Sept. 2nd, 2013

Dear workshop members,

The following paper is a reworking of my dissertation claims on the connections between British and American abolitionists in the crucial decades leading up to the American Civil War. The late 1830s and 1840s were vital years of cooperation between the two movements as the British movement's influence declined in Great Britain and the American movement's mobilization increasingly organized itself--despite intense formal and often violent resistance.

Theoretically, I'm examining two dimensions of transnational movement scholarship: the notion of 'newness' of transnational dynamics, particularly around the use of media technologies and the notion of 'scale' and verticality in transnational diffusion. The paper I present here is an attempt to challenge notions put forth by contentious politics approaches that the flow of tactics, knowledge and information within a transnational context move up and down, from local to national to transnational. The abolitionists developed ideas and strategies together, despite expansive distance and (for us 21st century-ites) crude media technologies. Indeed, the ideas developed by the two movements to further the abolitionist cause in the United States appear often to be devoid of an origin or original author given the closeness of the cooperation between the movements. As a result, diffusion or the spread of ideas and people appears to have moved *across* movement networks rather than up or down (as I previously argued in my dissertation). Each movement maintained dynamic sites of tactical invention, with changes in one site affecting directly changes in the other site. Based on this dynamic, I draw the concept physicists developed of "quantum entanglement"—previously connected particles become separated geographically yet remain linked to one another, continue to be dynamic sites of activity and are impacted if the connected site is also impacted.

My questions for our discussion: as always, I remain concerned about matching my evidence to my theoretical claims. Do I need further examples of the connected sites of action? Does the evidence I provide on the role of women and political engagement remain sufficient to prove my argument on horizontal flow and simultaneity? Could my theoretical discussion use more detailed and explicit unpacking on the process of horizontal diffusion and the importance of the domestic state to transnational tactical diffusion across movements?

Thank you very much for your help, in advance of our discussion.

Best,

Cecelia Walsh-Russo

0

Cooperation and Diffusion: Tactical knowledge building and the 19th century Anglo-American abolitionist alliance

Part I. Introduction to case study
The recent uprisings of the Arab Spring signaled to observers, activists and scholars of social movements alike the fundamental place of diffusion dynamics within social movements. From Tunisia to Egypt the fall of authoritarian regimes due to mass mobilizations and collective action indicate the centrality of the spread of idea, tactics and personnel to the experience and study of social movements. The spread of ideas, tactics and personnel has long been a focus of study within scholarship on social movements (Tarrow, 1989; Tarrow and McAdam, 2005; Tilly, 2004; Whittier and Meyer, 1997; Wood, 2012; Chabot, 2002; Chabot and Duyvendak, 2002; McAdam and Rucht, 1993). Dynamics of tactical learning within the flow of movement forms, particularly the transnational spread of tactics has been a recent significant concern of social movement scholarship (transnational scholars here).

Much of the scholarship on transnational social movements tends to focus almost exclusively on elements specific to *"new"* transnational social movement activists (Tarrow, 2005; Tarrow and McAdam, 2005; Roggeband, 2010; Smith, 1999; Wood, 2001; 2007; 2012; Matsuzawa, 2011; Vasi, 2011). Much recent scholarly work on transnational social movements and diffusion, while generating important theoretical and empirical findings, nevertheless tends to devote its attention almost exclusively to contemporary anti-globalization, anti-neoliberalism movements and their myriad of targets, including international financial institutions, international organizations, and other non-state actors (Tarrow, 2005; Tarrow and Della Porta, 2005). However, sociological understandings of transnational social movements cannot be limited to the present period. Drawing on historical case studies, we can learn much from the past about the internal dynamics of transnational networks: for example, the process of coalition building across geographic borders, how collective identity may be formulated and maintained across nation-states, the effects of interaction with international governing bodies (Tarrow, 2005). Like today's movements against what are often broadly defined effects of "globalization" and "neoliberalism," social movements prior to the twentieth and twenty first centuries also targeted institutions representative of a global capitalism tied to specifically transnational or international modes of productions. Despite the nineteenth century constraints of transportation, limited communication technologies, and the devastating effects of colonialism, transnational organizing against international targets of oppression and violence flourished. Information, people and tactical knowledge flowed back and forth between the Old World of European nation-states and the New World of burgeoning state formation and power. Thus, the purpose of the study is to challenge scholarly theoretical arguments of diffusion that favor vertical or "scaled" diffusion models in favor of a theoretical explanation of transnational tactical diffusion that places mutuality, fluidity and bi-directional flows of ideas and information, tactics, personnel at the center of the explanation for diffusion process as it takes place among actors tied to one another across state borders. In addition, the study draws upon the case study of transnational ties between two movements of the 19th century. By drawing upon a historical case study, the study repositions transnational diffusion away from understandings of its "newness" and towards an understanding of transnational diffusion dynamics as an historical process with commonalities and direct links to today's political realities of globalized capital, resources and resistance. Thus, the study seeks not only to challenge traditional dimensions of theoretical frameworks used to explain vertical or "scaled" diffusion (Tarrow, 2005) but also offer contribution to empirical evidence of transnational diffusion's historical context. The study assesses the traits of transnational connections between British and American abolitionists during the mid-19th century as the two

1

movements moved into greater contact with one another. The British abolitionist movement attained widespread success beginning with the ban of slavery in the West Indies in 1833 followed by a complete ban on slavery in British Empire by 1838. The American movement achieved no such widespread or noteworthy victory on the national stage. Perhaps ironically both movements by the early 1840s began to grapple with similar concerns on the question of slavery, particularly as American slavery came into greater focus for the two movements (Temperley, 1972). In assessing the inter-movement dynamics between the British and American abolitionist campaigns, I observed the content of British and American abolitionist writings found in the two movements' national organizations newspapers as well as non-movement, mainstream newspaper writings compiled by the Niles' Register. The observations of the two movements were also based upon secondary writings of historians of abolitionism on both sides of the Atlantic (Temperley, 1972; Taylor, 1974; Rugemer, 2009; Brown, 2006; Rice, 1981; Blackett, 1983). As I will demonstrate in the following sections, by the mid-1840s the two movements simultaneously learned from one another and built a cooperative unity through transnational networks with regards to the following concern: end slavery within the United States and ultimately bring an end to slavery throughout the world. As the largest slave state in the Western hemisphere, the United States presented an almost unassailable challenge for British and American abolitionists alike. Indeed, the challenge threatened at times to overwhelm the movements. Internal debate and eventual conflict over the role of women and the broader role of abolitionism within the larger political contexts of Great Britain and the United States drew such contention and division, the alliance between the British and American movements appeared to almost diminish. Yet, diminish their ties they did not. In fact, the spread of tactics continued under conditions of cooperation.

