

Turning Points in Transnational Anti-Slavery Activism: Cardinal  
Lavigerie's "Anti-Slavery Crusade," the British and Foreign Anti-  
Slavery Society, and the "Anti-Slavery Revival" of the Late  
Nineteenth Century, 1888-1890

A thesis submitted by

Samantha Travis

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

Tufts University

May 2017

Adviser: Dr. Elizabeth Foster

## Abstract

This thesis provides a detailed analysis of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's relationship with Cardinal Lavigerie, a French Catholic clergyman and prominent anti-slavery activist, and his transnational anti-slavery campaign between 1888 and 1890. Given the intensity of the imperial rivalry between Britain and France at this particular point in the nineteenth century, the fact that a British organization would openly and enthusiastically engage with Lavigerie seemed to be—and remains—something of a historical curiosity. While a number of historians have already discussed the overall significance of the relationship between the Anti-Slavery Society and the Cardinal's campaign in bringing about the “anti-slavery revival” of the late nineteenth century, this study focuses on particular moments or points of contact between the two in an attempt to provide a more nuanced and clarified view into the ways in which Lavigerie's campaign was presented, received, and adopted by the British.

## Acknowledgements

This thesis owes much to the unwavering support and encouragement of a number of people. I would first like to thank my adviser, Professor Elizabeth Foster, for her steady guidance and insightful feedback throughout the course of this project. She has been an exceptional mentor over the last two years, and I am extremely grateful for all of the advice—both personal and professional—that she has offered to me throughout my time at Tufts. I would also like to thank Professor Hugh Roberts and Professor Heather Curtis for serving on my thesis committee and for providing helpful comments and challenging critiques during my thesis defense. Additionally, I would like to thank my fellow graduate students in the History Department at Tufts University for their camaraderie and friendly support, especially Katie Anderson, Marena Cole, Malcolm Gent, Kristin Glomstad, Isabel Loyola, Nick Scott, Neelum Sohail, and Damir Vucicevic. I am also grateful to Professor David Proctor for his regular check-ins and interest in my project. My friends and family in Florida also deserve a great deal of acknowledgement. I would like to thank Professor Adrian O'Connor and Professor Larissa Kopytoff at the University of South Florida for their wholehearted encouragement of my studies. And, of course, I would like to thank my parents, Dave and Cindy Travis, and my brothers, Kyle and Austin, for their unfailing love and support. Thank you.

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter I: The Meeting in London, 1888.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Section I: Background and Mutual Benefits .....	21
Section II: The Composition of the Meeting.....	24
Section III: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Appeal as a “New Witness” .....	26
Section IV: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Proposals to End the Slave Trade .....	35
Section V: The Cardinal’s Reception and the Underlying Tensions.....	37
Conclusion.....	42
<b>Chapter II: The Brussels Conference, 1889-1890.....</b>	<b>44</b>
Section I: The Debate in the House of Commons.....	48
Section II: Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society Prepare for the Brussels Conference .....	64
Section III: The Brussels Conference.....	68
Conclusion.....	76
<b>Chapter III: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress, 1890.....</b>	<b>79</b>
Section I: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Transnational Anti-Slavery Network .....	81
Section II: The Conference at Lucerne .....	87
Section III: The Paris Congress of 1890.....	98
Conclusion.....	108
<b>Conclusion: Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society’s Relationship</b>	
<b>After 1890 .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>116</b>

## Introduction

In its description of the meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society held on July 31, 1888, the *Times* noted how “[t]here was a strange conjunction of circumstances” at this particular gathering of anti-slavery activists due to the imposing presence of one man: Cardinal Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie. Cardinal Lavigerie had traveled to Prince’s Hall in London in the hopes of bringing to light the continued existence of the slave trade in Africa, but the author seemed particularly baffled that Lavigerie, a French Roman Catholic “Prince of the Church,” would travel to London to address members of the British Anti-Slavery Society, a “body composed in the main of Nonconformists and members of the Society of Friends.”<sup>1</sup> As he pointed out, one might have assumed that such a meeting would be “the last assembly with which...an Archbishop of Algiers and Carthage would care to fraternize.” Yet, to the author’s amazement, “their unity now seem[ed] natural.” To him, the differences—national, religious, and linguistic—that distinguished Lavigerie from his British and largely Protestant audience did not impede the French cardinal in his goal of effectively rallying the Society’s support for his newly launched “anti-slavery crusade.”<sup>2</sup> The article repeatedly commented upon how significant this event was for

---

<sup>1</sup> The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society underwent numerous name changes throughout its

<sup>2</sup> While in this instance the *Times* article did not outright refer to Lavigerie’s efforts as a “crusade,” the author presented Lavigerie as a “crusader,” thereby echoing language that will be seen and referred to throughout the course of this thesis. It was a rather common way to characterize the Cardinal’s campaign, as both he and those he associated with often referred to it as such. For examples of primary sources which refer to Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign as a “crusade,” see Cardinal Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888* (Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 5. Also, “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Crusade against Slavery” in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 85–90.

