NONCONFORMIST "IMMEDIATISM" AND THE CRUSADE AGAINST AMERICAN SLAVERY,
1823-1835

"I bless God for America,"declaimed the Scottish Secession minister,
John Ritchie, in 1834, "for her temperance and her revivals; we need them here;
but there is one thing she needs from us, the principle of UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION."

Ironically, at the same time that British Dissenters were bestowing admiring
attention on the American religious experiment, they were also learning to draw
back in shock and dismay at the revelation of American slavery and its relation
to the American churches. "American Protestantism" evidently nourished a cardinal
sin against which British brethren were compelled to bear witness. In consequence,
the transatlantic connection was destined to make an important contribution
to antislavery history—a contribution which has been partly obscured by the
larger prominence hitherto given to international Garrisonian, Unitarian, and
Quaker agitation and by the prevailing social conservatism of American evangelical
denominational statesmen. ²

Yet in fact, for over thirty years the churches of evangelical Dissent
were engaged in pressing the claims of immediate emancipation upon their American
counterparts, sometimes by "affectionate expostulation," sometimes by indignant
remonstrance, and occasionally (as at the World Convention in 1840) by joining
in the cry of "no communion with slaveholders." With the American brethren
this course naturally created great tension. Fearful of social upheaval in
the republic and concerned for denominational and national unity, leading American
churchmen generally remained wary of the slavery question until well into the
1840s. But for the minority of religious abolitionists in America, the role
of Dissent was of fundamental importance. Condemned by northern society, censured
in denominational assemblies, and denounced by the religious press, they
vindicated their Christian abolitionism by British example and looked to the
prestigious overseas churches for help. Ultimately this sustained criticism
from British Dissent helped urge northern Protestantism toward effective support of the antislavery cause.

While this career did not end until the close of the Civil War, the main features of the pattern were formed in the critical decade of the 1830s, that is, in the period referred to by Harriet Martineau as the "martyr age" in America. By the beginning of this period Dissent had just achieved maturity in the antislavery enterprise, having accepted "immediatism," labored successfully for West Indian emancipation, and enlisted in the work of annihilating slavery from the earth. Since this commitment occurred at the very time that the new fraternal relation was developing with America, the increased contacts, at first comfortably fraternal and evangelical, took on abrasive features. By 1836 debate, confrontation, and dissension over slavery unsettled the relations of Dissent with the American churches. In the end the fraternal bond survived but weaker than at first promise and subject to the strain of continuing censure, reproof, and answering resentment. It was significant too that this fragility in the transatlantic relationship arose at the very moment when the slavery issue was beginning to work the disruption of denominations in America.

Dissent's commitment to the cause of abolition and its readiness to confront the American churches on this issue was accomplished primarily in the decade between 1823 and 1833. Prior to that time Nonconformist leaders, while professing horror of slavery, had often abstained from direct or full involvement in the British antislavery struggle. Politically, Dissent was just emerging from the insecurities of the French Revolutionary era and spending its energies on the campaign to repeal the disabilities of the Test and Corporation Acts (successful in 1828). Socially and religiously, the dissenting communities were still completing their journey from the conservatism, moderation, and seclusion of Hanoverian chapel life toward the more open and dynamic evangelicalism of Victorian Nonconformity. While notable testimony against slavery was given by individuals,
Dissenters generally supported the leadership of Anglican and humanitarian gradualists and hoped that parliamentary pressures and the suspension of the slave trade would soon turn planters toward free labor. But by 1830 this outlook had begun to change dramatically.

Several elements were involved in this transformation. First, all major divisions of evangelical Dissent--Congregationalists, Baptists, Wesleyans (including their more revivalist and democratic kindred, the Primitive Methodists) and several Scottish Presbyterian bodies of which the United Secession Church was the most important--now began to enlist unreservedly in the struggle against West Indian slavery and to develop political weapons for this end. Doubtless many factors--Dissenters' more militant pursuit of their own rights, the broadened franchise of 1832, the enthusiastic spirit of the reform age--ministered to this change. But the chief promptings were evangelical. Nonconformists led in the early nineteenth-century mission movement. Their work among the West Indian blacks aroused the ire of the planters, and the resulting conflicts awakened the parent societies and turned missionary leaders into effective and implacable opponents of the slave system.4

The most powerful impulse to this development was the "Demerara martyrdom" in 1823 of the Rev. John Smith, an agent of the Congregational London Missionary Society in Guiana. Smith who had openly shown his disapproval of slavery fell victim to the colony's enraged reaction to the unsuccessful slave rebellion of 1822. Tried and convicted of complicity in the revolt without substantiating evidence, Smith was sentenced to be hanged but died in prison from illness and the harsh conditions of his confinement. The "martyrdom" created a sensation in England, particularly after the IMS published the texts of all documents relating to the case. Public outrage, evident in published letters and editorial opinion in the evangelical press, produced a flood of petitions to parliament and marked the beginning of an intensified Nonconformist crusade to eliminate
At the height of the Demerara agitation, William Knibb, a Baptist print-shop assistant, was moved by a missionary tract which he was setting, to offer himself for overseas work. In Jamaica he became a celebrated champion of the slaves, continuing his work amid intense planter hostility until his death in 1847. Much more than Smith, Knibb was an aggressive publicist and agitator. During his frequent visits to England he issued stirring appeals in the press and sought to enlist all men of religious and political influence in the slave's cause. In the crucial years 1832 and 1833 when the abolition question was before parliament he provided important information to the Anti-Slavery Society and often attended strategy sessions of the central committee. More than any other figure, Knibb compelled evangelical Dissent to identify the cause of missions with that of black emancipation.