Unlike prior accounts of transnational diffusion of ideas (Matsuzawa, 2011; Chabot; 2002; Chabot and Duyvendak, 2002), the study demonstrates how abolitionists on both sides of the Atlantic tactically drew from one another *at the same time*. The spread of tactics used by both movements to address the specific challenge of slavery were not only transferred through a bi-directional flow of interrelations between British and American abolitionists based upon friendship ties and cultural factors such as similar religious worldviews. In the case of British and American abolitionists, these factors certainly contributed to the increase in the bi-directional flow of the two movement's tactics, ideas and people (Temperley, 1972; Taylor 1974). However, the case study of British and American abolitionist movements during the early and mid-19th century provides an important empirical corrective to the theoretical framework of diffusion across horizontal relations in that each movement's relationship to their domestic context shaped the contours of *how* tactical diffusion with one another occurred. Matsuzawa's (2011) placement of the *translocal* as the pivotal locale certainly helps advance scholarly understandings of the role of local agency within the broader transnational diffusion dynamic. However, her account undertheorizes the impact of the state, how its domestic and international policies and its acceptance or rejection of the movement's claims, grievances and tactics shape the impact of mutual influence and how significant the collaboration between 'fellow travelers' may be on an international stage (Matsuzawa, 2011). Furthermore, my discussion departs from prior arguments of actor agency within diffusion processes and the concept of "creative reinvention" (Chabot and Duyvendak, 2002) of tactical forms because of evidence that the movement of tactics occurred sometimes simultaneously, was bi-directional and emerged from the interaction of domestic actors acting in their capacity as international actors, creating and recreating space beyond the domestic state for discussion, disagreement and action against slavery. The study provides further evidence of how ideational, tactical and relational diffusion may not only occur along a vertical path of power within which an *innovator* creates and an *adaptor* adopts or adapts an innovation but also across horizontal lines of mutuality and respect where the origin of a tactical innovation may emerge within two locales simultaneously.

The historical case study of the connections between the British and American abolitionist movements serves an example of how the emergence and experience of horizontal diffusion is at least partially explained by state response to a movement's use of tactics within the specific context of the nation-state. To further this argument, I will demonstrate how the British movement and American movement worked together because of a shared experience: neither the British nor the American state despite similar democratic contexts[1] permitted abolitionism to use traditional means for political participation. The British movement initially became focused upon the American movement *only after* British abolitionists found themselves thwarted within their own domestic context, post-emancipation victory. The strategic turn towards the American movement for the British movement occurred following the legislative victory of 1838 as British abolitionists became increasingly marginalized and dismissed within their domestic context. The British state and broader populous left behind abolitionist concerns and moved on to other political matters (Temperley, 1972). Thus, because of the British state's rejection of the British movement's further contributions to domestic politics following the end of slavery, British abolitionists began to look elsewhere for struggles with which to provide influence and experience. As the British encountered the American movement, the two movements became aligned together against slavery in the United States under a unifying framework: end the inherent ideological contradiction within the United States, a slave state with a national identity that purports to support and spread human freedom (Temperley, 1972; Flanderland, 1972). As the movements together began to simultaneously challenge their national states'—and eventually global opinion--the movements on each side of the Atlantic became simultaneously two dynamic and knowledge building sites of cooperative action, each movement learning from the other. The study will trace out the evidence for horizontal diffusion, mutual influence and "back and forth" flow—shaped by in part by their respective state's response to their movement-- through examination of two key moments of cooperation during the 1840s: a) the debate over the role of women within the Anglo-American abolitionist alliance and b) the debate over the relationship between abolitionism and the broader field of movements and political concerns concurrent with antebellum abolitionism.

Part II. Literature on social movements and diffusion
The diffusion of ideas, practices, personnel, worldview, and tactics between social movement organizations and participants has been a foundational focus in the study of social movements (Tarrow, 1983; Tilly,1977, 1993, 2006; McAdam, 1995; McAdam and Rucht, 1993; Whittier and Meyer, 1997; Soule, 1997; Strang and Soule, 1998;). Early studies in the post-civil rights era of social movement analysis examined how movements were able to develop, refine and spread templates or repertoires of movement actions and ideas (Tilly, 1995; Smith, Smith, and Johnston, 2002; Smith 1994; 2004; Ayres, 1999). More recent scholarship on transnational social movements and contentious politics has begun to analyze how participants across state borders work to develop a shared vision between and among the transnational portions of their movements based on a global ethos of cooperation (Tarrow, 2005;

---

[1] Nevertheless, significant differences with regard to political context characterized the two movements. Among the noted differences, the British state offered a centralized Parliamentary process for British abolitionists to voice opposition to British participation in the slave trade primarily through the use of petition. The American movement was woefully thwarted by the 1836 Congressional "Gag Rule" that prevented the hearing of abolitionist petitions to Congress. The Gag Rule was subsequently supported by Congress for many years and meant the American movement was prevented from being heard within a national political context.

Smith 2005; DellaPorta and Tarrow, 2005; Wood, 2012).[2] However, as prior research reminds us, participants rarely develop this vision under circumstances of their own choosing.

