

# Frederick Douglass in the British Isles: The Craft of Sailing Away from Garrisonianism

*Grace Grove*

English

*Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lori Leavell*

After the publication in 1845 of his first autobiography, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*, Frederick Douglass spent twenty-one months traveling abroad in Ireland, England, Scotland, and Wales, lecturing “on nearly 200 occasions” and cataloging his events in letters (Dilbeck 64). While his lectures placed him in the “front line of the anti-slavery movement” in Europe, the publication of Douglass’s letters in American anti-slavery newspapers ensured that he remained in the foreground of the abolitionist movement in the United States (Sweeney 71). Four months into his excursion in Ireland, Douglass wrote to the pacifist founder of the New England Anti-Slavery Society and the promoter of his Boston *Narrative*, William Lloyd Garrison, that he had “spent some of the happiest moments of [his] life since landing in [the] country” (Chaffin xv; Douglass, *My Bondage* 276). While these feelings largely can be attributed to the overwhelming amount of acceptance Douglass experienced from the Irish people as he was “treated at every turn with the kindness and difference paid to white people,” his time in the British Isles brought him elements of

independence and freedom from both slavery and Garrisonianism—a civil rights movement founded in the peaceful use of moral suasion to intellectually argue for equal rights, the abolition of slavery, the temperance movement, and women’s rights (Douglass, *My Bondage* 277). Scholars including Robert Levine, James McPherson, Bernard Boxill, and Benjamin Quarles acknowledge that Douglass officially announced his break from Garrisonianism in 1851, a move precipitated by the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in the fall of the previous year. (Political non-participation, the cornerstone of Garrisonianism, would seem unjustifiable in light of the federal legislation legalizing the extension of slavery’s reach beyond the South.) These scholars also have begun to look at the division as a gradual process that commenced years before—during the time Douglass toured the British Isles. Though it would be easy to point to occurrences like the purchase of Douglass’s freedom on December 12, 1846, his establishment of the *North Star* in 1847, or even, as Levine suggests, his speech aboard the *Cambria* after first leaving America, all of which are significant moments, I argue that the most important event in Douglass’s journey to claim his independence from Garrison took place in September of 1845 when he embarked on editing and publishing the first of two Dublin editions of his *Narrative*.

I say “most important” because the first Dublin edition is the marker—the material product—that indicates what form his shift away from Garrison would take: Douglass becomes not only an orator and writer but also an editor insofar as he takes control of the production of the new narrative. This first Dublin publication marks the beginning of Douglass’s actions to claim independence from non-violent Garrisonian policies as he traveled the British Isles, becoming an independent “celebrity” in his own right and developing himself as a political speaker and “antislavery leader” (Levine 108). Ultimately, even though Douglass continued to correspond and occasionally lecture with

Garrison while he traveled the British Isles, he gained distance and freedom by separating himself from a racially oppressive United States. This new-found liberty allowed Douglass to grow as an independent individual and abolitionist, cultivating non-Garrisonian ideas about the necessity not only of political action but also of violent resistance. Just as this excursion offered Douglass new opportunities, the Dublin editions of his *Narrative* physically represented a textual separation from Garrison that is quite literal: Garrison's preface has been removed. Arguing for the significance of Douglass's time in the British Isles, this paper takes the first Dublin edition as a defining moment in Douglass's intellectual and political development, the beginning of a journey that would continue for years to come.

The changes Douglass made to his *Narrative* in the Dublin editions demonstrate his discontentment with the presence of Garrison's hand in introducing the first autobiography, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave* (May 1845). Levine details how Douglass, with the aid of printer Richard D. Webb, altered the original narrative by changing "the title page, illustration, epigraph, prefaces, and appendixes" (Levine 87). While these paratextual changes might initially appear inconsequential when viewing the *Narrative* as a whole, I agree with Levine that they should be considered as meaningful devices. These paratextual changes restored Douglass's "editorial voice," enabling him to counter racist ideas of black people being untrustworthy and incapable of higher thought and education (Levine 77). In other words, while Garrison's promotion of Douglass's *Narrative* in the preface brought Douglass popularity and trust among American readers, it simultaneously hindered Douglass from achieving full authority. The effort to distance himself from Garrison is further supported by the knowledge that Douglass made these paratextual changes only four months after the first publication--one month after beginning the British tour. These alterations represented how, within