Already by 1826 a correspondent of the Congregational Magazine was suggesting that Dissent was uniquely qualified for the antislavery crusade by its own historic mission for freedom. And by the end of the decade the veteran clerical leaders in each of the connexions had become prominently identified with the agitation—such men as William Jay among the Congregationalists, Joseph Ivimey among the Baptists, Richard Watson among the Methodists, and Hugh Heugh in the Secession Church. A ready support of the national Society, Dissenters also joined and sometimes led local organizations, as the Scottish Congregationalist, Ralph Wardlaw, did with notable success in the Glasgow Emancipation Society after its original organization in 1823. By 1830 Dissenting meetings were routinely sending petitions to the Commons while even such cautious and historic bodies as the Three Denominations and the Dissenting Deputies contributed memorials. Not to be outdone, in the same year the Wesleyan Conference, prompted by Watson, requested every Methodist chapel in the kingdom to address parliament in this interest.
Equally important was the rapid adherence of Dissenters to the new anti-slavery gospel of "immediatism." In one sense a change to new and more promising campaign tactics against West Indian slavery, "immediatism" was more broadly a call to a great moral crusade transcending issues of political strategy or national policy. In this guise it was congenial to the evangelical mind. For "immediate emancipation" abjured the reform ethos of gradual humanitarian improvement (coupled with a careful respect for existing property rights) and instead seemed almost to require a personal regeneration, an inner spiritual transformation whereby the new convert determined to make no prudential or expedient compromise with the evil but rather to battle for its immediate and universal obliteration. Although "immediatism" first emerged from Quaker and Scottish Establishment backgrounds, Nonconformists, both Scottish and English, were quick to follow. Only a month after the Rev. Andrew Thomson of St. George's, Edinburgh raised the cry for immediate and total extirpation of slavery at the Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society in October, 1830, Wardlaw was preaching "immediatism" in Glasgow (thereby alienating the considerable West Indian interest in his congregation). In the same year the London Board of Congregational Ministers formally embraced the cause. When victory over slavery in the Empire came in 1833 the revivalist and universalist nature of this faith would not permit the crusade to end. Three years earlier Wardlaw had preached the hope that "there may not be a remaining instance in earth of man the property of man," and warned that "we cannot be satisfied with diminishing or sweetening, or cutting off some of the streams of bitterness—we must stop up the fountain." And in 1832 the Baptist Ivimey had told the ladies of Chelmsford that "the utter extinction of slavery" was foretold in Bible prophecy. Thus even before the collapse of West Indian resistance, antislavery Dissenters had begun to fix critical gaze on the remaining bastion of slavery, the United States. Attention to American slavery had never been entirely absent.
Even in the eighteenth century John Wesley had damned American slavery as "the vilest sun on earth," and in 1795 the Baptist Abraham Booth had chided American coreligionists for permitting bondage in "the freest country on earth." During the opening decades of the new century evangelical periodicals continued to fret over the heathenism of American blacks and the cruelty of their masters, while in George Bourne, a product of Homerton Academy in 1828, Dissent gave an antislavery pioneer and gifted clerical agitator to the American South.

Then in the 1820s such publications as the Evangelical Magazine, the organ of the IMS, the Congregational Magazine, the Baptist Magazine, and the Wesleyan Magazine gave sustained attention to American Protestantism with its paradoxical juxtaposition of revivalism and slavery. After 1832 these monthly journals were joined by Nonconformity's newspaper, the London Patriot, which in its first issue reprinted American antislavery appeals from Benjamin Lundy's Genius of Universal Emancipation, submitted by Joseph Ivimey. Remarkable too was the fact that the emerging generation of Dissenting leaders coupled outreach to America with zeal for the antislavery cause. Especially notable among them were Wardlaw in Scotland, James in Birmingham, and Hinton, the Baptist author of the monumental History and Topography of the United States and later editor of the British Emancipator and the Anti-Slavery Reporter. By the 1830s Exeter Hall, the forum of the great reform societies, was resounding to appeals for assault on American slavery at meetings where prominent Nonconformist divines often appeared on the platform, while in Scotland a former Methodist errand-boy, George Thompson, was lecturing on the same subject in chapels of the Secession Church. From critical concern of this kind to active intervention was not a large step. One further development in these years readied British Dissenters for
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1833 Nonconformists were educated to the current state of the American antislavery
movement by the British debate over the American Colonization Society. Popular
in the South and the border states as well as in the North, the Society proposed
progressively to reduce the evil of slavery by financing the emigration of
emancipated blacks to free settlements in West Africa. In 1831 the Society's
president, the Quaker Elliot Cresson of Philadelphia, arrived in England on
a begging mission. Hoping to collect as much as £10,000, Cresson lectured in
Britain and Ireland, won a valued testimonial from the venerable Thomas Clarkson,
organized the British African Colonization Society under the patronage of a
royal duke, and received large gifts of money. Yet opposition also developed,
led by Zachary Macaulay, the editor of the Anti-Slavery Reporter, and Charles
Stuart, the antislavery eccentric whose American experience had left him strongly
opposed to the colonizationist program. In 1832 Stuart published Remarks on
the Colony of Liberia, a telling attack on Cresson's advocacy of colonizationism
in Britain.