British/French and Protestant/Catholic relations, as the meeting seemed to “cast down barriers...and rendered possible and natural [a] truly catholic meeting.” Given the broader historical context in which this event took place, the Anti-Slavery Society’s reception of Cardinal Lavigerie was indeed “remarkable,” and its significance extended beyond the event itself as it revealed the potential for transnational cooperation during a period of “aggressive nationalism” and intense imperial competition.<sup>3</sup>

The “strange” scene at Prince’s Hall described above took place within the context of the “scramble for Africa,” a period characterized by an explosion of European interest in imperial expansion on the African continent during the late nineteenth century.<sup>4</sup> The Berlin Conference of 1884-85, which effectively brought the European Powers together to “carve up” the African continent, had taken place only three years before the Anti-Slavery Society invited Cardinal Lavigerie to London, and the famous Fashoda incident of 1898, which almost saw British and French forces “go to war for empire” in the middle of Africa, loomed on the horizon.<sup>5</sup> By the time of Lavigerie’s visit to London, the governments of the various European Powers—especially Britain and France—were entering into a

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Times*. August 1, 1888. The Times Digital Archive. Also, William Mulligan, “Chapter 8: The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe, 1888-1890,” in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 150, 160. Also, François Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet, and Missionary* (London: Athlone Press, 1994), 370.

<sup>4</sup> *The Times*. August 1, 1888. The Times Digital Archive. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 1, 9. Also, Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010), 312-321

<sup>5</sup> For more information on the significance of these two events, see Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 312-316; Tyler Edward Stovall, *Transnational France: The Modern History of a Universal Nation* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2015), 218.

race to establish “effective occupation” of their respective territories in Africa.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, these circumstances greatly informed both the perceptions of and the actual development of the relations between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain, links that were first forged at the meeting at Prince’s Hall in July 1888.

But what brought Cardinal Lavigerie to London in the first place? How did a French Roman Catholic clergyman find himself appealing to a society composed of mostly British Protestants on behalf of the slaves in Africa? While the details surrounding the Cardinal’s visit to London will be investigated in the chapters that follow, it is important to note that the meeting in London was part of a larger transnational campaign organized by Lavigerie to end the slave trade in Africa.<sup>7</sup> Cardinal Lavigerie had long felt that the “slave-trade presented a radical obstacle to development of any kind in Africa,” and he drew on his experiences as the Archbishop of Algiers and Carthage and as the founder of the Missionaries of Our Lady of Africa (more commonly known as the “White Fathers”) to organize an anti-slavery campaign focused on eradicating this problem.<sup>8</sup> In 1868, Pope Pius IX had charged Lavigerie with the task of “evangelizing” the Sahara and the French Sudan, and his ambitions as a missionary were linked with his interests as

---

<sup>6</sup> Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 314-315.

<sup>7</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 369-372. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 151. Also, Suzanne Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade* (New York: Africana Pub. Corp., 1975), 201-206. Also, Daniel Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s” in *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 707.

<sup>8</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367. For more information on the founding of the White Fathers, see Adrian Hastings, *The Church in Africa: 1450-1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 253-255; Aylward Shorter, *The Cross and Flag in Africa: The “White Fathers” during the Colonial Scramble (1892-1914)* (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 2006), xxi-xxv; Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 146-163.

a Frenchman in that he wished to “cross the desert and link Algeria to the sub-Saharan colonies then being established by France.”<sup>9</sup> Indeed, the Cardinal was a “committed imperialist” who was supportive of the French “civilizing mission” in Africa, and he worked tirelessly to expand French—and Catholic—influence in the areas surrounding Lake Victoria and Lake Tanganyika, and it was because of his missionary efforts in this region that he was “forced to confront the horrors of African slavery.”<sup>10</sup>

By the late nineteenth century, the transatlantic slave trade—the focus of previous anti-slavery efforts in Europe and elsewhere—was drawing to a close. Brazil, the last part of the Americas to abolish slavery, finally did so in 1888, the same year that Lavigerie launched his anti-slavery campaign.<sup>11</sup> In fact, the two occurrences—the abolition of slavery in Brazil and the launching of the Cardinal’s campaign—were intimately connected. As Gianni La Bella describes, Brazil’s decision to abolish slavery was “a gift of the South American State” to Pope Leo XIII to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination, and in response the Pope prepared the papal encyclical *In plurimis*, which was released

---

<sup>9</sup> Shorter, *The Cross and Flag in Africa*, 2.

<sup>10</sup> Cardinal Lavigerie’s support of the French “civilizing mission” in Africa is especially clear in his homily delivered in Paris on September 21, 1890, an address that will be examined in more detail in the third chapter. See “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Sermon,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 211-212. See also Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 17. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 201. Also, Martin A. Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 96. Also, Joseph Dean O’Donnell, *Lavigerie in Tunisia: The Interplay of Imperialist and Missionary* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1979), xi-xvii. For more information on the relationship between anti-slavery discourse and European “civilizing missions,” see Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 713-716, 719.