this short period of time, Douglass had come to consider the need for Garrison's influence as an aspect of his past. Fionnghuala Sweeney explains how Douglass's seemingly minor changes in the first Dublin edition provide readers with the "philosophical and psychological criteria" with which to approach the rest of Douglass's *Narrative* (68). "His control of the text's authenticating machinery" allowed Douglass to be seen as a person challenging greater oppression rather than a fugitive slave rebelling against a white, American master (Sweeney 63). Douglass additionally continued to make changes to the *Narrative* when he published the second Dublin edition in February of 1846, "adding a full paragraph on his British travels [and] mentioning his successful meetings in Ireland" (Levine 98). Together the Dublin editions were "central to Douglass's independence" because they allowed him to direct his own authenticity, instructing his readers in the preface how he wished them to interact with his story instead of holding onto the need of a white abolitionist's introduction (Levine 98).

In fact, while the paratextual changes Douglass made in his Dublin editions signaled his growing independence, they additionally showed a personal development in how he risked his American image to broaden his political presence in the British Isles. For instance, Levine points to how "textual scholars . . . [of] the standard edition of the *Narrative* for Yale University Press's *Frederick Douglass Papers* in 1999" considered the Dublin editions to be a "corruption" even though it was the first Boston edition that Douglass saw as corrupted. (Levine 77). The issues the editors found pertained to how in the 1845 and 1846 Dublin editions Douglass "'adapt[ed] the text to the British audiences and away from the primary American context'" (Levine 77). While catering to his British audience dissociated Douglass's narrative from the abolitionist movement in America, the action also demonstrated how he made efforts to develop himself as a better political thinker. By distancing his narrative from Garrison's Anti-Slavery Society, I propose that Douglass

was experimenting with connecting the abolitionist movement to other movements--such as women's suffrage and the temperance movement. Sweeney argues a similar point when she locates the significance of the Dublin editions in their "geopolitical orientation" that situates American slavery within a "transnational network of separate but interlocking [progressive liberal] agendas" (Sweeney 70, 114). In other words, Douglass's decision to revise his narrative within the context of appealing to a British audience made him a diverse trans-Atlantic social advocate, thus developing his own political and social identity. Even though, as Levine points out, Douglass risked the credibility of the Dublin editions by adapting the paratext to his new audience, Sweeney's insight demonstrates how the alterations set Douglass on a path to broaden not only his audience but also his social agenda. This independence and diversity developed his authority as a transnational lecturer while simultaneously bringing the anti-slavery movement into a broader social dialogue.

My paper points to how Douglass was willing to trade a stable connection to Garrisonianism in exchange for self-authentication and a chance to bring his anti-slavery message to a larger platform. Douglass's own words in *My Bondage and My Freedom* (1855) explain how he used the need to escape any backlash from the publication of his *Narrative* to reach a larger objective of "concentrat[ing on] the moral and religious sentiment of [Great Britain's] people against slavery in the United States" (Douglass, *My Bondage* 281). Even though this self-evaluation appeared nine years after having returned to the United States from his British tour, Douglass's actions in 1845 seem to affirm his later claims that his time abroad was part of a strategy to increase--on his own terms--international support for the abolition of slavery in the U.S. There's no doubt that Douglass planned for a lecture tour. In fact, he packed "an iron neck-collar, leather whip, handcuffs, and chains used by slaveholders" so that he could more thoroughly communicate to his

British audiences the horrors of the American slave system (Chaffin 10). I would argue that his plan to release a new edition of his narrative, one produced without the oversight of Garrison's organization, should be viewed similarly. Just as he took mastery of the objects and used them to appeal to the sympathies of his audiences, Douglass's Dublin narratives symbolized an authority of his own narrative--independent from Garrison or another anti-slavery society. As early as 1845, then, Douglass recognized the value and advantages of mounting an anti-slavery argument with international support. In addition to these goals, Levine supplies us with the insight that Douglass also wanted to "'increase [his] stock of information' as a part of an overall project of 'self-improvement'" (Levine 90). In other words, Douglass planned to use his lecture tour as a time to develop his skills as an orator and activist, independent from specific organizations. These goals for Douglass's time in the British Isles reinforce the idea that he had greater plans for his personal development and the advocacy for the abolitionist movement apart from Garrisonian support.