In this controversy many Dissenters rapidly turned against the colonization
scheme. Before the 1830s occasional Nonconformist notice had favored the American
society, believing that its plan to send freed blacks to Liberia would both
reduce slavery and help Christianize the "dark continent." At its founding
in 1816 the society had received the congratulations of the Evangelical Magazine.
Thomas Raffles of Liverpool, the most prominent Congregational minister in the
north, introduced Cresson on his arrival in England to the editor of The Times,
and Dissenter journals published favorable articles on the society. The Baptist
Magazine printed Cresson's letter appealing for funds together with the
enthusiastic testimony of O.B. Brown, the politically influential Baptist minister
in Washington, that colonizationism was the only solution which would prevent
the nation from being "drenched in blood" while at the same time it would confer
huge blessings on Africa: "The colonists are taking with them the arts of civilized
life, and the light of divine revelation." Similarly, in 1832 the British Wesleyan
Conference praised colonization proposals as endeavoring some moral reparation for slavery. The London Baptist minister, Thomas Price, later one of Cresson's most severe critics, declared in June, 1833 that in the past he had honored and admired the Society's plan.²²

Yet distrust had probably been growing from the beginning of Cresson's mission. His British African Colonization Society rested on Establishment patronage, and his usual practice was to speak in Anglican churches, explaining privately that "our great hope is in the Church (where the wealth lies)." Although he publicly appealed for broad support, he regarded Dissenters as already "ultraist." By the summer of 1832 Stuart's argument that the Society was a creature of Southern slaveholders could be seen emerging in letters to the Patriot, surprising the editor by the unusual warmth which they displayed.²³

The most strident Dissenter voice raised against Cresson was that of Thomas Price, since 1825 minister of the Baptist church at Devonshire Square. Prior to the slavery controversy, Price had not been prominent, having published only a sermon, a tract on Antinomianism, and (with others) a supplement to Watts' hymns. He had initially regarded the Colonization Society with "admiration and with thankfulness to God." His new conviction in 1833 that the Society was "based on an unrighteous and detestable principle" owed much to Garrison's Thoughts on African Colonization, published in 1832. In February, 1833 Dissent's leading literary journal, the Eclectic Review, issued a twenty-three page review of Garrison's work, probably written by Price. Filled with copious extracts from the book, the review expressed shock and abhorrence of the colonization scheme, and the account had the same effect upon readers. The relation "created in my mind feelings of greater indignation than I can venture to express," wrote one correspondent to the Patriot, desperately urging Christians to "assemble and enter their protest against the proceedings of these 'American brethren'--these 'American savages.'" Cresson had reason to complain to the Baptist Magazine.
that "that most uncandid and undeserved attack in the February Eclectic is doing much harm." 26

If Price was the reviewer, he intensified the attack when Garrison arrived in London in May, 1833. The minister arranged and publicized a great antislavery meeting to be held at his own Baptist chapel at which both Garrison and Cresson were to be present. The session occurred on June 10, but Garrison, George Thompson, and Price himself turned the meeting into a clamorous anti-colonization demonstration, and Cresson angrily refused to speak. The Patriot provided the full text of the denunciations and three weeks later an indignant reply by Cresson. 27 Subsequently, a bitter exchange between Cresson and Price took place in the Baptist Magazine with Price urging Garrison's view that colonization was a scheme to perpetuate slavery and counselling readers to give no money to the American. In later reviews of American literature the Eclectic routinely deplored "feeble and sophistical" defences of colonizationism "in opposition to the advocates of emancipation." 28

Price was certainly more militant than most Nonconformists, some of whom defended the Society. But the Patriot printed the full text of the July Exeter Hall meeting when colonization was pronounced "a gross deception," and Calvin Colton, the London correspondent of the New York Observer, wrote home that it was useless to argue with the English on this question. By November James was writing to his American friend, William Patton, that faith in Cresson's society was a delusion and warning that the repute of American revivalism was fading before the cry, "Let them learn humanity towards blacks!" Dissenter objections were not merely to the colonization plan's practical shortcomings or to its slaveholder support, but to its fundamental disturbance of the evangelical vision. "What . . . is to be done with our black brethren in the Millennium?" demanded Thomas Raffles, now a convert to Cresson's opposition. "Are we then . . . to place oceans and continents between us and our poor black brethren, because,
forsooth, we cannot endure the color of their skin? I have for my part no notion of such a millennium as this: and can as soon bring myself to believe that there will be something analogous to Liberia and the Colonization Society in Heaven." 30

In Victorian England sympathy with colonization was to be as rare among prominent Dissenters as it was common among Protestant leaders in the United States.