<sup>11</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 706.



on May 5, 1888.<sup>12</sup> For years Cardinal Lavigerie had sought to bring the slave trade in Africa—specifically the slave raids in the interior and the slave trade as it existed on the East African coast—to the attention of governmental authorities and the Vatican, and he saw this occasion as the perfect opportunity to publicize the problem.<sup>13</sup> Once he heard that preparations were underway for a papal encyclical on the issue of slavery, the Cardinal wrote to Leo XIII urging him to “not give the impression that slavery no longer existed,” and suggested that the Pope include comments on the slave trade in Africa in his encyclical.<sup>14</sup> Lavigerie felt that by addressing the issue of the slavery in Africa, the Roman Catholic Church would be placed at the forefront of one of the most pressing “humanitarian” concerns of the time.<sup>15</sup> Leo XIII, who had been looking for ways to expand Catholic influence, incorporated the Cardinal’s suggestions into his encyclical, and he was also receptive to another idea proposed by Lavigerie: the creation of a new anti-slavery campaign.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Gianni La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” in *The papacy and the new world order: Vatican diplomacy, Catholic opinion and international politics at the time of Leo XIII, 1878-1903*, ed. Vincent Viane (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 386.

<sup>13</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 706.

<sup>14</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367. Also, “Lettre de son éminence le Cardinal Lavigerie à sa sainteté le Pape Léon XIII pour le prier de prendre en mains la cause de l’abolition de la traite en Afrique,” in Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie, *Documents Sur La Fondation de l’Oeuvre Antiesclavagiste*, (Saint-Cloud: Imprimerie V<sup>ve</sup> Eugène Belin et Fils, 1889), LI-LIX.

<sup>15</sup> It should be noted that the term “humanitarian” has a long history, reaching back to the seventeenth century. For more on the development of this term and its relationship to anti-slavery activism, see Michael N. Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011), 49-75. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367-368. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 202.

<sup>16</sup> “In Plurimis (May 5, 1888) | LEO XIII.” Accessed September 18, 2016. [http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_05051888\\_in-plurimis.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_05051888_in-plurimis.html). Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367-368. Also, La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 386-387. For more information on Pope Leo XIII’s efforts to expand Catholic influence both in Europe and abroad, see Vincent Viane, “Introduction: Reality and Image in the Pontificate of Leo XIII,” in *The papacy and the new world order: Vatican diplomacy, Catholic opinion and international politics at the time of Leo XIII, 1878-1903*, ed. Vincent Viane (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 9-28. It should also be noted that the anti-slavery

Soon after his initial correspondence with Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Lavigerie traveled to the Vatican with a group of White Fathers and Africans “recently redeemed from slavery” on May 4, 1888 to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Pope’s ordination, and it was on this occasion that Lavigerie was “given the task of preaching the [anti-slavery] crusade in the Pope’s name.”<sup>17</sup> Following a private meeting between the two, Pope Leo XIII “publicly charged Lavigerie with a new . . . mission to do everything possible to appeal to the Christian world to join in an international crusade and put an end, once and for all, to the horrors of slavery,” thus lending an international and ecumenical dimension to the campaign.<sup>18</sup> While a number of historians have since stressed that Cardinal Lavigerie, rather than Pope Leo XIII, “took the lead” in the anti-slavery campaign that subsequently swept across Western Europe in 1888, the campaign’s connection to the papacy is nonetheless significant.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, Lavigerie’s campaign grew out of a particularly Catholic context, and the campaign’s ties to the Catholic Church deeply informed its development.<sup>20</sup> Cardinal Lavigerie “drew upon the transnational networks of Catholicism” as he worked to establish new anti-slavery societies in Paris, Brussels, and other

---

campaign was not the only significant collaboration between Cardinal Lavigerie and Pope Leo XIII. While Cardinal Lavigerie’s relationship to the Third Republic will not be examined in any significant detail in this analysis, it is worth noting that in 1890 Cardinal Lavigerie launched the *ralliement* policy with the support of Pope Leo XIII, which essentially “advocat[ed] ecclesiastical acceptance of the Third Republic” and sought to “reconcile” the Catholic Church with the republican regime. For more information, see Stovall, *Transnational France*, 193; Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 369; José de Arteche, *The Cardinal of Africa, Charles Lavigerie; Founder of the White Fathers* (London: Catholic Book Club, 1964), 176-187; Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*.  
<sup>17</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 369. Also, La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 386-387.

<sup>18</sup> La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 388.

<sup>19</sup> Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 153.

<sup>20</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 706-707. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 17.

capitals across Western Europe to support his “mission.”<sup>21</sup> Yet Lavigerie did not limit his campaign to strictly Catholic audiences, but instead his efforts opened the door to a new kind of “anti-slavery internationalism” in the late nineteenth century.<sup>22</sup>

As a number of recent studies demonstrate, Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign marked “the revival of anti-slavery activism” in Europe during the late 1880s and early 1890s, and some historians have pointed in particular to the ways in which the Cardinal’s campaign established transnational connections and overcame significant national and religious differences in support of a “shared cause.”<sup>23</sup> While anti-slavery societies had existed both on the continent and in the British Isles since the first half of the nineteenth century, many of these societies either completely dissolved or—as in the case of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society—lost a significant amount of members by the early 1880s.<sup>24</sup> To revitalize this largely forgotten cause, Cardinal Lavigerie’s campaign “drew upon new tools for campaigning, co-operation, and the spread of ideas about ‘civilisation,’” an approach which signified the “rise of a new anti-slavery internationalism.”<sup>25</sup> Specifically, the Cardinal’s campaign often employed language that drew on a number of “common themes and identities” to unite his international audience, such as the themes of “common humanity, Christianity,

---

<sup>21</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. Amalia Ribí Forclaz also uses this term in her analysis; see Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 15.