Even though Douglass's dissatisfaction with the first *Narrative* was apparent through the publication of an Irish edition, the Boston edition remained important to gaining his independence from Garrison by providing him with the funds to support himself initially. Before he embarked on the tour, Douglass saved three-hundred and fifty dollars from the sale of his first *Narrative* (Douglass, "Douglass to Maria" 143). Additionally, when Douglass prepared for the British tour, he packed into his steamer trunk "copies of the Narrative" which he planned to sell to his new audiences (Chaffin 9). Even though it was the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society's vice-president, James Buffum, who raised the funds for Douglass's passage to Ireland, Douglass made plans to increase his financial independence by selling the old editions of his *Narrative*. This is not to say that Douglass did not continue to receive funds from anti-slavery societies or help from other

Garrisonians, but his preparation demonstrates his intention to maintain his independence instead of relying solely on the support of Garrison's organization. The marketability of his work proved profitable when within five weeks of arriving in Dublin on August 31, 1845, Douglass "sold over 100 copies of his [Boston] *Narrative*" (Quarles 39). This pattern of sales sets the stage for the rest of Douglass's time on his tour and brings an additional insight into why he published the first Dublin edition only one month after arriving in the British Isles. The first Dublin edition not only offered a textual separation from Garrison, but also its sale allowed him more financial independence. Furthermore, the fact that he catered the new edition to his European audiences would have aided the Dublin edition's markability. By the time Douglass was ready to publish the second Dublin edition in February of 1846, all 2,000 copies of his first Dublin edition had been sold in the five-month time-span. (Levine 98). The popularity of Douglass's Boston *Narrative* initially functioned as a stepping-stone to gaining a larger audience and greater support among the British Isles so that he could develop his own independence and voice while simultaneously bridging the various political movements of the nineteenth century.

The changes Douglass made between the first Dublin edition in 1845 and the second Dublin edition in 1846 exhibit how he continued to struggle for authority over his *Narrative* while in the British Isles. Upon arriving in Ireland, Douglass worked with Richard D. Webb, a Quaker printer friend of Garrison's who belonged to an Irish antislavery group, to publish the Irish editions of his *Narrative* (Levine 85). By most accounts, Webb "did not like Douglass's personality," considering him "self-possessed [and] prone to take offense" (Blight 143). Levine has suggested that Webb's perception might have been a result of his past conflict with another black Garrisonian, Charles Lennox Remond, whom he called "a big spoiled child." (Levine 86). This is not to say that Webb and Douglass did not have their own, separate tensions since

they also disagreed over edits made to the Dublin editions. While Douglass maintained more authority over how the Dublin editions were constructed, he still struggled against Webb's supervision. Levine points out how "without consulting Douglass, Webb replaced the bold engraving of the author on the Boston edition with a new engraving by H. Adlard, which present[ed] Douglass . . . as a sort of meek-looking British dandy [with a] relatively light [complexion]" (Levine 87). While the correction angered Douglass, the distribution of the entire stock of first Dublin editions enabled him to choose a more suitable image for the second Dublin edition (Levine 87). Douglass and Webb's conflict over the frontispiece and their differing opinions over Douglass's visual presentation displays how Douglass made efforts to claim authority over his image and *Narrative* in spite of being surrounded by Garrisonian influences.

