they could obtain them without the shedding of blood. He recalled that during the Revolution many people had rallied to the words "liberty or death". Similarly, slaves had to use every means at their disposal to put an end to their submission ([18]).

It is well-known that the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 caused many white and especially black abolitionists to reconsider their views on violence. However, it is particularly interesting to shed light on the reactions which the law elicited among rank-and-file fugitives in the North. Newspaper accounts provide valuable information on the innumerable meetings which were organized in response to the provisions contained in the law. In Providence, Rhode Island, for example, groups of blacks gathered in the streets to discuss the best ways to ensure their defense. It was decided that each fugitive would be armed and would rather "sell his life before leaving Rhode Island" as a slave. The local newspaper reported that fugitives had not decided to remove to Canada, but rather to act according to the principle of "liberty or death", a motto which had been invoked during the Revolutionary War. It was reported that "a large number of citizens of all colors and parties, have pledged their support."([19])

At a meeting called together in Boston to discuss the law, Frederick Douglass made a powerful speech, stating that the black population of the city had unanimously decided "to suffer *death* rather than be carried back into slavery". His words were received with "tremendous cheers" from the audience, composed almost entirely of blacks ([20]).

William and Ellen Craft, both fugitives in Boston, were the victims of a desperate attempt at taking them back to slavery in Georgia. It was generally known in abolitionist circles that William Craft was armed with a knife and revolving pistols, and would have resisted "to the death any attempt to take him into slavery again". Reportedly, most of the population of Boston expressed determination not to let the Crafts be taken from the city ([21]).

The ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence were often recalled by abolitionists. In examining them, Garnet, for

example, emphasized that he found no fault in them. Furthermore, he believed that the principle "all men are created equal" was certainly sincere, and that the Declaration reflected a deep devotion to the cause of freedom. The revolutionary events that followed indicated the sincerity with which the principles were carried through. Nevertheless, Garnet seemed more impressed with the ideals propounded by the pilgrims, whom he considered profoundly dedicated to eliminating tyranny and oppression. Their devotion, he believed, was imbued with a deep sense of liberty which laid the true foundations for the creation of republican institutions. According to Garnet, the Founding Fathers were profoundly influenced by the spirit of the pilgrims, by their perseverence, and their love of liberty. Guided by the wisdom of the pilgrims, the former pressed forward in their fight to gain national independence ([23]).

However, not all blacks admired the lofty ideals enunciated by the Founding Fathers. Robert Purvis, the well-known Philadelphia abolitionist, who signed the Declaration of Sentiments at the founding of the AASS, openly stated some years later at a meeting of the Pennsylvania Society that he had "no veneration" for the Founders. He recalled that both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were slave-holders, and that the former had even signed the first Federal Fugitive Slave Law in 1793 ([24]).

Purvis was not alone in criticizing the Founding Fathers. The radical white abolitionist Parker Pillsbury, in a Fourth of July oration after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850, overtly declared that Washington, Jefferson, and Adams were simply failures. He said that Washington was traditionally lauded for his generosity, yet, stormed Pillsbury, it was time to recall the men and women who "worked for Washington without pay", the hundreds of slaves who labored for him and could not enjoy the fruits of their toil, because Washington took them away from them. How then, asked Pillsbury, could he be entitled to so much honor, or be recalled for his generosity? ([25])

Exasperated by the effects of the Fugitive Slave Law on his people, in 1857 Charles Lenox Remond forcefully rejected the usefulness of commemorating revolutionary heroes and events. As

long as fugitive slaves, to ensure their safety, were obliged to escape to Canada, he considered it highly inappropriate to evoke memories of Lexington or Bunker Hill ([25]).

A patriotic holiday, such as the Fourth of July, was often the occasion for white abolitionists to voice their conviction that the ideals of the American Revolution had been grossly betrayed by their government. For example, Garrison denounced the day in the following words:

> *The mockery of mockeries is at hand - the Fourth of July! By many, the day will be spent in rioting and intemperate drinking - by others, in political defamation and partisan heat - by others, in boasting of the freedom of American people and unhazardous denunciations of the mother country. The waste of money, health, and morals, will be immense. Another party will seize the occasion (many with the best motives) to extol the merits of the Colonization Society and increase its funds. Mistaken men! A very small number will spend the day in sadness and supplication, on account of the horrible oppression which is exercised over the bodies and souls of two millions of the rational creatures of God, in this boasted land of liberty.*([26])

James Birney had gone so far as to decline any invitations to celebrate the Fourth of July as the anniversary of American liberty, as he considered the holiday proof of "national hypocrisy". When liberty would finally be enjoyed by all the inhabitants of the land, he then would be quite willing to join in celebrations. However, since

> *two millions and a half of Native Americans - my poor despised brethren - are enslaved in this land, groaning in worse than Algerian bondage; - bought and sold, men, women and little children; as beasts in the market. The Slave trade in its most revolting forms is maintained in the District of Columbia, under the very eaves of the Capitol. This too, whilst we have in our mouths 'All men are created equal, and entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'*([27]).