<sup>23</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 7, 16-18. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 705-707, 719. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 150-155.

<sup>24</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 17. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 705-707. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 32-33.

<sup>25</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707.

[and] Europeanness.”<sup>26</sup> By centering his discourse within the “wider context of Christian and European progress,” Lavigerie galvanized a transnational anti-slavery movement that attracted supporters from a range of nationalities and religious (albeit specifically Christian) backgrounds.<sup>27</sup>

However, that is not to say that Cardinal Lavigerie’s campaign saw no evidence of tensions related to specific national and religious differences. On the contrary, Lavigerie’s anti-slavery movement operated according to national and religious lines, and it often took various governmental and imperial interests into account when formulating its humanitarian goals.<sup>28</sup> As Daniel Laqua describes, “Anti-slavery internationalism was simultaneously national and transnational: activists co-operated across national boundaries and adopted similar language and methods, but still operated within very specific national and imperial contexts.”<sup>29</sup> As he traveled throughout Europe in the summer of 1888, Lavigerie formed or established connections with anti-slavery societies in countries such as France, Britain, Belgium, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland.<sup>30</sup> While the Cardinal’s “crusade” brought each of these societies into contact to address an issue of international concern, these societies “remained tied to specific religious, national, and imperial settings.”<sup>31</sup> As Amalia Ribi Forclaz argues, “. . .these groups entertained an interdependent and mutually formative relationship with

---

<sup>26</sup> Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 155.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>28</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 706-707. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 1-9, 15.

<sup>29</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 706.

<sup>30</sup> While anti-slavery societies were also created in Austria, Spain, and Portugal, they exerted very little influence and did not gain much momentum. The countries listed above were more active in Cardinal Lavigerie’s campaign. See Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 28. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707.

<sup>31</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 719.

government authorities, and much of the activists' international engagement ultimately had to pass through national channels."<sup>32</sup> Therefore, the anti-slavery campaign put into motion by Cardinal Lavigerie had to contend with the challenge of reconciling the various societies' ties to specific religious and national identities, while at the same time acknowledging the ways in which governmental interests informed each society's position within the larger movement.

An investigation of Cardinal Lavigerie's relationship with one anti-slavery society in particular best illustrates the degree to which the transnational connections established as a result of Lavigerie's campaign were able to overcome the various national and religious tensions that seemed to threaten such an undertaking. As this thesis endeavors to show, a detailed examination of Cardinal Lavigerie's relationship with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society stands as a particularly compelling case study, as a focused analysis of the Anti-Slavery Society's reception of the Cardinal and his campaign poignantly reveals how anti-slavery activists from radically different backgrounds could come together in support of a common cause during a period of intense imperial competition. Given the intensity of the imperial rivalry between Britain and France at this point in the nineteenth century, the fact that a British organization would openly welcome a French clergyman seemed to be—and remains—something of a historical curiosity.<sup>33</sup> Additionally, the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain stands as one of the few examples of the Cardinal's interest in working

---

<sup>32</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 8.

<sup>33</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 150, 160. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370.

with non-Catholic organizations to bring about the abolition of slavery in Africa.<sup>34</sup> Thus, this analysis focuses on one particular aspect of the Cardinal's campaign—Lavigerie's relationship with the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain—in an attempt to provide a more nuanced investigation of the workings of “anti-slavery internationalism” at the height of the “scramble for Africa.”<sup>35</sup>

While a number of historians have already gestured to the overall significance of the link between the Anti-Slavery Society and Cardinal Lavigerie's campaign, a study that focuses exclusively on particular moments or points of contact between the two can add a layer of precision to an analysis which seeks to explore the ways in which Cardinal Lavigerie's campaign was presented, received, and adopted by the British. This aspect of Lavigerie's campaign is often only mentioned as a quick reference in studies dedicated to examining the nature of late nineteenth century anti-slavery activism, and thus the implications of the connection between Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society could be examined more fully.<sup>36</sup> It should be noted, however, that this analysis does not pretend to offer an exhaustive analysis of the worldviews of either the members of the Anti-Slavery Society or of the views held by Lavigerie himself.

---

<sup>34</sup> While the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was not the only Protestant-based anti-slavery organization that Lavigerie “co-existed” with as he attempted to expand his movement, his meeting with the British society signified Lavigerie's willingness to work with Protestant groups, and the connections he forged between the Anti-Slavery Society and the French and Italian societies proved far more deeply-rooted than the connections established with other societies. Further reasons for why Lavigerie had a particular interest in working with the Anti-Slavery Society will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters. See Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-22.