Douglass's conflicts with Garrisonians Maria Chapman, Richard D. Webb, and James Buffum exemplify how he clashed with the Anti-Slavery Society's ideals and presumptions. As the "appointed guardian of the volatile young Douglass" and "setup man for Douglass's performance," Buffum accompanied Douglass on his tour to the British Isles (Blight 145). In a setting where Douglass hoped to express his independence from Garrisonian influence, he experienced a "growing resentment" toward the "devout Garrisonian . . . watchdog" (Chaffin 17, Blight 145). Douglass verbally struck out against Buffum's presence after he discovered that the manager of the Anti-Slavery Society in Boston, Maria Chapman, wrote to Buffum and Webb, directing them to monitor Douglass for any developing ideals which might stray from the Garrisonian agenda. Specifically, she instructed them to surveil "Frederick's ambitions, his ideological straying, and especially his desire for money gained from sales of his book" (Tillery 141). These directives show how these Garrisonians wanted to prevent Douglass from achieving financial independence or asserting an identity outside



their organization. Though Chapman claimed that she did not want Douglass to become corrupted by the funds that he was earning from his *Narrative*, her letter was also an effort to keep Douglass from joining the British Anti-Slavery society (Blight 148). Douglass became so enraged with Chapman's lack of confidence and efforts to control his actions, that he "threatened to leave the Anti-Slavery Society" (Tillery 141, Blight 148-149). David Blight considers this moment so significant that he suggests this "exchange might [represent] the beginning of the end of his ideological and personal loyalty to Garrisonianism" (Blight 149). While Webb's tampering with his narrative had been angering and Buffum's supervision annoying, for Douglass, Chapman's directive to monitor his ideals was reminiscent of his time in slavery. Similarly, Blight analyzed Buffum's supervision to be a type of "racial paternalism," and in a letter to Webb on March 29, 1846, Douglass, himself, likened their supervision to an "overseer ship," thus alluding to oppression he experienced during slavery (Blight 146, Blight 149). I would argue that Chapman was not only using Garrisonianism as an excuse to dictate how Douglass thought and felt, but she also sought to control his independence by attempting to prevent him from obtaining the monetary resources needed to achieve independence. Though I would still point to the publication of the first Dublin edition as the beginning of Douglass's independence from Garrison, the constricting and manipulative actions of Chapman, Webb, and Buffum pushed him further away from Garrison's organization.

The letters exchanged between Douglass and Garrison as well as Garrison's trip to the British Isles during Douglass's tour demonstrate why the Dublin editions did not, at the time, signal a firm break between the two abolitionists. Though Douglass separated his *Narrative* from Garrison within a month of arriving in the British Isles, he still maintained Garrisonian contacts and even lectured alongside Garrison while on his British tour. In fact, in a letter to Garrison written on

September 29, 1845--directly after the first Irish edition was published-- Douglass claims that one of his goals in retreating to Ireland "was to get a little repose" and "return home refreshed and strengthened, ready and able to join [Garrison] vigorously in the prosecution of [their] holy cause" (Woodson 397). While this statement might have been for the sake of Garrison's readers in the *Liberator*--we know Douglass was aware of his letters' publication since he mentions writing on a manner "fit for publication" in the same letter--it also demonstrates the camaraderie between the two men since Douglass was willing to speak so frankly about his exhaustion (Woodson 396). Douglass further demonstrated his loyalty to Garrison when they spoke at lectures together during Garrison's three-month lecture tour in the British Isles in 1846. In two different situations Douglass supported Garrison when the crowds turned on the visiting leader of the American Anti-Slavery Society. At the World Temperance Convention, Douglass defended Garrison when the other attendees considered his speech--which contested the idea of slaveholders' paternalistic actions as "charitable" -- a disturbance to "the harmony of the meeting" (Quarles 47). In a similar situation at a protest against the International Evangelical Alliance, Douglass endured the crowd's scorn as the protesters "heckled" Garrison for advocating for the exclusion of all slaveholders from the International Evangelical Alliance (Quarles 49). Though Douglass continued to support the ideals for which Garrison was disparaged, these instances stand unique in that Douglass received acceptance from the majority of his audiences in the British Isles. While this is not to say that Douglass never faced disagreement from audiences, but part of his growth as an orator was reading his audience and interpreting best how to appeal to them. While Douglass agreed with Garrison that paternalism should not be seen as "charitable" or acceptable within the Evangelical Alliance, he conversely seldomly attempted to lecture to protestors. Additionally, when it came time for Garrison to depart from

the British Isles in November 1864, Douglass was the one to propose that he, British abolitionist George Thompson, and Garrisonian Richard D. Webb give “three cheers” “as the steamer pulled away” (Quarles 70). The support Douglass gives Garrison in these public situations while they are together in the British Isles does not disprove my argument that Douglass was pulling away from Garrisonianism. Rather, it represents the gradualness of the break between the two abolitionists. Even as Douglass gained a reputation independent of Garrison, he defended and encouraged his old mentor during the times they toured together.