Traditional studies of diffusion often examined the dissemination of an innovation (an item, idea or practice) to adopters (individuals, groups, corporate units) through modes of communication, social structures (networks, community, class) and social values or cultural practices (Katz 1999: 147). The categorical dichotomy between groups that create diffused items and those who receive those items-- and analysis surrounding the interaction between the spread of an item and the reception within a local population--has a long standing tradition within social science and the study of social movements. Early works on diffusion examined the spread of a newly acquired item or idea typically over a single geographic region (Rogers, 1962). The early paradigmatic models of diffusion held that the adoption process of an idea or thing moved from one stage of adoption to the next, and thus provided conditions for seemingly fluid acceptance or rejection of a particular innovation, transmitted--and either adopted or rejected--by structurally equivalent actors. Among earlier diffusion theorists, several fundamental assumptions emerged. Diffusion was understood as encompassed by a set of five stages and followed discreet rules of staging and implementation of an innovation (Chabot, 2002). The S-curve theory was developed as a predictor for the increase in individuals adopting an innovation after passage of each time period, with adoption rate increases most striking after the stages of experimentation and adaptation (Rodgers, 1995: 23; Chabot, 2002: 107).[3]

As diffusion research within social movements evolved, studies on movements increasingly emphasized explanations that detailed how claims, tactics, ideas spread across populations were embedded within historical and cultural contexts (Strange and Soule, 1998; Tilly, 1995, Tarrow, 1989, McAdam, 1982). The case study of the Anglo-American abolitionist movements illuminates how the series of temporal stages of diffusion held by scholars of social movements and diffusion studies fails to capture the challenges confronted by transnational actors. In his analysis of transnational diffusion of the adaptation of a Ghandian repertoire by civil rights leaders during the 1950s, Chabot (2002) draws on the by now familiar distinct stages of diffusion that I argue is no longer applicable to the study of transnational social movements. Given that elements of a particular repertoire are what most often diffuse and not the entire repertoire, and that these elements do so at different times in a protest cycle, staging as a method and a framework for understanding diffusion fails to capture the processual components of diffusion. In the example of the Anglo-American abolitionist struggle, the processual dynamic was built—not upon a learning dynamic of *innovator* followed by *adopter*—but rather by the mutual and often simultaneous learning of tactics and ideas at different moments during the decades-long alliance. The mutuality, respect, and cooperation between the two abolitionist movements advance the discussion of *horizontal* diffusion dynamics by also reinserting the saliency of the state in contributing to the timing of mutual cooperation between transnational movements. British and American abolitionists came to rely upon one another because of the challenges the two movements faced in their domestic context posed directly by their respective states—each at a specific moment in their state's histories. The British state began to ignore the British movement post-emancipation with the American state resolutely anti-abolitionist until the Civil War was more than half complete.

In addition, the example of Anglo-American abolitionism also challenges the concept of *creative reinvention* conceived initially by Chabot (2002) and Chabot and Duyvendak (2002) in their analysis of transnational diffusion of two diffused tactics--the Gandhian based repertoire of non-violence and

---

[2] For a recent thorough examination of dynamics within diffusion and transnational social movements, see Soule,
[3] Sorokin's theories on diffusion included a critique of the S-curve model and argument against its implicit assumption of universalism. Given the myriad of diffusion processes, Sorokin argued, several S-curves might exist (Katz, 1999: 151).

"coming-out" routines between Western and non-Western contexts.   Chabot and Duyvendak develop their conceptual contribution through a reformulation of the adaptation phase of the movement to include nuanced, empirical examples of how receivers of transnational tactics adapt, with agency and creativity, a tactic for use within local contexts. While their conceptual contribution has added much to further understanding of the complexity of the transnational diffusion process, particularly with regards to adaptation, "creative reinvention" assumes a temporal lag between when transnational movement actors learn of a tactic and the subsequent "reinvention" of a tactic for local use. The study of Anglo-American abolitionism pushes away the assumption of a temporal lag within diffusion and adaptation and instead presents an example of horizontal tactical diffusion across state borders—and across time—where in creative diffusion and adaptation occurred during the same or similar time period. "Simultaneous creative *in*vention" is perhaps a more apt description of the transnational cooperative learning that took place between Anglo-American abolitionists. As the following discussion will illuminate, frequently ideas would circulate between the British and American movements, with the origins of ideas difficult to trace, and put into practice within a context of transnational cooperation on both sides of the Atlantic. The debate over the role of women within abolitionism and the debate over further involvement in outside movements are examples of such simultaneous—and inventive—knowledge-building.

Part III. Historical background of transnational Anglo-American cooperation
The exchange of ideas around ending slavery between and among British and American abolitionists was fervent and bountiful. For example, among the most prominent of African American abolitionist leaders and one of the original seventeen members of the American Antislavery Society, Charles Lennox Remond spent over two years in England as an advocate for the abolitionist cause. In his work as a member of the transatlantic alliance against slavery, he remarked frequently that the struggle for freedom in one location gained strength and perseverance from struggles for freedom in other locations.[4] It was this widespread belief, and the subsequent practice, the idea that tactics and strategies could flow across time and space and eventually assist reformers in far-away locales that helped sustain the transatlantic alliance between British and American reformers in their work to end slavery. Few embodied this belief and practice of diffusion more staunchly or with more vigor than Charles Remond's colleague, William Lloyd Garrison. During his last trip to Great Britain, two years after the conclusion of the Civil War, Garrison traveled with British abolitionist George Thompson on a tour of the British Isles. Throughout their journey, Garrison was greeted with tributes by various British dignitaries, from Manchester to Glasgow to Edinburgh, who acclaimed him as the rightful leader of the transatlantic movement against slavery and praised the victory of the American struggle to end slavery.[5] By the late 1860s, Garrison, Thompson, Fredrick Douglass and other less well-known members of the transatlantic alliance could look back at the past three decades struggle with some satisfaction; their close ties helped stitch together an often internally contentious, yet ultimately strong, set of transferable tactics that began to be fully realized by mid-1830s with the emergence of an American movement.