<sup>35</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 1, 9.

<sup>36</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 150, 160. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370-372. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707-709, 719. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 201-206. Also, La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 389-392.

Rather, this study provides a focused examination into the ways in which the similarities and differences between the two were viewed at the time, and how they were able to negotiate their respective differences at these particular moments. Indeed, a focus on specific moments and places in time can offer another way to correct what Amalia Ribí Forclaz describes as the “mystification” of transnational networks, where the national and imperial contexts in which these networks operated are often lost in attempts to stress transnational connections and themes.<sup>37</sup>

In an attempt to provide a more nuanced and clarified view of the relationship between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society, this project makes use of publications and speeches which were produced in reference to three key moments: the July 1888 meeting in London, the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890, and the attempts to organize an anti-slavery conference of the societies which culminated in the Paris Congress of 1890. Specifically, this analysis provides a close reading of the letters and speeches that Lavigerie published in reference to these events in addition to the relevant reports produced by *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*, which was the official publication of the Anti-Slavery Society. As it was through the proliferation of periodicals and the staging of local and international conferences that Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society were able to exchange ideas and work towards a common goal,

---

<sup>37</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 4. William Mulligan and Daniel Laqua also address the dangers of losing particular national and imperial contexts in transnational histories. See Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 705-707, 719; William Mulligan, “Introduction: The Global Reach of Abolitionism in the Nineteenth Century,” in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 3.

this analysis makes use of the very sources by which the Cardinal and the Society were able to establish and maintain their transnational connection.<sup>38</sup> In fact, these sources not only open a window into the ways in which Lavigerie and the Society perceived and collaborated with each other, but also provide a view as to how those outside of anti-slavery circles—particularly governmental actors—responded to the anti-slavery movement that had gained traction as a result of Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society’s collaboration. As the sources examined in the following chapters demonstrate, these publications often referenced governmental reactions to the anti-slavery campaign, thereby providing a way to investigate how the cooperative efforts of Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society resonated beyond their immediate interactions and fit within the broader context of imperial policymaking.

In addition to these primary sources, this analysis makes use of a wealth of secondary sources, especially those that focus specifically on Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign. Recent studies produced by Amalia Ribi Forclaz, Daniel Laqua, Gianni La Bella, and William Mulligan were particularly useful in the conceptualization of this project, and these works stand as a testament to the current surge of interest in the rise of transnational humanitarian networks during the late nineteenth century—and of Lavigerie’s campaign in particular.<sup>39</sup> As the studies constructed by Ribi Forclaz, Laqua, and Mulligan were all produced within the last ten years, they represent a new challenge to the traditional reading

---

<sup>38</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 705, 707.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 705-726. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 149-170. Also, La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 381-394.



of anti-slavery activism, where the actions of late nineteenth century anti-slavery activists are minimized in favor of earlier movements, especially those emanating from Britain.<sup>40</sup> As Amalia Ribi Forclaz describes, “The history of anti-slavery activism has, for a long time, centered on the role of middle-class men and women in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain and America,” and the anti-slavery movement that started to gain momentum on the continent in the late nineteenth century is often seen by some historians as “but a weak echo of previous movements.”<sup>41</sup> Additionally, these four historians specifically highlight the importance of religion—particularly Catholicism—in the launching of the “anti-slavery revival” of the late nineteenth century, correcting what has been termed the “secular bias” in the history of humanitarian networks and imperial history more broadly.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, this study seeks to build on these trends in an attempt to further combat the predominately secular and strictly Anglocentric readings of the history anti-slavery activism.

Beyond these studies in transnational history, sources focusing solely on the history of the anti-slavery movement in Britain and on the personal history of Cardinal Lavignerie were also integral to the development of this project. To effectively place these moments within a broader domestic and international context, Suzanne Miers’s study of British initiatives to end the slave trade in Africa—and her focus on Britain’s role in the convening of the Brussels

---

<sup>40</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 2, 6.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Here Ribi Forclaz cites the work of Kevin Grant, who specifically criticizes the “secular bias” in imperial history. See Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 6-7. Also, Kevin Grant, “Christian Critics of Empire: Missionaries, Lantern Lectures, and the Congo Reform Campaign in Britain,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 29, 2 (2001), 52. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707-709. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 158-159. Also, La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 381-394.

Conference of 1889-1890 in particular—helped immensely, and it is one of the only full-length studies of the Brussels Conference.<sup>43</sup> In terms of information pertaining to the Cardinal, François Renault, a White Father himself, produced a two-volume study on Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign, and he also wrote a more concise work that was translated into English.<sup>44</sup> Other accounts of Lavigerie and his work were examined in an attempt to corroborate certain claims, though Renault remains the authority on the subject.<sup>45</sup> Both Miers and Renault provided critical background information that could not have been arrived at otherwise, and these accounts helped to further contextualize the primary sources examined in this study by bringing specific national, organizational, and personal concerns to light.