Even though Douglass outwardly supported Garrison while he was on his British tour, there were times in which he acknowledged their growing differences. Initially Douglass’s inclusion of his “rebellion against the slave breaker Edward Covey” within his first *Narrative* showed that his thoughts were not completely aligned with non-violent Garrisonian policy (Levine 76). In a way, the inclusion of the violent encounter was a strike for independence in a narrative where Douglass did not have full ownership of the editorship. In his “A Few Facts and Personal Observation of Slavery” speech delivered in Scotland on March 24, 1846, Douglass uses his anger at his mistreatment by Covey to come close to validating violent resistance among slaves. In what Levine calls “one of Douglass’s boldest statements about black violence . . . while still . . . a Garrisonian,” Douglass rails that he would not have the slaveholder “know the deadly enemies that continually surround him . . . nor the unseen hands that are raised to strike him the deadly blow” (Levine 117, Blassingame 199). This statement completely contradicts the Garrisonian policy of moral suasion to change the actions of slaveholders. Douglass again subtly exhibits opposition to non-violent Garrisonianism on July 6, 1846, in a “private letter to [British abolitionist] Elizabeth Pease” (Ritchie 262). On this occasion, several months before Garrison arrived in the British Isles for his own

lecture tour, Douglass “admitted that there was ‘a slight difference’ between himself and Garrison on the non-resistance principle” (Ritchie 262). Daniel Ritchie cites this correspondence as a “practical admit[tance] that defensive wars might be just” (Ritchie 262). This letter predates several of Douglass’s more outright claims about the necessity of violent resistance. For instance, Bernard Boxill points to his “Is it right and wise to kill a kidnapper?” essay published on June 2, 1854, as Douglass’s “first extended defense” of violent resistance as a tool to force slaveholders into acknowledging arguments of moral suasion (Boxill 718). While this essay may be the “first extended defence” of violence, Douglass’s acknowledgement of his violence toward Covey in his *Narrative*; his March 24, 1846, speech in Scotland; and his July 6, 1846, letter aptly demonstrate the progression of his political thought to consider violence as a necessary tool--as Boxill suggests--to shock and scare slaveholders into accepting the initial arguments of moral suasion.

The purchase of Douglass’s freedom and the money he received to buy a printing press signified his legal independence from slavery and a greater distancing from Garrisonianism. On December 12, 1846, approximately sixteen months after beginning his British tour, Ellen and Anna Richardson “engaged a New York lawyer” to negotiate Douglass’s purchase and “raised \$700 to purchase [Douglass’s] freedom” after his owner, Thomas Auld, handed his ownership over to “his brother Hugh [Auld]” (Blight 171, Quarles 51). While Douglass appreciated his British friends’ gesture and longed to return home to his family, “many American abolitionists criticized the transaction” and pushed Douglass to reject the paperwork (Quarles 51). Quarles further explains that the Anti-Slavery Society’s “Declaration of Sentiments, adopted in Philadelphia in 1833 . . . ‘maintain[ed] that no compensation should be given to the planters emancipating their slaves, because it would be a surrender of the great fundamental principle, that

‘man cannot hold property in man’” (Quarles 52). Although Garrison attempted “to justify the purchase,” other Garrisonians believed that acknowledging the purchase would “legitimate the slave trade” (Quarles 51, Levine 112). I would argue that Garrison’s effort to make an exception for Douglass was an endeavor to maintain their tenuous relationship. Between Douglass’s anger at the Garrisonians’ attempt to control his life, the allies he made in his travels, and his escalating mistrust of policies relying on moral suasion, Garrison understood that Douglass was rising as an equally popular figure within abolitionist and liberal circles. And furthermore, with American Garrisonian extremists like Henry C. Wright “spearhead[ing] the opposition” and carrying on the debate for almost three months, the differing ideals continued the split between Douglass and the Garrisonians (Quarles 52). Though Douglass chose not to publicly speak out against Wright at the time, it is important to note that after he officially announced his break from Garrisonianism in 1851, Douglass would criticize Wright’s policies and even accuse him of “religious infidelity” (Ritchie 263).