For these reasons, he could not participate in such hypocritical celebrations. Nevertheless, the majority of white abolitionists continued having Fourth of July picnics.

The black population did not officially celebrate the Fourth of July before the Emancipation Proclamation. It was, in fact, not considered a day of celebration, but rather one of reflection on the injustices perpetrated against blacks. For example, in 1831 in a "Short Address to the Females of Color", published in *The Liberator,* the writer, Anna Elizabeth, had proposed that the approaching Fourth of July be set aside as a day of prayer and reflection ([28]).

Since blacks did not consider the Fourth of July a day for rejoicing, they chose other dates as worthy of notice. January 1st became a holiday to commemorate the end of the African slave trade on that day in 1808, while August 1st marked the end of slavery in the West Indies in 1834. On July 5th, blacks took the opportunity to renew their demand for equality with whites. The date was appropriately chosen because slavery in New York state had been abolished on that day in 1827 ([29]). Blacks emphasized that the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence had not been applied to them. For example, in an oration delivered by Peter Osborne on July 5, 1832 at the New Haven African Church in Connecticut, the speaker forcefully urged his people to unite to put into pratice the teachings of Christianity and the ideals propounded in the Declaration of Independence ([30]). He emphasized that that document made no distinctions with regard to color and equivocally proclaimed that all men were created free and equal. He urged his people to tirelessly proclaim liberty for their own brethren.

In his well-known speech entitled "July Fourth and the Negro", Douglass denounced the hypocrisy of a nation which sustained and perpetuated the institution of slavery, while it proclaimed and celebrated the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence. For Afro-Americans, Douglass explained, the day had no meaning whatsoever, or was rather to be intended as a day of mourning to recall the injustices perpetrated against them. How could they celebrate ideals which did not apply to them? What meaning could the words "freedom and equality" have for the American slave? They stood only as hollow words that served to unmask the mockery, the hypocrisy of a nation which tolerated

such a disgraceful institution, while it solemnly expounded its republican principles before the world.

Pronounced in 1852, these words also contained a ray of hope. Douglass had faith in the forces at work in the country which were striving to bring about the downfall of slavery. Furthermore, he was certain that no nation could continue shutting itself off from the rest of the world, nor could it hide its disgraceful customs and practices from the rest of mankind ([31]). He probably had in mind the impressions of well-known European travellers who had visited the United States and had written on the condition of slaves in the South. The writings of Charles Dickens, Basil Hall, Francis Kemble provided first-hand accounts which informed more and more European readers of the cruel facts concerning American slavery. Furthermore, black and white abolitionists travelled widely in the British Isles lecturing to Victorian audiences on the horrors to which black families were subjected. The exploitation and sexual abuse of black women were topics often discussed, especially by black lecturers, not just Douglass, but also Remond and Garnet.

Douglass' belief that a nation could not conceal its disgraceful practices from the rest of the world was shared by Henry David Thoreau. In an address delivered on July 5, 1854, the latter unequivocally stated that a government which perpetrated injustice would eventually have to pay a penalty for its actions, by becoming the laughing stock of the world ([32]).

Douglass was not new to sharp criticism of his country, or his countrymen. Some months after the founding of his newspaper, *The North Star,* in December 1847, recalling the anniversary of the Fourth of July, he noted that the thousands of people who assembled to celebrate the occasion in his city, Rochester, not more than a hundred desired "to see those principles triumphant in this country". He bitterly concluded, "theirs is a white liberty" ([33]).

Some years earlier, Remond in a letter addressed to the West Newbury Anti-Slavery Society had expressed his strong distaste toward Fourth of July orators. He was tired of hearing and reading of their so-called patriotism, or their republicanism, which he

considered simply insulting to black people ([34]).

The Rev. T.F. Alexander in an address delivered on July 4, 1837 at Lynn, Massachusetts claimed that the holiday was being "shamelessly desecrated" by doctors of divinity who apologized for "man-stealing" and embarked on a crusade against abolitionists ([35]). The *National Anti-Slavery Standard* went even farther in defining the Fourth of July "a sham feast-day of a bastard Liberty" ([36]).