Nevertheless, sources that do not directly address either Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign or the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain were also consulted in order to better understand certain historiographical trends and broader historical contexts. In addition to more general studies of French and

---

<sup>43</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 149. For examples of other texts that were especially helpful in gathering information on the British side, see Richard Huzzey, *Freedom Burning: Anti-Slavery and Empire in Victorian Britain* (Cornell University Press, 2012); Kevin Grant, *A Civilised Savagery: Britain and the New Slaverries in Africa, 1884-1926* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Donald A. Yerxa, *British Abolitionism and the Question of Moral Progress in History* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2012).

<sup>44</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*. Also, François Renault, *Lavigerie: l’esclavage africain et l’Europe : 1868-1892* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1971).

<sup>45</sup> Despite his personal links to the White Fathers, Renault’s work has remained a key reference point in many discussions of Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign. See, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 150; Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709; Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 201-206. For examples of additional studies of Lavigerie in different contexts, see de Arteché, *The Cardinal of Africa*; J. Dean O’Donnell Jr, “Cardinal Charles Lavigerie: The Politics of Getting a Red Hat,” in *Catholic Historical Review* 63, no. 2 (April 1977): 185–203; O’Donnell, *Lavigerie in Tunisia*; James E. Ward, “The Algiers Toast: Lavigerie’s Work or Leo XIII’s?” in *Catholic Historical Review* 51, no. 2 (July 1965): 173–91.

British imperial history, recent examinations of missionary activities in both the British and French colonies served as foundational texts when thinking about how to navigate the tensions between governmental and religious interests in imperial settings. In the French context, J.P. Daughton, Elizabeth Foster, and Aylward Shorter's works helped to provide a good understanding of the history of French missionary activities in the colonies.<sup>46</sup> As for the British context, the works of Steven Maughan and Kevin Grant were particularly helpful.<sup>47</sup> Studies focused primarily on missionary activity in Africa were also useful, such as Adrian Hastings's examination of the history of Christianity in Africa.<sup>48</sup> While this analysis does not provide a detailed discussion of the reality of the slave trade in Africa, works concerning the history of slavery and the slave trade in Africa were also consulted in addition to broader studies of the history of abolitionism.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> J.P. Daughton, *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880-1914*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). Also, Owen White and J. P. Daughton, *In God's Empire: French Missionaries and the Modern World*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012). Also, Elizabeth Ann Foster, *Faith in Empire: Religion, Politics, and Colonial Rule in French Senegal, 1880-1940* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013). Also, Shorter, *The Cross and Flag in Africa*.

<sup>47</sup> Steven S. Maughan, *Mighty England Do Good: Culture, Faith, Empire, and World in the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1850-1915*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014). Also, Grant, *A Civilised Savagery*.

<sup>48</sup> Hastings, *The Church in Africa*. See also, Richard Gray and Lamin O Sanneh, *Christianity, the Papacy, and Mission in Africa* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2012); Richard Gray, *Black Christians and White Missionaries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Roland Anthony Oliver, *The Missionary Factor in East Africa* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1952); Martin Ballard, *White Men's God: The Extraordinary Story of Missionaries in Africa* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Pub., 2008).

<sup>49</sup> For examples of studies on slavery and the slave trade in Africa, see Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule*; Martin A. Klein, *Breaking the Chains: Slavery, Bondage, and Emancipation in Modern Africa and Asia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993); Paul E. Lovejoy, *Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983). Henri Médard and Shane Doyle, *Slavery in the Great Lakes Region of East Africa* (Oxford: James Currey, 2007). Suzanne Miers and Martin A Klein. *Slavery and Colonial Rule in Africa* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1999). Suzanne Miers and Igor Kopytoff, *Slavery in Africa: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977). Suzanne Miers and Richard L Roberts, *The End of Slavery in Africa* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988). For examples of studies of abolitionism more generally, see Roger Anstey, Christine Bolt, Seymour Drescher, and Rockefeller Foundation, eds. *Anti-Slavery*,

Additionally, studies of the history of humanitarianism and internationalism were consulted in order to better understand the development of these terms.<sup>50</sup> Thus, this project draws from a wide range of secondary sources, building off of ideas and themes found in studies of the histories of imperialism, religion, and humanitarianism in the late nineteenth century.

Focusing on events that took place between 1888 and 1890, the chapters that follow are organized chronologically. By focusing on this particular period, this analysis highlights the most active years in the relationship between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain, as the Cardinal officially launched his anti-slavery campaign in 1888 and he died in 1892 after his health started to decline in 1890.<sup>51</sup> The first chapter examines Lavigerie's visit to London in July 1888, and points to this moment as the initial, yet highly consequential, moment of contact between the Cardinal and the Society. This chapter seeks to position this particular meeting as a significant turning point in the history of anti-slavery activism, as it signified the moment at which the "anti-slavery revival" of the late nineteenth century truly became a transnational and

---

*Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey* (Hamden, Conn.: W. Dawson ; Archon Books, 1980); Thomas Bender, John Ashworth, David Brion Davis, and Thomas L Haskell *The Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); David Brion Davis and Rogers D. Spotswood Collection *Slavery and Human Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); Seymour Drescher, *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

<sup>50</sup> See Barnett, *Empire of Humanity*; Martin H. Geyer, Johannes Paulmann, and German Historical Institute in London, *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); J. P. Daughton "Behind the Imperial Curtain: International Humanitarian Efforts and the Critique of French Colonialism in the Interwar Years." *French Historical Studies* 34, no. 3 (June 20, 2011): 503–28. doi:10.1215/00161071-1259166.