The later tension between the two abolitionists demonstrates how the purchase of Douglass’s freedom distanced him from other Garrisonians. Douglass firmly believed “that his acceptance of the transaction was justified in light of what he termed the distinction between ‘natural freedom’ and ‘legal freedom’” (Tillery 142). In other words, Douglass “asserted that Hugh Auld had no power over [him] but what was conferred by the United States government” (Blight 172). The transaction the Richardsons acquired for him only granted Douglass freedom in the eyes of the law. It was this distinction in recognizing how Douglass was already free by natural right and that the institution of slavery made no impact upon his character that set apart his ideology from the Garrisonians. Once Douglass affirmed that America’s institutions could not bind his soul to slavery, the end result of freedom began to justify the means used to achieve the abolishment

of slavery. This realization was escalated when “Douglass’s English supporters . . . rais[ed] funds that would enable him to start up his own newspaper” (Levine 110). The additional freedom of having the means to support himself while continuing his abolitionist advocacy created competition for Garrison’s *Liberator*. The division between Garrison and Douglass became more apparent with Douglass’s growing independence. The transition of Douglass from a fugitive slave lecturer to a free newspaper editor broadened the gap between Douglass and the Garrisonians and signifies a distancing of ideologies as Douglass gained the freedom to authenticate himself in America as he had in the British Isles.

Douglass’s “Farewell to the British People” speech given in London on March 30, 1847, only five days before he would board the *Cambria* to sail back to the United States, reveals a departure from the Garrisonian non-violence policy without fully abandoning Garrisonianism. In the beginning of his speech, Douglass pays respect to Garrison and praises him as a “beloved, esteemed, and almost venerated friend” who is a “great [reformer] and [pioneer] in the cause of freedom in religion” (Douglass, “Farewell” 218). Yet, even with these praises for Garrison, other factors within the speech hinder Douglass from being a true Garrisonian. His references to the Irish “Pat” Character, Gerrit Smith, and Madison Washington contradict Garrison’s policies of abolition through moral suasion. Douglass uses the “motto of Pat” to demonstrate how when “the abolitionist sees slavery . . . interwoven with the very texture . . . of [their] social and religious organizations, . . . he resolves at whatever hazard to his reputation, ease, comfort, luxury, or even of life itself, to pursue, and, if possible, destroy it” (Douglass, “Farewell” 216). Douglass goes on to say that in this situation, the abolitionist should say as Pat said: “Wherever you see a head, hit it!” (Douglass, “Farewell” 216). These words not only justify the use of violence against slaveholders within a particular set of

circumstances, but advocate for the ultimate sacrifice of the abolitionist's life. Sweeny helps us reach a deeper, more personal meaning for Douglass in this allusion by bringing it to readers' attention that the Irish "Pat and Mike" routines involved a cross-talk act in dialect, punctuated by bouts of violence by characters both stupid and, preferably, drunk" (Sweeney 114). While this at first does not appear to be an appropriate analogy for Douglass to use, Sweeny goes on to explain that "slipping into the Irish dialect" allows "Douglass to suggest categories of resistance that transgress the abolitionist doctrines of non-violence . . . and moral suasion, doctrines that, ironically, provide the moral legitimation underpinning his address ('Wherever you see a head, hit it!')" (Sweeney 114-115). In other words, Douglass is proposing that since slavery inhabits the social, religious, and legal spheres, violence becomes a morally justifiable necessity. How else to combat a social corruption with roots deeply embedded in multiple sectors of society? However, because Douglass veils this claim by relating it to the comedic Irish Pat and Mike routines, his words are not taken seriously by his American readers, thus not appearing to break fully from Garrisonian ideals. While Douglass's conclusions about the necessity of violence contradict non-violent Garrisonianism, because he began his farewell speech by praising Garrison and later hiding his evolving ideas within the Irish dialect and humor, Douglass's words do not appear as a complete break from Garrisonian ideology.