The Anglo-American alliance created the components of a vital and vibrant political community that extended beyond national borders. The abolitionist community generated journals and pamphlets with great abundance. The creation and spread of British and American abolitionist newspapers were developed for and read simultaneously by British and American abolitionists (Rice, 1981). The British

---

[4] Blackett (2006), p40.
[5] Ibid.

and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society had four newspapers during its organizational lifespan, an example of the how the sharing of documents, pamphlets, and reports on slavery was continuous and wide spread.

As the attraction of movements to one another based on knowledge building and support for one another's anti-slavery stance grew in focus, so too did a mutual target: the United States' institution of plantation slavery. The American movement upheld the British movement for its legislative success and its prominent leaders; British leaders' most powerful success was bringing a resounding end to slavery throughout the British Empire. For the British, the attraction and subsequent cooperation with American abolitionists was extended based upon the American movement's impressive size of its membership, its ability to stir up a heated and at times violent opposition, and its comprehensive and far reaching organizational structure (Temperley, 1972). Thus, each movement offered the other valuable resources in terms of building cooperation and mutual influence. Based on the unique conditions of their respective domestic political contexts, each movement was able to enter into nuanced discussion and debate with one another as they built a moral and tactical alliance.

Part IV. Evidence of cooperation as condition for tactical diffusion within transnational 19th century Anglo-American abolitionism

The span of Anglo-American anti-slavery and abolitionist movements' connection to one another lasted roughly two centuries. Historians (Blackett, 1983; Flanderland, 1972; Rice, 1981; Temperley, 1972) locate several moments of connection between the Atlantic based movements as pivotal periods of heightened cooperation, unity and mutual influence with respect to the spread of tactics. By the beginning of the 1840s, transatlantic abolitionists moved their local abolitionists' struggles from their respective national contexts to a transnational political space with the mutual sharing of key tactics, including the following:

a.) The debate on the role of women abolitionists within the struggle against transatlantic slavery.
b.) The debate on role of broader political action and the amount of connection and influence to "outside" causes as a vehicle for abolitionist pressure placed on national states.

     The role of women
The transatlantic world of British and American abolitionism rallied and united around the problem of American slavery (Temperley, 1972; Blackett, 1983; Flanderland, 1972; Rice, 1981). The founding of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (BFASS)[6] during the spring of 1839 in London helped signal to British (English, Irish and Scottish abolitionists and abolitionist societies) and American abolitionists that the struggle against American plantation slavery would be a continued focus for transatlantic abolitionist fight against slavery. The following year the BFASS organized what became known to transatlantic abolitionists as a "world" convention, a meeting to convene in London for the advancement of the abolitionist struggle with greatest attention paid—although not exclusively—to the United States.[7] The origins of the very idea of a "world" convention exemplified the transatlantic cooperation, mutual influence, and 'back and forth' flow of ideas. The idea of a convention as world

---

[6] The organization's funds were derived from private donations and profits generated from its publication sales (Temperley, p81). Donations generated averaged about 2,000 pounds annually during the 1840s (Ibid, 1972).
[7] Convention delegates were primarily from the English speaking world. However, French, Spanish, Haitian and Swiss delegates helped comprise the additional non-English speaking participants. Nearly five thousand participants crammed into the Freemasons' Hall for the two week convention (Temperley, 1972).

meeting for abolitionists began with American Joshua Leavitt editor of the Emancipator abolitionist newsletter. The idea was then discussed and ultimately implemented with zeal and fervor by BFASS founder Joseph Sturge.[8] The title of the convention was meant to invoke the international perspective of the delegates, despite most delegates' ties to the respective regions of Great Britain and the United States. In June 1840 delegates convened in London to debate and discuss concerns of the abolitionist struggle.[9] Almost immediately upon the beginning of the proceedings, contentious debate--and eventual and however reluctant cooperation--emerged. Following the welcome address by the esteemed and by then elderly British abolitionist Thomas Clarkson, the convention took an unexpected turn. Americans (and Garrison supporters) Lucretia Mott and Sarah Pugh arrived to the convention expecting full participation. In addition to Mott and Pugh, additional female delegates'[10] emerged from the delegate crowd and strenuously argued for the right to be included in the pubic proceedings. Thus, what commenced was a debate about the public role of women abolitionists within the official struggle against slavery within the United States. Delegates led by American abolitionist Wendell Phillips proposed to include women's participation in the formal convention. British and American delegates responded with a forceful denouncement at Phillips' proposal and simultaneously praised women's formal contributions to the abolitionist movements within the United States and in Great Britain. Garrison, still in transit when the debate arose on the first day, wrote to his wife, "At the opening of the Convention, Wendell Phillips moved that the female delegates from the US be admitted to seats therein: which motion he sustained in a spirited manner…it was rejected, however, by a large majority, on the ground of custom and usage. George Thompson deprecated its introduction and urged Wendell to withdraw it! All this was some days before our arrival.[11]" The plea on the part of British abolitionist George Thompson was a cry for unity and cooperation over often pandemonium and controlled chaos within the convention hall. Maria Waring, conference attendee, British abolitionist and Garrison supporter, detailed the ensuing contentious debate in a personal letter, "I suppose thou heard that there were women delegates over…They were sitting among the other women that came to see and hear. There were seven of them. Their men stood up grandly and valiantly for them…But it went against them…." Waring continued with a description of the contentious mood, "Part of the time it was quite impossible to know what was said. Cries of "order order" "Divide divide" "No no no no no," "Vote, vote, vote, "Chair, chair" were dinging in our ears…It was just like a House of Commons uproar…It ended against the women, and it was miserable to see…."[12]

As official and therefore legitimate presiders over the convention, British and American male abolitionists agreed that women should be excluded from debate during the convention and would thereby be forced to either watch the proceedings from a railed off section of the convention hall or retire to their hotels during the day throughout the two week convention.[13] Male abolitionists also agreed that women attendees were permitted to discuss the events of the day with their male colleagues in the private settings of nightly-held salons, where issues were more informally discussed and debated. These meetings helped further connect male and female abolitionists to one another's views and perhaps unintentionally allowed female abolitionists access to debate, decision making and

---

[8] Taylor (1974), p.85.