<sup>51</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 150. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 719.

ecumenical effort.<sup>52</sup> The second chapter explores the consequences of the meeting in London, particularly how the collaborative efforts of Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society gave way to governmental initiatives to organize an international anti-slavery conference of the European Powers. Through an examination of the plans for the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890, this chapter confirms the argument first put forth by William Mulligan that Cardinal Lavigerie's campaign and his role in resurrecting anti-slavery activism in Britain alongside the Anti-Slavery Society shaped public opinion in such a way that the European governments—the British government, in particular—had to contend with the question of how to go about abolishing the slave trade in Africa.<sup>53</sup> The third chapter expands on the theme of the balance between governmental and non-governmental initiatives and the organization of international conferences, but investigates it from a different angle. This chapter investigates Cardinal Lavigerie's plans for the organization of an international conference of the anti-slavery societies, which started to develop concurrently with the plans for the Brussels Conference but eventually culminated in the Paris Congress of 1890. The thesis ends with a conclusion that provides a look at the status of Cardinal Lavigerie's relationship with the Anti-Slavery Society following the Paris Congress of 1890, and it also provides a brief consideration of the significance of these particular moments of exchange, cooperation, and tension between the Cardinal and the Society.

---

<sup>52</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 16.

<sup>53</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 149-166.

## Chapter I: The Meeting in London, 1888

On July 31, 1888, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society welcomed the French Cardinal Charles Marital Allemand Lavigerie to London amid a great deal of excitement. Only a few months before, Cardinal Lavigerie had launched his “anti-slavery crusade” in Rome and he arrived in London a few weeks after delivering a stirring address in Paris at the Church of St. Sulpice. After receiving word of the enthusiasm surrounding Lavigerie’s campaign on the continent, members of the British Anti-Slavery Society asked Lavigerie for a copy of the address delivered in Paris so that they might be able to reproduce it for their own publication, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*. They also invited him to London to “speak at a gathering of the friends of the Slave.”<sup>54</sup> In response, the Cardinal forwarded a copy of his speech (which was reprinted in their publication) along with “a warm letter of interest in the Society’s work, and a hope that during his approaching visit to London, he [would] be able personally to place himself in connection with the Society.”<sup>55</sup> Despite the fact that the Society had only four days to prepare for the meeting, members and eminent guests of the Society traveled to Prince’s Hall to listen to the Cardinal’s appeal.<sup>56</sup> Expecting Lavigerie to simply reproduce the speech given at St. Sulpice, members of the audience instead witnessed an address that was particularly tailored to his audience in London.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> “The Late Cardinal Lavigerie,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 12, no. 6 (November 1892): 363.

<sup>55</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Crusade against Slavery,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 85.

<sup>56</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 91.

<sup>57</sup> François Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet, and Missionary* (London: Athlone Press, 1994), 370.

As the third stop on his “publicity tour” promoting anti-slavery activism across Europe, Cardinal Lavigerie’s journey to London represented a significant turning point in the history of the revived anti-slavery movement of the late nineteenth century.<sup>58</sup> While cooperation between the Anti-Slavery Society and the Roman Catholic Church was not entirely unprecedented, the image of Cardinal Lavigerie speaking to a mostly Protestant audience struck some as a “strange,” if not an outright remarkable, sight.<sup>59</sup> What was a Roman Catholic Cardinal—a Frenchman, no less—doing at a gathering of a mostly Protestant anti-slavery society in Britain? Why would Cardinal Lavigerie want to appear before such a society, and what did the Anti-Slavery Society hope to gain by inviting him? The Cardinal’s previous stops in Rome (chosen first out of “filial duty”) and Paris (chosen second out of “patriotism”) were to be expected in a campaign launched by a French Catholic Cardinal, but his decision to visit London appeared to be a curious choice.<sup>60</sup> Yet the decision to hold the meeting in London was carefully calculated on both ends, and it carried major implications for the future of the

---

<sup>58</sup> Amalia Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism: The Politics of Anti-Slavery Activism, 1880-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 1, 6. Also, Daniel Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s,” *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 705, 707.

<sup>59</sup> As Adrian Hastings describes, Pope Gregory XVI issued his own condemnation of slavery in his papal encyclical *In Supremo Apostolatus* in 1839, which, as Hastings suggests, was largely a “response to British pressure” to more publically and formally condemn the practice. This precedent of papal/British cooperation on the question was later mentioned by a prominent member of the Anti-Slavery Society in reference to Lavigerie’s visit, as described later in this chapter. See Adrian Hastings, *The Church in Africa: 1450-1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 248; “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370-372. Also, *The Times*. August 1, 1888. The Times Digital Archive. For further examples of reactions amongst the press, see “Press Notices of the Crusade,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 110–17.