Douglass's additional mention of Gerrit Smith and Madison Washington in his "Farewell to the British People" also points to how Douglass is moving away from Garrisonianism and toward a policy of violent resistance. He mentions Gerrit Smith as a "noble . . . champion of the slave," largely because Smith had run an advertisement in a newspaper saying that he would pay "10,000 dollars [to] . . . any poor slaveholders who might not have the means of removing the Negroes they were desirous of emancipating" (Douglass, "Farewell" 223). This

mere mention of Smith was a diversion from Garrisonianism since Garrison despised Smith for his “militant abolitionism” and “radical . . . rhetoric and action” (Levine 112, Gordon-Omelka 1). I would add that the slight is even more apparent since Douglass is pointing toward one of Smith’s non-violent actions, which borders on Garrison’s moral suasion policy. So not only did Douglass dare to present Gerrit Smith within his speech, but he portrayed him as taking the kind of action that Garrison himself might well take. Put differently, Douglass presents Smith’s methods as a viable alternative to Garrison’s. While this would be considered an offence to Garrison since Douglass was still officially a part of Garrisonianism, Douglass’s further attention to Madison Washington takes a more violent tilt away from non-violent moral suasion. In lamenting that the League of Universal Brotherhood--a growing movement of Americans and Englishmen who swore to oppose any war--would sway both the legislators and white southerners from resorting to large-scale violence by emphasizing how war would risk the safety of American property and finances, Douglass praises Madison Washington for being “noble” and “break[ing] his fetters on the deck of the *Creole*, achiev[ing] liberty for himself and one hundred and thirty-five others” (Douglass, “Farewell” 228). Douglass further warns that while plantation owners might not be able to “fight a battle in [their] own land, . . . slaves [were] ready to rise and strike for [their] own liberty” (Douglass, “Farewell” 228). Certainly, this assertion that slaves were battle-ready surpasses the mere allusion to “radical” abolitionist, Gerrit Smith (Gordon-Omelka 1). Douglass’s warning of violence reveals how his political thought has evolved to include collective violent revolt. Even though Garrison’s *Liberator* “celebrated and defended black rebels, including [Madison] Washington, Garrison himself did not endorse violence” (Levine 134). Because of this concession to the acknowledgement of “black rebels” within the *Liberator*, Douglass’s mention of Washington might not be considered a



slight against Garrisonianism, but his proposal for slaves to war against white Americans certainly defies Garrison and his ideals of moral suasion. Therefore, Douglass's mention of both Gerrit Smith and the potential of a black uprising suggests that Douglass's time abroad brought him enough independence to challenge--both subtly and overtly--the ideas of nonviolent Garrisonianism. Though it was a "farewell" address, it was part of a beginning, a beginning that dates back to that first Dublin edition.

Douglass's tour among the British Isles granted him the chance to experience the life of an abolitionist without fearing that others might discover his fugitive slave status or that he might become unemployed if he overtly disagreed with Garrison and the Anti-Slavery Society. While Douglass's first autobiography granted him a chance to tell his story, the 1845 Boston *Narrative* also initially put him at risk of detection while still keeping him under a white man's thumb through Garrison's preface of introduction and authentication. The fact that Douglass produced another edition of his *Narrative* just over a month after escaping the United States demonstrates how dissatisfied Douglass was with his lack of editorial authority in the first edition. While Garrisonians were still present within Douglass's life while in the British Isles, the racial freedom he experienced allowed him to step out of Garrison's shadow and begin to develop his own political skills as an abolitionist and a social advocate. With the income he received from selling copies of his first narrative and the following Dublin editions, Douglass was able to further distance himself from relying solely on Garrisonians or other Anti-Slavery Societies for aid. When he did receive substantial financial aid to purchase his freedom and buy a printing press, the funds were raised by British allies against Garrisonian wishes. Ultimately, the time Douglass spent in the British Isles brought distance, independence, and opportunities for self-authorship separate from non-violent Garrisonians who relied solely on

moral suasion. Douglass's time abroad further allowed him to develop his own political thought and consider the implications of violent resistance being necessary. In sailing to the British Isles, Douglass embarked on a journey that would only continue even after his return to the U.S.