By 1833 these developments had prepared evangelical Dissenters to take their place beside Quaker and Unitarian abolitionists in "Christian admonition" to the American churches. Already the message was being given in various ways—in sermons and public addresses (duly reported in American newspapers), in "affectionate" letters sent overseas, in "pathetic" or indignant appeals to American travelers. Sometimes, as did James before the IMS in 1834, speakers contrasted the achievements of Britain and America in the antislavery cause, and appealed to Americans in attendance to carry British prayers for emancipation to the American churches. 31 Such appeals were dangerously irritating because at the same moment American evangelical statesmen were condemning abolition and strengthening their commitment to colonization. 32

Leonard Bacon wrote his Review of Pamphlets on Slavery and Colonization in 1833, and in the same year Robert J. Breckenridge elaborately defended colonization in the Biblical Repository. 32

Visitors to Britain were apt to be wearied with persistent criticism and become resentful. The spectacular exception was the conversion to abolition of the New York Presbyterian, Samuel Hanson Cox, a triumph which the New York Evangelist attributed to the influence of John Morison, editor of the Evangelical Magazine, Hugh Heugh, Secession churchman of Glasgow, and John Edgar, the Belfast professor and temperance reformer. In May, 1833 Cox had defended America's slavery record at the British and Foreign Bible Society; in September he had told the great Scottish evangelical, Thomas Chalmers, that Americans were sick of hearing criticism and complained of personal attacks on him by clerical orators at Exeter Hall. Yet "he pondered on the subject—on what he had heard of it in this
country," and came to see "all its enormities." In 1835 he wrote an introduction to the British edition of William Jay's expose, *Slavery in America.*

More direct approaches were also in the making. Wardlaw, writing to a missionary in India in 1833, exulted at the Glasgow plan to send George Thompson to America as an antislavery orator. Thompson had already become well established as an effective agitator for West Indian emancipation, and Garrison's 1833 visit to England had inspired him to found a network of societies throughout Britain committed to *universal* abolition. Thompson was to go to America as agent of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, but the Nonconformist bodies were also moving on their own. In the same year the Congregational Board debated the wisdom of sending an admonitory letter to American ministers, but the Baptists led the way. At the end of December, 1833 a declaration of the London Board of Ministers to American Baptists reminded these brethren that slavery was "a crime against the Majesty of heaven" which every Christian was bound to oppose. Recounting their own struggle against West Indian slavery and stressing their own momentous conversion to "immediate emancipation," English Baptists urged Americans to join in acknowledging slavery as "a sin to be abandoned, and not an evil to be mitigated." The letter closed with earnest exhortations to action, warning at the same time that colonizationist remedies were wholly inadequate.

These antislavery commotions and manoeuvrings served as background to the transatlantic denominational missions of 1834 and 1835. The initiative came from England, and the primary object was not the promotion of the antislavery crusade, of course, but rather the completion of the new and confident Anglo-American sense of identity and unity in Puritan tradition and evangelical Protestantism. Yet the issue of slavery assumed an ever enlarging role in the history of these exchanges. The first visit, that of the English Congregational delegation to America in 1834, generated some inevitable friction but no irreparable injury to transatlantic amity. In the following year American
Congregational and Presbyterian bodies sent representatives to visit the Congregational Union, the Scottish churches, and an assortment of British reform societies. Here tensions were more manifest and the outcome less reassuring. Finally, in that same summer of 1835, while the American envoys were in Europe, the British Baptists sent representatives to the American Baptist Triennial Convention at Richmond. Dispatched without preparation or invitation, the Baptist mission proved disastrous. While the other religious embassies, British and American, had brushed with antislavery controversy, the Baptist envoys, despite heroic efforts to avoid combat, were drawn into violent conflict, both in America and England. Indeed, the mission was so destructive to its fraternal objects that, despite plans for more such visits, no further Anglo-American exchanges were attempted after 1835. To both British Nonconformists and American Protestants it was clear that the magnitude of their differences over slavery required a more wary approach to religious cooperation.

There may be cause to wonder why disaster did not strike more quickly. The American society through which these British delegates passed in 1834 and 1835 was experiencing the explosive disorders of the early abolition agitation. In the South hatred and fear of the new militancy progressed swiftly from the silencing of native liberals to the seizure of Northern abolition tracts from the United States mails at Charleston. The North was scarcely less harsh. There the Clinton Hall riot in October, 1833 was followed by a crescendo of violence as abolitionists tried to exploit platform and press for their unpopular views. In July 1834 a New York mob destroyed the house of the antislavery philanthropist, Lewis Tappan, a similar assault on the home of Samuel Hanson Cox being prevented only by the hastily summoned militia. George Thompson's arrival in September and his subsequent lecture campaign so heightened passions that "the infamous foreign scoundrel" was in danger of being lynched on several occasions. Over the next two years American abolitionist orators such as Theodore Dwight Weld
and Henry B. Stanton were mobbed repeatedly, while in November 1837 the movement had its first martyr in the Alton editor, Elijah Lovejoy. British antislavery visitors could peaceably tour such a nation only with deliberate circumspection.  