Perhaps one of the earliest and most explicit avowals of black patriotism can be traced back to a meeting organized in January 1817 by the Afro-American abolitionist, James Forten, in Philadelphia. On that occasion, about 3,000 to 3,500 blacks were called upon to discuss plans for colonization to Liberia. Forten reported that not one person present expressed his approval of the plan, and when asked who opposed it, the audience answered unanimously in the negative. Participants expressed loyalty to their ancestors, who had painfully cultivated the soil of America, and to those who had subsequently sworn allegiance to the American cause by fighting the British during the Revolutionary War. Blacks who attended the meeting had no desire to violate the principles set forth by their ancestors, nor to abandon their slave brethren, victims of unlimited suffering and oppression. For these reasons, the former expressed firm loyalty to their native land and opposition to any plan intended to separate them from the country of their ancestors.

This response is particularly important to keep in mind, as it was to mark a reversal of opinion on the part of the majority of Afro-American abolitionists on the subject of colonization. Up to that time, some black leaders had launched the idea of a return to Africa, as an answer to the unlimited prejudice to which their people were continually subjected in the United States. As a result of the Bethel Church meeting, black leaders abandoned their former stand and denounced colonization. It is certainly noteworthy that at so early a date, the views of the rank-and-file were held in such high consideration by black leaders, as to reverse their own stand on such a crucial issue.

In Part II of his *Thoughts on African Colonization,* Garrison included proceedings of meetings in which free blacks undeniably

expressed loyalty to their mother country, the United States. Furthermore, in numerous instances, the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence were cited to indicate unlimited devotion to the land of their birth. At a meeting held in Boston in March 1831, participants even expressed their zeal to do everything in their power to improve their own condition and that of their brethren "in this our native land" ([37]).

The black press provides innumerable examples of devotion to the United States and to the ideals contained in the Declaration of Independence. Readers are constantly being called upon to improve their condition and to continue the patriotic tradition begun by their forefathers. Very often the proceedings of state and national Negro conventions are reproduced, which also contain quotations from the Declaration of Independence. In numerous instances, it is in the name of those lofty ideals that participants claim their right to share the priviledges enjoyed by other Americans. The following quotation from the Colored National Convention held at Rochester, New York in 1853 undeniably reveals the strong patriotic ties of the participants:

> *We are Americans, and as Americans, we would speak to Americans. We address you not as aliens nor as exiles, humbly asking to be permitted to dwell among you in peace; but we address you as American citizens asserting their rights on their own native soil. Neither do we address you as enemies (although the recipients of innumerable wrongs.) but in the spirit of patriotic good will. ([38])*

At the Black State Convention held in Columbus, Ohio in 1857, John Mercer Langston made a vehement speech in favor of the enfranchisement of blacks in the state. In examining their patriotism and loyalty to their country of birth, he unequivocally demanded complete legal equality with whites. Langston continued:

> *In the name of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the ancient policy of the Fathers of the Republic, the well-established doctrine that nativity gives citizenship, that taxation and*

> *representation are inseparable, in the name of our patriotism and loyal bearing towards the country in a trying hour, as well as the principle that every person ought to be tried by his peers, we ask the erasure of the word 'uibitefrom the State Constitution. ([39])*

At the Convention which met the following year in Cincinnati, the resolution offered by Langston, in favor of equal rights, reflected even more strongly the admiration with which the revolutionary principles were held, and the fervent desire that they be applied to blacks.

> *That in the name ofour humanity, in the name of our nativity, in the name of the old Revolutionary doctrine, that taxation and Representation ought not to be separated, in the name ofjustice and good policy, and in the Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution, we demand of the people and government of the State of Ohio the repeal of all laws that make complexional discriminations, and full equality before the law. ([40])*

In appealing to the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, abolitionists saw their struggle to end slavery and guarantee the rights of free blacks as both a collective and individual duty toward their country. They felt that if a portion of Americans had been deprived of their freedom, it was a moral responsibility to see that they obtained it. Abolitionist correspondence often reveals the anxiety of the authors in coping with such an enormous task, their discouragement, especially after the approval of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850, the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854), and the Dred Scott decision (1857). Confronted with such a momentous responsibility, they often expressed loneliness in the face of the widespread opposition which surrounded them. At times they felt incapable of performing the duty which they had assigned themselves. Their letters reveal the ways in which they encouraged one another. These aspects are especially evident in the correspondence of abolitionist women. The following lines written by Angelina Grimké to Abby Kelley provide a pertinent example:

I know by sorrowful experience what it is to feel as thee describest, having a work to do and yet not knowing how to do it, opposed by all to whom I was wont to look for counsel, and bound down under a sense of my utter incapacity to do what was required of my hands. ([41])

Despite moments of discouragement, Kelley's commitment to the cause was indeed exemplary. She tirelessly travelled miles and miles preaching the antislavery message in areas where similar thoughts had never been expressed. During the day she held meetings, while at night she frequently journeyed from place to place ([42]). After years of self-sacrifice, Wendell Phillips, particularly concerned about her health, wrote:

You know: how obedient I always am to whatever you ask. Have I not thus earned the right to ask to be once a listener to my advice? Though not indeed mine only, but the advice of all your friends, all the best friends of our cause. You must give up working and talking and take a year's rest. For your own sake, we cannot see you kill yourself.([43])

Similarly, Maria Weston Chapman wrote some years earlier:

We are deeply cheered by your labor in Worcester County, but yet we fear you are taxing your physical strength too far.([44])

Clearly, Kelley's efforts met with praise. James Jackson, an antislavery agent, in a letter to her wrote:

...no individual in our ranks can at the peculiar juncture of affairs do as much good as yourself... ([45])

Sally Hollie's devotion to the cause is less well-known than Kelley's, but nonetheless certainly deserves consideration. She likewise manifested a deep sensitivity and sense of duty toward the plight of the slave. Her dedication was characterized by extreme modesty and self-sacrifice. In 1852 she wrote to Gerrit Smith:

I love the Anti-Slavery cause more and more every hour I live. And if I feel

> *thankful for anything, it is that I am permitted to bear some humble part in demolishing this great system of human iniquity, American slavery ([46])*

Persistence and devotion to the cause are especially apparent in the following words written some years later:

> *While the slave has such sore need of every word uttered faithfully in his behalf, I must continue to give every mite of effort to his righteous causes ([47])*

In February 1858, after three months of continuous lecturing and travelling for the antislavery cause, she had so greatly taxed her strength, that she was obliged to suspend her labors for more than a month ([48]).

The far-reaching commitments of both Kelley and Hollie are mere examples of the work of many other abolitionist women, who labored tirelessly to put an end to American bondage. It is indeed difficult not to view their self-sacrifice and devotion as dictated by a sense of moral and patriotic duty, by a desire to put into practice the ideals propounded by the Founding Fathers.

In assessing their commitment to the cause of freedom, it should be recalled that abolitionists - men and women, black and white - denounced their government despite the risks which their criticism entailed. In their attempts at mobilizing Northern public opinion against the atrocities committed in the South, they became the objects of attacks perpetrated by pro-slavery forces that operated in the North ([49]). A few incidents are worth recalling. Lewis Tappan's house was stormed by a hostile crowd in 1834. The British abolitionist, George Thompson, on numerous occasions was confronted by fiery crowds that tried to keep him from speaking. William Lloyd Garrison and Theodore Weld were also molested many times by anti-abolitionist mobs ([50]). Furthermore, anti-abolitionist riots took place in numerous cities, and were particularly violent in New York, Boston and Cincinnati. If white reformers were targets of anti-abolitionist forces, black activists were even more the victims of this hostility ([51]). For this reason, their commitment to the antislavery cause deserves even more admiration.

1 *The Liberator,* Jan. 1, 1831.

2 Resolutions of the Convention, In John L. Thomas, ed., *Slavery Attacked. The Abolitionist Crusade* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 95; Alvan Stewart to Gamiel Bailey, April, 1842 (n.d.), in Luther Rawson Marsh ed., *Writings and Speeches of Alvan Stewart, on Slavery* (New York: Burdick, 1860), p. 268.

3 Gerrit Smith to Henry Highland Garnet, June 10, 1843, *Gerrit Smith Miller Papers (GSMP),* Syracuse University (SU).

4 Betty Fladeland, *Men and Brothers Anglo-American Antislavery Cooperation* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), pp. 154-155.

5 *The Liberator,* December 4, 1833.

6 Angelina Grimke to Abby Kelley, April 15, 1837, *Abby Kelley Foster Papers (AKFP),* American Antiquarian Society Collection (AASC).

7 Ronald G. Walters, *The Antislavery Appeal American Abolitionism After 1830* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976), p. 28.

8 George W. Perkins, "Can Slaves Rightfully Resist and Fight", In Julia Griffiths, *Autographs for Freedom,* Rochester Ladies Anti-Slavery Society (Boston: JP. Jewett & Co., 1853), pp. 37-39.