[9] A portrait of the convention's commencement—with the inclusion of several female delegates including Elizabeth Peas-- hangs in the National Portrait Gallery, London (Temperley, 1972).

[10] A total of seven women—British and American—were sent to the 1840 convention as formal delegates (Flanderland, 1972).

[11] Letter from W.L. Garrison to Helen Garrison, London, 29 June 1840 from Taylor (1974), p91.

[12] Letter from Maria Waring, June 1840 from Taylor (1974), p96.

[13] Wellman (2004), p60-61.

crucial "behind the scenes" matters of the convention not available during the official hours of the daytime convention (Flandeland, 1972). The overall mood and tone of the convention delegates, while perhaps reeling from the unanticipated debate around the position of women within the transatlantic alliance and confused by internal, domestic conflict nevertheless was one of overall cooperative spirit embodied by the two movements' connections to one another. British abolitionist and convention attendee, Elizabeth Peas wrote in a personal letter

> "such also was the spirit of exclusion manifested towards these noble women who had left family & home on this mission of Love & Mercy—Every obstacle was thrown in the way & no public opportunity was ever afforded them for a free interchange of sentiment with their English sisters. I regretted it deeply…Nothwithstanding, however, that there were many things to be regretted…great, ever great good will I have no doubt from the recent Convention—the principles it upheld, the sentiments it has sent forth, the information it has elicited cannot but beneficially affect the conditions of slaves everywhere."[14]

In the more formal public debates during the first convention of 1840, British and American white male abolitionists cooperated with another on the "woman question" (with little or no substantive public debate following the first day's public protest) by consigning women to positions of public silence and invisibility despite abolitionist women's extensive contributions to the transatlantic movement.

Formal cooperation among abolitionists should not be confused, however, with the absence of conflict or disagreement between members of the transatlantic abolitionist alliance. A few years prior up to the 1840 World Convention until the outbreak of the American Civil War, W.L. Garrison led a faction of American and British abolitionists against the formal exclusion of women abolitionists and their contributions to the abolitionist struggle. Nevertheless, despite these disagreements a generous spirit of Anglo-American unity prevailed in the subsequent months and years following the first convention. British abolitionists often wrote with high praise about their American colleagues. Irish abolitionist leader Richard Webb wrote fondly of his encounters with Americans Garrison and Lucrieta Mott. "Those American abolitionists are noble people—men and women…," Webb wrote in an 1840 letter, "and the greatest amongst them, are as meek and humble as martyrs. Their company is quite refreshing, strengthening, and delightful."[15] However, the debate around women's position within the transatlantic alliance opened the proverbial Pandora's Box of "outside" concerns.[16] The extent to which "women's matters" within the abolitionist movements should or should not be formally addressed within organizational meetings, conventions, public discussions led to another moment of mutual influence between the two movements.

---

[14] Letter no. 104 from Elizabeth Pease to recipient unknown, London, July 17th, 1840 from Taylor (1974), p101-102. Elizabeth Peas Nichol, a Quaker and committed Garrisonian, was leader of an abolitionist women's society in England prior to her convention attendance in 1840 (Taylor, p54).

[15] Letter from Richard Webb unspecified date June 1840 from Taylor (1974), p96.

[16] By the mid-1830s British and American male abolitionists came to recognize the value of female abolitionists in bolstering the sheer number of signatures through petitioning and petitions. Within Great Britain between 1830 and 1833 antislavery women submitted 5,020 petitions to Parliament (Zaeske, p43). During 1833 alone, petitions bore a quarter of the names from British women for a total of almost 300,000 signatures. For American women, the number of submitted signatures collected during the abolitionist petition campaign of 1837 and sent to US Congress that year amounted to slightly over 200,000 signatures (Zaeske, p171).

i.   *To engage politically or engage beyond political life? Anglo-American abolitionists' debate on political action and connection to "outside" causes.*

With the rise of abolitionist women's public protest and the increase in Chartist and Temperance movement activities, American and British abolitionists began furtive debates on the role—and possible contribution--of the movements against slavery towards shaping the broader political and religious landscapes of the United States and Great Britain.[17] Webb wrote in a personal letter in 1840, "There is a split amongst the abolitionists here and in America. One party, who have peculiar government principles and [are] in favor of the right of women to participate in their discussions are the disciples of Garrison. The others, who oppose such views, are generally united with by such of the Clergy as are abolitionists…." [18] Webb was quick to dispel any negative consequences of such cleavages. He wrote, "Both [sides] are firms to the great cause…We have members here[19] who have suffered greatly in the cause—men of great ability, great endurance, wonderful loftiness of mind.[20]" The two abolitionist campaigns began to simultaneously develop a moral strategy with a public denouncement of slavery as a sin through which Americans were complicit with the continuation of Southern plantation slavery.[21] During the years leading up to and following the world convention of 1840, Americans and British abolitionists drew from the strategy of "moral suasion." Debates centered around the use of the tactic of direct political action--in addition to framing slavery as a moral sin, as an institution that must end swiftly[22] and without compensation to slaveowners.[23] Embedded within this debate was a quandary experienced by the two movements. How should the movements influence their individual national states' *against* slavery given the movements' respective lack of state influence, relevancy and prominence--either within Great Britain or the United States? The incapacity to influence or affect lasting political change on at least a national level meant the two movements further developed cooperative ties with another--as well as deepened their internal conflict. No tension perhaps embodied the struggle over tactics within a debilitating national context than the tension between Lewis Tappan and William Lloyd Garrison. The cleavages between the Garrisonians and the anti-Garrisonians (Tappan's group associated with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society) over ideological control of national organizations were linked to the conflict over the appropriate role of Anglo-American abolitionist movements' tactical choice to expand beyond the fundamental concern with slavery in the United States.[24]Thus, the discussion over various non-slavery related concerns that included the role of women in collective action, the use of the voting booth versus the pulpit, the annexation of territories in the United States as slave or non-slave states was linked to how Anglo-American abolitionists could