The first Dissenting visitors, the Congregational representatives, were circumspect. In England the two delegates, Andrew Reed and James Matheson, had signified their abhorrence of slavery, though Matheson appears to have thought better of the colonization scheme than did Reed. In America they moved chiefly among American colonizationist churchmen, fulfilling their denominational duties, never concealing their strong antislavery views but avoiding identification with abolitionist militants. Following their arrival in New York in April 1834 they began a round of greeting Congregational and Presbyterian assemblies, visiting the New York anniversaries, and observing the progress of American religion. Nothing in their instructions required them to testify against slavery to their denominational brethren, and in New York the delegates did not attend the antislavery convention. Nonetheless, in his travels, Reed, the more important of the delegates, openly disclosed his sympathy for blacks and disgust with the slave system. He admired the industry and thrift of free negroes, a refutation of common argument that blacks were better off in bondage. He was horrified by a visit to the Baltimore slave mart and touched by the ardor and honesty of slaves' religious devotions in Kentucky. His judgments were sometimes shrewd. Slaves' actual conditions, he noted, were often worse than the stipulations of the law, and they were not improving. American debate on the issue, he thought, was inflamed by society's fear of the blacks' growing numbers, while he was sure that the slaves themselves were increasingly pressing for emancipation. In Boston he joined in consultations with Lyman Beecher, John Tappan, and other moderate reformers who were seeking the fusion of colonizationists and abolitionists—plans which matured late in the year in the short-lived American Union. Always he perceived the issue from the evangelical perspective: religion
had been hostile to West Indian planters, and American planters could sustain slavery only at the expense of Christianity. His companion, Matheson, appears to have been somewhat less candid, but in New Hampshire he attempted to move a congregation to action by reciting the history of the British struggle and at the farewell service in New York he reproved American churches for tolerating the nation's great sin.

Yet the Englishmen were generally successful in avoiding controversy, and the productive character of their visit was brought into question only when their report, written primarily by Reed, was published in London and New York early in 1835. A critical assessment at the end of the volume compared the rival programs of the Colonization Society and the Antislavery Society. While Reed granted that the former was supported by "the intelligent and influential in most places," he dismissed its remedies for slavery as complicated, vague, and totally inadequate: in fifteen years it had moved fewer than three thousand blacks to Africa. Furthermore, colonizationism was both morally defective and economically unsound. The Colonization Society sought Southern support, reassuring slaveholders that it meant no disturbance to property, and it ignored the basic American need for African (and Irish) heavy labor. The Antislavery Society, by contrast, was properly oriented toward immediate and total abolition, though Reed agreed that its methods were sometimes shocking and needlessly provocative. And while abolition now seemed "in advance of the public mind," Reed was able to identify hopeful trends, one of which was the effect of the British emancipation act of 1833 on American opinion.

In England these comments on slavery at first made little stir. Most British reviewers of the book focused on other aspects of American religion--its revivals and especially the experiment in separation of church and state. It was only in a more highly charged atmosphere six years later that the two men had to defend themselves against Thompson and other British critics for their
alleged deference toward American hosts and their incautious criticism of American abolitionist methods. In America, however, the comments on slavery caused offense. Princeton's Biblical Repertory, probably the most prestigious of the religious reviews, found the visitors' treatment of slavery the single great fault in an otherwise gratifying assessment of American religion. Reed, the review pointed out, had spent only a few days in Virginia and Kentucky, and his judgments of slave conditions could have been based only on unfriendly descriptions rather than personal experience. Had he investigated properly, "he would have found that the slaves are far less severely tasked,—that they are far better fed, clothed, and lodged, and all their physical wants better provided for, than the operatives in the English manufactories." Farther south, the book was rejected with less ceremony. The Columbia, South Carolina Telescope, threatening to organize a boycott of Harper Brothers, the American publisher, extracted an apology. The New York editors confessed that, relying on the good reputation of the British ministers, they had not troubled to scrutinize the text.

Yet these contacts with slavery controversy were slighter than the more trying experiences of the American delegates to Britain in the following summer. All of the four delegates were conservatives on social questions and hostile to abolition. John Codman, one of those chosen by the Massachusetts General Assembly, was an old-fashioned Boston Congregationalist who had remained unaffected by the Unitarian sweep twenty years earlier. As a young man he had studied in Edinburgh and had numerous British acquaintances. Heman Humphrey, his companion, was president of Amherst College and a champion of temperance and discreet revivals. Gardiner Spring of Albany and Robert J. Breckinridge of Baltimore were Old School Presbyterians, but the latter, a fiery Kentuckian, was easily the most colorful member of the delegation. When their departure neared, the abolitionist Elizur Wright warned Theodore Weld that "Spring, Humphrey, Breckiridge [sic], etc. are . . . to be at the May meetings in London, and to
take the rounds afterwards." He thought "their colonization Jesuitism might sadly perplex our British brethren," and wanted to send Samuel Hanson Cox and Joshua Leavitt to neutralize their influence. But another correspondent of George Thompson rejoiced that the delegates were going to the May meetings and anticipated that they would be much embarrassed by the slavery question.  