9 Truman Nelson, ed., *Documents of Upheaval. Selections from William Lloyd Garrison's Liberator* 1831-1865 (New York: Hill & Wang, 1966), p. 203.

10 Milton Meltzer & Patricia Holland, *Lydia Maria Child. Selected Letters, 1817-1880* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1982), pp. 86-87.

11 *National Enquirer,* Dec. 14 1837, Library Co. of Philadelphia.

12 Lydia Maria Child to Kelley, Oct. 1, 1838, *AKFP,* AASC.

13 Gerrit Smith to members of the Liberty Party in the County of Madison, Oct. 10, *1851, Liberty Party Circulars,* William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

14 Philip S. Foner, *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass* (New York: International Publishers, 1950, vol. II), p. 437.

15 Dorothy Sterling, ed., *Speak Out in Thunder Tones Letters and Other Writings by Black Northerners,* 1787-1865 (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1973), pp. 268-270.

16 William Cooper Nell, *The Colored Patriots of the American Revolution* (Boston: Robert F. Wallcutt, 1855), p. 360.

17 Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, *Fifteenth Annual Report,* 26, *John J. Tyler Arboretum,* Painter Library.

18 Thomas R. Frazier, ed., *Afro-American History: Primary Sources* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), pp. 64-70.

19 *Morning Mirror,* Oct. 3, 1850.

20 *Morning Mirror,* Oct. 14, 1850.

21 Samuel May to J.B. Estlin, Nov. 10, 1850, in Clare Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1974), p 352.

22 Speech of Henry Highland Garnet, Delivered at the 7th Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, *The Colored American,* May 30, 1840.

23 *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* Nov. 3, 1860.

24 The *Liberator,* July 11, 1851.

25 William F. Cheek, *Black Resistance Before the Civil War* (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1970), p. 151

26 Wendell Phillips Garrison, Francis Jackson Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison. The Story of His Life Told By His Children* (New York: The Century Co., 1885, vol. I), pp. 284-285.

27 James Birney to Saginaw City Committee, June 25, 1842, in Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Letters of James Gillespie Birney* 1831-1857 (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1966), p. 700.

28 The *Liberator,* June 18, 1831.

29 Dorothy Sterling, ed., *Speak Out,* p. 53.

30 Herbert Aptheker, ed., *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States,* (Secaucus: Citadel Press, 1973, vol. I), pp. 137-138.

31 Philip S. Foner, *Frederick Douglass,* vol. II, pp. 181-204.

32 Henry David Thoreau, *Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1963), p. 30.

33 The *North Star,* July 8, 1848.

34 Carter G. Woodson, The *Mind of the Negro As Reflected in Letters Written During the Crisis, 1800-1860* (New York: Negro University Press, 1969), p. 315.

35 *The Liberator,* July 28, 1837.

36 *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* Aug. 4, 1855.

37 William Lloyd Garrison, *Thoughts on African Colonization* (Boston: Garrison & Knapp, 1832, Pt. II), p. 34.

38 Howard Holman Bell, ed., *Minutes of the Proceedings of the National Negro Conventions 1830-1864* (New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969), p.8.

39 Philip S. Foner & George G. Walker, eds., *Proceedings of the Black State Conventions, 1840-1865* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979), p. 329.

40 Philip S. Foner & George G. Walker, eds, *Proceedings,* p. 336.

41 Angelina Grimké Weld to Kelley, Feb. 24, 1838, *Abigail Foster Papers (AFP),* Worcester Historical Museum Collection (WHMC).

42 Kelley to Olive H. Darling, Nov. 3, 1845, *AFP,* WHMC.

43 Phillips to Kelley, May 31, 1855, *AFP,* WHMC.

44 Maria Weston Chapman to Kelley, Aug. 16, 1840, *AFP,* WHMC.

45 James Jackson to Kelley, Sept. 6, 1840, *AFP,* WHMC.

46 Hollie to Gerrit Smith, March 31, 1852, *GSMP,* SU.

47 Hollie to Smith, Jan. 1,1858, *GSMP,* SU.

48 Hollie to Smith, Feb. 24, 1858, *GSMP,* SU.

49 Lerone Bennett, *Pioneers in Protest* (Chicago: Johnson, 1968), p. 167.

50 Ellen Ginzburg Migliorino, *L'emancipazione degli afroamericani. Il dibattito negli Stati Uniti prima della guerra civile* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 1989), pp. 79-80.

51 Jane H. Pease & William H. Pease, *They Who Would Be Free Blacks' Search for Freedom, 1830-1861* (New York: Atheneum, 1974), pp. 234-236.