---

[17] Flanderland, 1972; Rice 1981.
[18] Letter from Richard Webb unspecified date June 1840 from Taylor (1974), p96.
[19] Webb was writing from London during the convention proceedings.
[20] Letter from Richard Webb unspecified date June 1840 from Taylor (1974), p97.
[21] Rice, TKTK.
[22] The doctrine of *immediatism*—the ending of slavery as rapidly as possible—was a perspective embraced by British and American abolitionists during the same time period of the 1830s and 1840s. Beginning in the 1830s, Black abolitionists began to push the Anglo-American alliance towards viewing slavery's end as imminent and therefore not achieved through gradual emancipation.
[23] TKTKTK American and British abolitionists were divided on the question of compensation. The ending of slavery in British colonies began in 1833 with monetary compensation given to slaveowners. American abolitionists did not agree that the moral sin of slaveownership—or its ending--should be compensated with any financial reward.
[24] Temperley, 1965.

9

cooperatively persuade the United States to relinquish slavery as an institution. Tappan wrote in his diary of Garrison in 1839:

> Garrison and others have grown luke-warm on the anti-slavery subject & have loaded the cause with their no-government—woman's rights…Garrison told me 2 ½ years ago that there were subjects he considered to be paramount to the antislavery cause, to which he meant to devote his attention to chiefly.[25]

Tappan and his group grew increasingly concerned and wary of Garrison and his followers' anti-institutional, multi-issue stance and saw these as a turn against godliness and government. The effort Garrisonians took to incorporate women already visibly and deeply involved in the movement signaled for Tappan's group a turn against antislavery, and as an egregious sin of self-heathenism and a position, therefore, against Christianity itself. By the late 1803s, the US national abolition conventions in particular became sites of conflicts between pro-Garrisonians and anti-Garrisonians. Garrison was questioned in a debate within the Massachusetts Antislavery Society Convention following the defection of a small number of former members in 1837. Henry Stanton, American abolitionist and husband of suffragist Elizabeth Kady Stanton, pointedly questioned Garrison. He requested the convention to "Let me ask him a question. Mr. Garrison! Do you or do you not believe it a sin to go to the polls?" "Sin for *me*," was Garrison's response."[26] Anti-Garrisonsians were appalled by Garrisons' insinuation that only the noblest and committed of abolitionists would avoid casting a vote.

In addition to the sponsorship of national conventions, the American Antislavery Society in 1837 organized a national petition campaign that was based on the work of volunteer groups that went door to door soliciting signatures against slavery.[27] For some abolitionist leaders, petition campaigns did not go far enough[28], and many worried Garrison's perceived radical stances on sin and political participation scared off potential "converters" to *immediatism*. As a result of these anxieties, by the time of the national convention of 1837, serious and committed calls circulated among abolition circles, particularly in the Northeast, for the formation of a third party to counter the proslavery opposition.[29] True to his confrontational style, Garrison and his followers responded to calls for a third party directly, and warned that political party formation would lead to a divisive end for abolitionists and worked to end the 'party' movement.[30] While Garrison opposed the formation of a political party, Lewis Tappan and his friends were equally divided on the question of political party formation. Tappan associate, Joshua Leavitt, became heavily involved in the Liberty Party, an abolitionist political party formed in 1840. By the beginning of the 1840s, after much debate and proselytizing from within national conventions that had been held from 1837-1839, the Liberty Party became a national third party with a presidential candidate. The Party drew on delegates from at least twelve Northern states, including Ohio and Michigan.[31]

---

[25] Friedman (1979), p99.

[26] Sewell, p31

[27] McPherson (1931), p179

[28] By 1840, the abolition petitions arrived to Congress in large numbers, and the House voted to reject any further attempts to send petitions regarding US involvement in slavery (McPherson, p180).

[29] Sewell (1976).

[30] Ibid, p43.

[31] Sewell, p80.

'Our country is the world': The debate over Texas

The simultaneous, cooperative understanding that lay at the core of Anglo-American abolitionist ties did not waver during the years of internal disputes however much relations may have appeared weighted down by the internal splits between Garrison supporters and dissuaders. While contentious debate over the use (or nonuse) of direct action may have threatened to split apart the "moral cordon[32]" Anglo-American abolitionists so carefully built, the spread of ideas over ending slavery characterized by cooperation continued. Abolitionist tactics of the antebellum era are most clearly seen in abolitionists' tactic of challenging world opinion—not against the United States' as a state but against slavery as an institution throughout the 1840s and 1850s. The two movements united under the agreement that the United States needed its' conscience awakened to the horrors of slavery.[33] The Anglo-American alliance of mutual influence and support navigated the obstacles presented by the domestic states of the United States and Great Britain through exertion of "outside pressure" placed on these domestic states. The cooperative use of this tactic may be seen in the national debate over the incorporation of Texas as a slave or non-slave state into the Union during the early and mid-1840s. In order to achieve this tactical goal, British and American abolitionists' exerted pressure on the British government to prevent the possibility that Texas would be incorporated into the United States as a slave state.[34]

Texas became a focal point of concern for American and British politicians, slaveowners, farmers and American and British abolitionists following Texas independence from Mexico in 1836.[35] The British government became interested in the maintenance of the state as independent from the United States as a preventative measure in stymieing American expansion. Understanding the importance of the debate surrounding Texas' status to the British as well as the American state, Anglo-American abolitionists drew upon their transatlantic alliance and mobilized against an increasingly violent Southern opposition.[36] In addition, by the mid-1840s, the US President Tyler was unabashed in his support for the incorporation of Texas into the Union.[37] Garrison wrote in private letter during the winter for 1843, "Great fears are entertained that Texas will be annexed to the Union at the present session of Congress. It was supposed that President Tyler would strongly recommend the annexation in his message, but he has had the cunning not to do so….Congress is corrupt enough to do anything, The rights of petition has again been cloven down….Anti-slavery is indubitably lengthening its cords and strengthening its stakes; but it has a mighty work to perform."[38] Blocked by American Congress by the Gag Rule instituted during the late 1830s and 1840s that prevented the hearing of anti-slavery petitions during the Congressional meetings, the Anglo-American alliance was forced to look elsewhere for political opportunities that would allow their position to be heard. Again, British and American abolitionists drew upon their fluid 'back and forth' culture of debate and discussion, facilitated by the increasing ease of travel between the United States and Great Britain. During the World Convention meeting of 1843 held in London, British and American abolitionists worked together, discussed and subsequently drafted proposals on the state of Texas incorporation into the United States. A delegation