### Works Cited

- Bernier, Celeste-Marie. *If I Survive: Frederick Douglass and Family in the Walter O. Evans Collection: a 200 year*. Edinburgh University Press, 2018. Print.
- Blight, David W. *Frederick Douglass: Prophet of Freedom*. Simon & Schuster, 2018. Print.
- Blassingame, John W., ed. *The Frederick Douglass Papers, Series One: Speeches, Debates, Interviews*. Yale University Press, vol.1, 1979. Print.
- Boxill, Bernard R. "Fear and Shame as Forms of Moral Suasion in the Thought of Frederick Douglass." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, vol. 30, no. 4, 1995, pp. 713-744. EBSCO, <https://web-a-ebSCOhost-com.ucark.idm.oclc.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=715a8c74-2c07-403a-b407-09711e1a8d19%40sdc-v-sessmgr02>.
- Chaffin, Tom. *Giant's Causeway: Frederick Douglass's Irish Odyssey and the Making of an American Visionary*. University of Virginia Press, 2014. Print.
- Dilbeck, D. H. *Frederick Douglass: America's Prophet*. University of North Carolina Press, 2018. EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection. Web. 18 Jan.

2020.

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1699522&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Douglass, Frederick. "Douglass to Maria Chapman, March 29, 1846." *Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass: Early Years, 1817-1849*. Ed. Philip S. Foner. vol. 1, New York: International Publishers, 1950. 142-144. Print

Douglass, Frederick. "Farewell Speech to the British People." *Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass: Early Years, 1817-1849*. Ed. Philip S. Foner. vol. 1, New York: International Publishers, 1950. 206-233. Print

Douglass, Frederick. *My Bondage and My Freedom*. Barnes & Noble Classics, 2005. Print.

Gordon-Omelka, Judith M. "Militant Abolitionist Gerrit Smith." *Fairmont Folio: Journal of History*, vol. 3, 1999, pp.1-16. Wichita University: Public Knowledge Project,  
<https://journals.wichita.edu/index.php/ff/issue/view/9>.

Levine, Robert. *The Lives of Frederick Douglass*. Harvard University Press, 2016. EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection. Web. 18 Jan. 2020.  
search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1133832&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

McPherson, James M. Preface. *Frederick Douglass*. By Benjamin Quarles. Ed. August Meier. New York: Atheneum. 1976. v-xii. Print.

Pease, William H., Jane H. Pease. "Boston Garrisonians and the Problem of Frederick Douglass," *Canadian Journal of History*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1967, pp. 29-48.

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1297234621/fulltextPDF/40B522887ED64572PQ/1?accountid=10017>.

Quarles, Benjamin. *Frederick Douglass*. Atheneum, 1976. Print.

Ritchie, Daniel. "'The stone in the sling': Frederick Douglass and Belfast Abolitionism." *American Nineteenth Century History*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2017, pp. 245-272. EBSCOhost, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2017.1371924>.

Sweeney, Fionnghuala. *Frederick Douglass and the Atlantic World*. Liverpool University Press, 2007. EBSCO Publishing: eBook Collection. Web. 25 Jan. 2020. DOI:10.1017/S0021875808005823.

Tillery, Tyrone. "The Inevitability of the Douglass-Garrison Conflict." *Phylon*, vol. 37, no. 2, 1976, pp. 137-149. JStor, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/274765>.

Woodson, Carter Godwin. ed. *The Mind of the Negro as reflected in letters written during the crisis, 1800-1860*. Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926. Internet Archive. <https://archive.org/details/mindofnegroasref00wood/page/n5/mode/2up>