The experience of this foursome demonstrated the rising dominance of the divisive slavery issue in Anglo-American relations. All of the delegates attempted to adjust to the emancipationist ethos of evangelical Britain. Codman seized a chance opportunity at the Wesleyan Missionary Society to express his abhorrence of slavery and hope for its extinction, while at the same time stressing the obstacles in the way. Even Breckinridge expressed his approval of an antislavery statement developed at the Congregational Union. But British emotions were
too strong to permit these moderate gestures to be accepted as satisfactory. "My feelings," complained Codman, "and those of my brethren, were frequently wounded by allusions to this subject . . . and by the unqualified abuse which was heaped upon our country for the toleration of an evil, the existence of which no one could more sincerely lament than ourselves." Nor were matters improved when Gardiner Spring preached to a half-empty Craven Chapel because many of the English delegates were in Exeter Hall listening to Daniel O'Connell castigate the Americans. Feeling in Scotland and Ireland was even more intense. Attempting to tell Scottish clerics of their important advances in temperance and revivals, the Americans were constantly being forced to discuss voluntaryism and slavery. And while Scottish Dissenters were ready to applaud America's free churches, they were just as ready to condemn America's peculiar sin. It was a subject, complained President Humphrey, on which "Americans are liable to be treated with some degree of incivility." He was annoyed that he and his colleagues were held personally responsible for slavery, and their disclaimers "received with an apparent hesitation which they do not deserve." At public meetings they were embarrassed by appeals "which would have been more in place had we been slave holders ourselves or friends to the system." In Ireland, Spring, the most impressive of the delegates according to James, was mortified by the decision of the Synod of Ulster not to receive him.

The year 1835 was pivotal in the rise of antislavery ardor in Nonconformity, and consequently the American ministers met with mixed cordiality and reproof. When at the summer's end Spring, Codman, and Humphrey returned home, they all published somewhat restrained appreciations of their British experiences. The fourth delegate, Breckinridge, remained on in Britain to play a more bitter and dramatic role in the hectic events of 1836. And when he turned homeward, he was to recommend that the churches give consideration to no further missions across the Atlantic.
Antislavery dissonance in these Congregational-Presbyterian exchanges, however, paled in comparison with the disastrous collisions attendant on the visit of British Baptist envoys to America in 1835. In this mission, unlike the other denominational visits, slavery and its relation to the churches became the overriding issue, overwhelming the harmonious ends of the embassy and generating bitter controversy on both sides of the Atlantic. Hopes for a unitive Atlantic Protestantism, so promising at the beginning of the year, survived only in far more somber and cautious form by autumn.

Although unanticipated, the commotions attending the British Baptist mission were probably inevitable, partly because of the enhanced controversial atmosphere of 1835 and partly because slavery had already become an especially emotional issue for Baptists in both Britain and America. Since the turn of the century English Baptists had labored to end the slave trade and slavery in the Empire, and in the 1830s the denomination was very quickly committed to "immediatism." During that same decade Baptist antislavery leadership passed from Joseph Irimey to a younger generation—militants like Thomas Price and John Philippo Mursell, the radical voluntaryist from Leicester, or more politically sophisticated statesmen like John Howard Hinton and Francis Augustus Cox. The determination of the connexion to carry the crusade to America was already evident in the London ministers' appeal of December, 1833 to American brethren, an appeal to which half a year later the Americans had given no reply.

In the United States the antislavery movement was rapidly creating divisions among Baptists. In New England abolitionism had made great strides among Baptists, especially in Maine and New Hampshire. The denomination's machinery, however, never very elaborate among Baptists, had remained under the control of conservative statesmen, while the leading newspaper, the Boston Christian Watchman, was pledged never to permit the slavery issue to invade its pages. Understandably, Baptist abolitionists, condemned by northern society and denounced by their own
denominational leaders, looked to the prestigious British church for help.

Nine months before the Baptist delegation landed in New York, an anonymous American minister placed an appeal in the British Baptist Magazine: "The anti-slavery cause is gaining ground, but we do all we do at the risk of life. We require all caution, and grace, and wisdom. Your delegation must be faithful, and show the house of Israel their sin." 49

In June, 1834, without waiting to judge the outcome of the Congregational mission, the Baptist Union decided to send its own representation to America, a hasty decision apparently taken because American Baptists met in convention in 1835 and not again until 1838. Just how far slavery entered into the British decision is difficult to say. At the meeting of the Baptist Union the stated purpose was to inaugurate transatlantic fellowship and gain more intimate knowledge of fellow-Baptists in America. The official instructions which went with the delegates and which they communicated to the Convention at Richmond made no mention of slavery. Yet a witness against slavery was certainly expected. The influential minister, Charles Stovel, pointed out that since many American Baptists were "in a state of slavery, . . . it cannot be a light matter to know in what way we may be able to promote their comfort and deliverance." More directly, the Baptist Union circular soliciting funds to defray the costs of the journey openly proclaimed that one of its objects was "to promote most zealously . . . the sacred cause of negro emancipation." Some testimony against this "foul blot on the American national character" must also have been anticipated in the Union's choice of anti-slavery delegates for the American mission. 49

The Union selected James Hoby and Francis Augustus Cox for their delegates. Hoby was a successful Birmingham preacher whose views on slavery leaned toward colonizationism and compensation to masters. But he was entirely overshadowed by his companion. Cox, the minister of Hackney, was a great man among the
Baptists. An effective preacher, a popular author, and founder of the Baptist Magazine, Cox was also a well-known advocate of liberal causes. He promoted parliamentary reform, helped establish London University, and counted among his friends such a notable as the Scottish radical, Henry Brougham. Cox also had acquired a reputation as antislavery orator, in token of which he sat on the central committee of the British and Foreign Society for the Universal Abolition of Negro Slavery and the Slave Trade. According to Thomas Price, when the dangers of American violence had been weighed at a meeting of the Baptist London Board, Cox had professed a willingness to be a martyr for the slave. And in America George Thompson, according to his later testimony, rejoiced at the news that Cox would soon lend help to the American cause.