---

[32] Blackett's phrase for the construction of Anglo-American abolitionist alliance created and supported by Black America abolitionists.
[33] Temperley (1974).
[34] Ibid.
[35] The United States was in an expansionist phase with new land needed for its growing agricultural economy, particularly the cultivation of cotton. The challenge for abolitionists remained that Texas could enter the Union with its previous slave holding status firmly in tact (Temperley, 1974).
[36] Silbey (2005).
[37] Ibid, p3.
[38] Letter from William Lloyd Garrison to H.C. Wright, December 15th, 1840 in Taylor (1974), p209.

of the BFASS along with American abolitionist Lewis Tappan together drafted a proposal within which they attempted to persuade the British government to acknowledge Texas independence with the condition that Texas be freed from the use of slavery.[39] The group's idea rested upon the premise that Texas would be able to maintain her independence, perhaps with financial support and compensation from Great Britain--provided Texas agreed to abolish slavery. In response to these proposals anti-abolitionist voices were soon adamant of a conspiratorial plot based on Great Britain's attempts to thwart the United States and its independence from Great Britain.[40] Implicated in the British conspiracy against the United States was—perhaps unsurprisingly--the Anglo-American abolitionist alliance.

Part V. Discussion and Conclusion

Why did the two movements—one burgeoning and the other established—work together to generate and deploy the same tactic of pressure towards the American state? As they were fully aware, Anglo-American abolitionists and their respective organizations were powerless to create long lasting tactics to end the United States' policy of keeping legitimate the use of plantation slavery as an economic, political, and social institution. The answer lies in the role of the individual domestic state in providing the contours of tactical diffusion. As the British state closed its political opening for abolitionism and the American state continued its fervent resistance to abolitionism, the Anglo-American alliance drew further on their transnational to one another. Each movement—separated by its own history, political reality, and geographic limits—drew closer to one another. A shared relationship to a closed state coupled with sustained use of print and transportation technologies helped generate ties so dense that attributing "original" abolitionist ideas and tactics to either group proved challenging to outside observers. The very closeness of the alliance was exploited by anti-abolitionists eager to paint their opposition as "foreigners." The result of the "moral cordon" was a dynamic of cooperation and mutual influence—indeed a form of 'simultaneity' centuries before today's communication technologies that characterized their exchange of ideas.

The case study serves as a beginning in a construction of an historical context for understanding transnational diffusion. The exhaustive work of the Anglo-American alliance pushes our understanding beyond contemporary examples of movement exchanges based on speedy technologies. Anglo-American abolitionism provides analysts with evidence of transnational diffusion beyond often used 20th and 21st century examples. Even in the 19th century--devoid of the sophisticated forms of communication technologies that increasingly define the 21st century--transnational actors debated, learned and challenged one another over movement tactics—within a spirit of cooperation and mutual influence.

Beyond an empirical contribution, Anglo-American abolitionism also provides evidence for theoretical challenges to traditional understandings of transnational diffusion. Against assumptions of tactical movement scaling up or down of tactics between the local and global, the case study provides us with an example of more horizontal-level diffusion with a 'back and forth' flow of ideas, mutual understanding, cooperation and solidarity between Anglo-American abolitionists as the fundamental characteristics of the movements' dynamic with one another. Importantly, an ethos of cooperation and solidarity did not emerge solely from the friendship ties between British and American abolitionists themselves—although the connections proved vital to help sustain the two movements. The closing of

---

[39] Temperley (1974).

[40] Relations between Great Britain and the United States during the 1840s could be characterized as shaky at best (Temperley, 1974; Silbey, 2005; Fladeland, 1972).

the British state and the blockage of the American state to abolitionist tactics helped secure the centrality of the Anglo-American alliance for the two movements. As abolitionists met with one another, wrote letters and published articles of concern, admiration, and disagreement about the discussion of central issues to each movement—the role of women and the role of abolitionism in the broader 'field' of 19th social and political movements—the circulation of ideas meant that diffusion occurred often beyond traditional understandings of transnational diffusion. Rather than evidence for "creative reinvention" of tactics, the Anglo-American alliance provides evidence for a form of what physicists term a "quantum entanglement"—as one idea was discussed and adapted in one locale, another locale discussed and adapted an idea *at the same time.* The two sites were nonetheless connected and drew energy from one another. The two distinct sites of Anglo-American abolitionism provides evidence for transnational diffusion as occurring within two separate, dynamic—yet connected—sites of action. The case study also offers the potential for further exploration into the effect of temporality and 'simultaneous' diffusion that may challenge understandings of diffusion as a process through which an idea or thing with origins in one locale in turn moves to another locale and is either adapted or rejected. The example of the 19th century Anglo-American abolitionist alliance serves as a study of reformers, tactics, and organizations extended beyond national borders during an era of technological innovation and state repression. A time period perhaps not too far from own.

Primary Sources

The *American Anti-Slavery Reporter*

The *London Anti-Slavery Reporter*

The *Niles' Register*

Secondary Sources

Ayres, Jeffrey M. (1999). "From the Streets to the Internet: The Cyber-Diffusion of Contention." *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science.* 566: 132-143.

Blackett, R.J.M. (1983) *Building an Antislavery Wall.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Brown, Christopher Leslie (2006). *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism.* Virginia: University of North Carolina Press.