The risks of the mission must certainly have become more apparent in September, 1834 when the American reply to the British Baptist epistle on slavery was finally received after a delay of nine months. The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, headed by the conservative Spencer Cone, refused to enter into any discussion of slavery. "Associated for the exclusive purpose of sending the gospel to the heathen, and to other benighted men not belonging to our own country," went the reply, "we are precluded, by our Constitution, from taking any part in the discussion on the subject proposed in said communication." Then accompanying this formal disclaimer, a long obiter dictum explained the American predicament with respect to emancipation. Since constitutional obstacles made any federal attack on slavery impossible, the only hope lay in calm and affectionate argument to move Southern masters to voluntary manumission. Moral appeals had already proved victorious in the North and would soon add Kentucky and Virginia to the roster of free states. But there was a sharp and impatient tone to the letter as well. The British themselves were responsible for the introduction of American slavery. Abolition talk increased the danger of insurrections, and "people in England would think somewhat differently on this
subject . . . , if the slaves were among themselves and the perils of this moral volcano were constantly impending over their own heads." Lastly and candidly, the Board made clear that it meant to retain the confidence of slaveholding Baptists and preserve the unity of the American church.

In November the London Board, "Dr. Cox in the Chair," briefly noted this reply but expressed hope that other American Baptists would "adopt every means consistent with Christian principles to diffuse their sentiments, and thus secure the immediate extinction of the slave system." This quick resolve masked an ambiguity which accompanied the Baptist delegates overseas and eventually brought confusion on the mission. Was the delegation to honor the Americans' refusal to discuss slavery or was it to follow the line of brotherly reproof opened in the original London letter? This transatlantic exchange also raised contention among American Baptists. The American Board had kept the entire exchange secret until the texts were published in the English Baptist Magazine early in 1835.

American abolitionist Baptists were outraged and found a voice in Cyrus Pitt Grosvenor, the minister at Salem and founder of the Salem Antislavery Society. Although a member of the Foreign Mission Board, Grosvenor was absent during the crucial sessions and learned of the exchange only after it was republished in the New York Observer on February 7, 1835. Noting that the English communication had been sent in December, 1833, Grosvenor in a furious letter to the Liberator indicted his colleagues for inexcusable delay, secrecy, and duplicity. Under his prodding, the Watchman finally republished the texts in March as the English delegation was setting out for America. But Grosvenor, unsatisfied, decided to supply the London Baptists with another reply, and for this purpose laid plans for a Boston convention of abolitionist Baptists in May when the English delegates would be in New England.

This was the environment in which the Baptist mission was launched. Cox and Hoby arrived in New York in April, 1835 and returned to England in October.
During that time they found it necessary to relate to the slavery issue in three major settings—the Triennial Convention at Richmond, the May anniversaries in New York, and Cox's subsequent tour in New England.

The Baptist visit to Richmond was uneventful, and for that very reason infamous in the eyes of antislavery men on both sides of the Atlantic. Cox and Hoby made the appropriate fraternal speeches, pondered missionary reports, discussed the evangelization of the West with John Mason Peck, heard hymns in Cherokee, but bore no public testimony against slavery. When the convention chose four American delegates, two of them South Carolina slaveholders, for a return embassy to Britain in 1836, they made no comment (though they must have been alarmed). In their report one year later they ventured to justify their silence. Since the Union's formal address made no reference to slavery, they said, "we were left ... free to pursue such a course as we might think most judicious after having informed ourselves of the existing state of the parties, and of the relative position of different societies." Neutrality, they concluded, was most judicious. Abolition speeches would have violated Virginia law, outraged the Convention, and vitiated the denominational ends of their mission. Before leaving Richmond the Englishmen assembled a private party of "influential brethren," ostensibly to leave a testimony to antislavery principles, but also to obtain guidance "relative to a public co-operation with the abolition agency, and the society about to hold its anniversary in New York."

If such a party included such denominational worthies as Spencer Cone, Howard Malcom, and Daniel Sharp, as it surely did, it is not difficult to imagine the counsel.

Cox was seeking advice because he had already received a request from George Thompson to speak at the Antislavery Society on Tuesday, May 12. In an English speech a year later, Thompson disclosed that he had arranged to have J.O. Choules, the English-born Baptist minister at Newport, warn Cox on his
arrival in America against the colonizationists at Richmond. Choules missed reaching Cox, but Thompson's invitation followed the English delegation to Richmond. To this request Cox made no reply because, as he stated, he was "in an indeterminate state of mind." In New York, however, the Society and the public expected his appearance. Newspapers published his London speeches against slavery, provoking the conservative press to rage that "some maiden Ladies in England sent forth two mad missionaries to preach treason to our constitution."

On May 11 while journeying northward on the steamer, Cox learned that he had been advertised as one of the resolution movers at the convention on the following day. On his arrival he was visited by Thompson and some ten officers of the Society. The discussion was long and inconclusive, Cox objecting that his involvement would be too political but promising to give definite answer on the following morning. He did so in the form of a brief note:

If I decline the honour of appearing on your platform this day, on occasion of your anniversary meeting, I must be understood to assume a position of neutrality, not with regard to those great principles and objects which it is well known Britain in general, and our denomination in particular, have maintained and promoted, but with regard solely to the political bearings of the question, with which, as a stranger, a foreigner, a visitor, I could not attempt to intermeddle.