Chabot, Sean (2002) "Transnational Diffusion and the African-American Reinvention of the Gandhian Repertoire" From *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements.* Smith, Jackie and Johnston, Hank, eds. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Chabot, Sean and Jan Williem Duyvardak (2002) "Globalization and transnational diffusion between social movements: Reconceptualizing the dissemination of the Gandhian repertoire and the "coming out" routine." *Theory and Society* 31: 697-740.

Covin, Joshua (2001) "The Revival of Anti-Slavery in the 1820s at the Local, National, and Global Levels." Paper Presented at the Third Annual Gilder Lehman Center International Conference at Yale University: *Sisterhood and Slavery: Transatlantic Anti-Slavery and Women's Rights*, Oct 25-28, 2001.

Davis, Brian David (1966). *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Drescher, Seymour (1977). *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

_____. (1986). *Capitalism and Anti-Slavery: British Mobilization in Comparative Perspective*. Basingstoke/London: MacMillan.

14

Della Porta, Donatella, Kriesi, Hanspeter and Rucht, Dieter, eds. (1999) *Social Movements in a Globalizing World.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

_____Della Porta, Donatella and Tarrow, Sidney, eds. (2005) Transnational Protest and Global Activism. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fanuzzi, Robert (2003). *Abolition's Public Sphere*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fladeland, Betty (1972*). Men and Brothers: Anglo-American antislavery cooperation*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Givan, Kolins Rebecca, Roberts, Kenneth M., and Soule, Sarah, eds. (2010). T*he Diffusion of Social Movements: Actors, Mechanisms and Political Effects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartel, Shareen (2006). *Unexpected Power: conflict and change among transnational activists*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press.

Headley, Joel Tyler (1873). *The Great Riots of New York, 1712-1873*. New York : Thunder's Mouth Press.

Katz, Elihu (1999) "Theorizing Diffusion: Tarde and Sorokin Revisited." From Paul Lopes and Mary Durfee, eds. *The Social Diffusion of Ideas and Things.* The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 566. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders. Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Matsuzawa, Setsuko (2011) "Horizontal Dynamics in Transnational Activism: The Case of Nu River Anti-Dam Activism in China" *Mobilization,* V16, n3: 369 - 387

McAdam, Doug. (1982). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____and Rucht, Dieter *(1993). The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas,* Annals, AAP, v55, 528.

_____ (1995). "Initiator and Spin-off" movements: diffusion processes in protest cycles." In *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action,* ed. M Traugott, pp. 217-39. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Mayer, Henry. (1998). *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Meyer, David and Whittier, Nancy (1994) "Social Movement Spillover" *Social Problems.* 41:277–98

Rice, C. Duncan (1981). *The Scots Abolitionists.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Rogers, Everett M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press. 4th ed.

Rugemer, Edward. (2009). *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Roggeband, Conny (2010) " Transnational Networks and Institutions: How Diffusion Shaped the Politicization of Sexual Harassment in Europe" in *The Diffusion of Social Movements: Actors, Mechanisms and Political Effects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Givan, Kolins Rebecca, Roberts, Kenneth M., and Soule, Sarah, eds.

Silbey, Joel (2005). *Storm over Texas: The Annexation Controversy and the Road to Civil War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Jackie, Chatfield, Charles and Pagnucco, Ron, eds. (1997). *Transnational social movements and global politics: solidarity beyond the state.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Smith, Jackie and Johnston, Hank, eds. (2002). Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements. London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Strang, David and Soule, Sarah A. (1998). "Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poison Pills." Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 24: 265-290.

Strang, David and Tuma, Nancy Brandon (1993). "Spatial and Temporal Heterogeneity in Diffusion." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 99, 3, 614-639.

Soule, Sarah. (1997) "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest." *Social Forces*, Vol. 75, No. 3., 855-882.

_____. (1999). "The Diffusion of an Unsuccessful Innovation." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 566: 120-131.

Taylor, Clare (1974). *British and American Abolitionists: An Episode in Transatlantic Understanding.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney (1989) *Democracy and Disorder. Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics.* New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, revised ed., ch.11

____. (2001)"Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics" *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 4: 1-20.

____. (2001) "Rooted Cosmopolitans: Transnational Activists in a World of States" Working Paper 2001-3, Workshop on Transnational Contention, Cornell University.

___. (2005) *The New Transnational Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

___.(2005) and McAdam, Doug. "Scale Shift in Transnational Contention" in *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, DellaPorta, Donatella and Sidney Tarry, eds. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Temperley, Howard (1974). *British Anti-Slavery, 1833-1870*. (Great Britain: Hazell Watson & Viney, Ltd).

Tilly, Charles. (1995) "Contentious Repertoires in Great Britain, 1758-1834." In *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*, ed. Mark Traugott. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

_____. (1995). Popular Contention in Great Britain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (1997) "Parliamentarization of Popular Protest in Great Britain, 1758-1834." In Charles Tilly, ed. *Roads from Past to Future.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

_____. (1998) *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

_____. (2002). "Event Catalogs as Theory." *Sociological Theory* 20: 2, July.

_____. (2002). *Stories, Identities and Political Change.* London: Rowland & Littlefield Publishers.

Vasi, Bogdan (2011) "Brokerage, Miscibility, and the Spread of Contention" *Mobilization*. V16, n1: 11–24.

Wellman, Judith (2004). *The Road to Seneca Falls: Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the First Woman's Rights Convention.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Wood, Lesley (2012). Direct Action, Deliberation, and Diffusion: Collective Action after the WTO protests in Seattle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2007). "Breaking the Wave: Repression, Identity and Seattle Tactics." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, V12; n4: 377-388.

_____"An Oppositional Transnational Coalition—the Case of People's Global Action." Presented at the Workshop on Contentious Politics, Columbia University, December, 2001.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram (1997). *Lewis Tappan and the Evangelical War against Slavery.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Zaeske, Susan (2003). S*ignatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery and Women's Political Identity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

17