And having once again made this decision for silence, Cox went off (with little sense of irony) to visit the Deaf and Dumb Institution. 56

At the Antislavery meeting Thompson made the most of Cox's "betrayal." Without producing the minister's letter, Thompson bitterly assailed the "hypocrisy" which could make Cox an eloquent abolitionist in Hackney and a mute observer in New York. Ominously for the future, he professed himself "ready and willing to settle the whole matter between himself and Dr. Cox in London, in Birmingham, or at Hackney." Hoby who was present as an astonished observer undertook the
difficult and unpopular task of trying to defend his colleague from the gallery. Here began the fierce denunciations of the English mission which were to delight abolitionist audiences in England and America for years to come.

Following this explosion, fully reported in the press, possible accommodations were futilely explored in further meetings with Thompson, Birney, Arthur Tappan, and others. Then on May 19 Cox set off on his grand tour to New England, Canada, and the West. Once again he brushed with the slavery issue during the Massachusetts Convention of Baptist Ministers on May 26-28 in Boston. Here the critical issue was whether he would give any recognition to the irregular sessions of Baptist abolitionist preachers organized by C. P. Grosvenor. Attended by over fifty Baptist ministers, this conference was proceeding to draft a new and friendly reply to the London Baptists' 1833 epistle on slavery. The English reproof was a "strictly proper and benevolent exercise of the moral power with which our common Benefactor has blessed you," stated the conference. "We are a guilty nation before God, touching the inalienable rights of many of our fellow-men." Cox dutifully attended the missionary and education societies and visited the Newton Theological Institution and Mount Auburn Cemetery, but shunned the abolitionist Baptists. Undaunted by Cox's careful policy of neutrality, Grosvenor had the memorial signed by 185 Baptist pastors and sent it off to England for publication in the Baptist Magazine.

From the moment of his landing in America, Cox had been confronted by an insoluble dilemma, caught between the requirements of his fraternal denominational mission and the expectations of abolitionists. Concluding that he could not cement ties with American Baptists unless he avoided the sensitive topic of slavery, he had followed the prudent course of silence. Only once, late in his American stay and in a more obscure setting, did he grasp the opportunity to extol the emancipationist cause. At the New Hampshire convention of Freewill Baptists, who were themselves strongly antislavery, he spoke "with
decision" in support of a unanimous motion for abolition. By the time the delegates returned to England in the autumn, their fraternal visit had become fatefuly entangled in explosive controversy, and Cox was careful to secure letters from such prominent American clergy as Spencer Cone, Daniel Sharp, and William Buell Sprague testifying to the regrettable necessity of his prudent policy in the American political environment.

In July, 1834 at the beginning of the great transatlantic missions, John Angell James, the contemporary Nonconformist best known to the American public, had written hopefully to Sprague of the possible conversion of American churchmen to true abolition: "Your country must be foremost of all lands in the great moral renovation of the world, but she has some sins first to put away from herself." A year later, assessing the results of the Congregational delegation, he was less sanguine: "I am not quite sure we shall derive all the advantage we anticipated from the deputation." And within a few years James would himself be subjected to scathing attack by the New York Observer for his views on slavery. This progression reflected the setback in transatlantic evangelical ties produced by the events of 1834-1835. One high purpose of the carefully nurtured relation between Dissent and the American church was mutual exhortation to religious and moral perfection in order that the expected renovation of the earth might indeed occur. In such causes as temperance, revivals, the free and voluntary church, the exchange of opinion and encouragement had been judged welcome and constructive, thus ministering to an atmosphere of endeavor and growing confidence. But by 1835 it was apparent that while Dissenters embraced abolition as a holy cause, leading American churchmen were unable to adopt so radical a solution for their "national sin" or to accept brotherly correction from abroad. The following year, 1836, was to see still further disruption in the ranks of evangelicalism, both British and American, as a result of this revelation.
The historical literature on the antislavery movement in both Britain and the United States is enormous. For a partial bibliography of the American movement, see Dwight Ewell Dunod, A Bibliography of Antislavery in America (Ann Arbor, 1961). Works focused specifically on British-American ties in the antislavery crusade are fewer, but see especially Betty Fladeand, Men and Brothers, Anglo-American Antislavery Cooperation (Urbana, 1972), and Christine Bolt, The Anti-Slavery Movement and Reconstruction: A Study in Anglo-American Co-operation (London, 1969). Unfortunately, neither author gives much attention to transatlantic religious ties with Nonconformists. Generally, the role of evangelical Nonconformity in the antislavery cause has been neglected. Attention has been paid to the important Quaker role—see especially Thomas E. Drake, Quakers and Slavery in America (New Haven, 1950)—and the Wesleyan story has been slightly touched upon in Donald G. Mathews, Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845 (Princeton, 1965). The most relevant research on evangelical Dissent and American slavery is Thomas F. Harwood's "British Evangelical Abolitionism and American Churches in the 1830's," Journal of Southern History, August 1962 (based on his earlier dissertation), though he deals only with the 1830s, ignores English Congregationalism, and fails to distinguish among the several Scottish denominations.
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