<sup>60</sup> Cardinal Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888* (Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 4.

anti-slavery movement.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, the meeting in London constituted a significant part of a larger transnational campaign launched by Cardinal Lavigerie at the behest of Pope Leo XIII in 1888, as the meeting signified the moment at which this new anti-slavery campaign— launched under a decidedly Catholic banner— became a truly transnational and ecumenical effort.<sup>62</sup>

While multiple historians have pointed to the overall significance of this initial meeting, the ways in which the Cardinal both presented himself to and was received by the Anti-Slavery Society deserves further analysis.<sup>63</sup> Given the fact that this event led to a radical shift in public interest both in Britain and across Europe in favor of the anti-slavery movement, it is worth investigating the event that led to such a shift in more detail.<sup>64</sup> As this chapter endeavors to show, the audience at Prince's Hall was largely receptive to the Cardinal's campaign and they, like Lavigerie himself, sought to establish lasting links between the Cardinal's initiative and their own. While it appears that the Society did not agree with all of Lavigerie's proposals in terms of how to best end the slave trade in Africa, his attempts to appeal to his audience's sense of a shared Christian and European tradition were largely successful, as they, in turn, interpreted his visit as an "attempt at building humanitarian connections beyond religious borders," and

---

<sup>61</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 1, 6. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 705, 707.

<sup>63</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20. Also William Mulligan, "Chapter 8: The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe, 1888-1890," in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 151-152, 154. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370-372. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 707. Also, Gianni La Bella, "Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign," in *The Papacy and the New World Order: Vatican Diplomacy, Catholic Opinion and International Politics at the time of Leo XIII* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 389-390. Also, Suzanne Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade* (New York: Africana Publishing Company, 1975), 203-204.

<sup>64</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 149-151, 165-166. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 375-379. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204-206.



they subsequently resolved to join him in his efforts to shape public opinion.<sup>65</sup> Through an examination of Cardinal Lavigerie's speech and *The Anti-Slavery Reporter's* coverage of the meeting in London, this chapter aims to effectively set the stage for Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society's evolving collaboration by investigating the very foundation of the connection between the two.

### **Section I: Background and Mutual Benefits**

After hearing of Cardinal Lavigerie's success on the continent, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society clearly recognized the benefits that a meeting with the Cardinal would provide. Yet in order to understand the reasons why such a society might have been interested in hosting Lavigerie, it is important to first understand its history and the state of the Society at the time of the Cardinal's visit. The Anti-Slavery Society was founded in 1839 by the Quaker John Sturge with the intention of "awaken[ing] public opinion" within Britain to promote methods of abolition that were "of a moral, religious, and pacific character," and it continued to advocate for the abolition of slavery as it existed around the world well into the later part of the century.<sup>66</sup> While many societies like the Anti-Slavery Society existed prior to and around the time of its founding, the Society remained particularly remarkable because it was "the only one the survive into the

---

<sup>65</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 372. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18. Also, Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 154-155.

<sup>66</sup> British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, Anti-Slavery International, and Adam Matthew Digital. *Sixty Years against Slavery a Brief Record of the Work and Aims of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1839-1899; with an Article on the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery by Joseph G. Alexander*. Empire Online. Section 5, Race, Class, Imperialism and Colonialism, 1607-2007 (London: Published at the Offices of the Society, 1900), 1-2. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 30.

1870s.”<sup>67</sup> Its membership was largely made up of members of the middle class and attracted mostly Quakers and other Nonconformists, though, as the century continued, it would become customary for members to “[pass] the torch on to their descendants,” as a number of families would remain prominent members in the Society for decades.<sup>68</sup> Funded by the “modest annual contributions of its members and larger donations from a few rich Quaker or non-conformist business and professional men,” the Society was “truly the keeper of the national conscience as far as slavery was concerned.”<sup>69</sup>

Indeed, the Anti-Slavery Society operated as an “important pressure group” in Britain, working to collect and disseminate information about the slave trade and the practice of slavery around the world.<sup>70</sup> To advance its cause, the Society released its own publication, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*, and it regularly organized public lectures and circulated various forms of propaganda to raise awareness. Additionally, it not only maintained close ties to members in Parliament (a fact of no little significance), but it also kept correspondence with “the leading Africanists of the day” to sustain interest and gather valuable information.<sup>71</sup> In fact, it was for this purpose that Cardinal Lavigerie was invited to London to speak to the members of the Society in 1888.

---

<sup>67</sup>Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 30.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>70</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 31.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 31-32. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

The anti-slavery cause, however, had all but diminished in the minds of the British by the time of Lavigerie's visit.<sup>72</sup> While it appeared that "[m]ost Englishmen [had] a patriotic thrill" following the abolition of European slavery in British-controlled territory in 1834, membership in the Society fell as the century progressed, and funds to support the work of the Society also dropped.<sup>73</sup> Indeed, to many within Britain it seemed as if the issue of slavery had been solved, and any attempt to advertise the cause by the early 1880s received little popular support. Though the Society had always been to some degree a "small-scale enterprise" with only a few hundred members, it seems as if many within the organization were growing frustrated by the lack of interest in anti-slavery activism by the time of Lavigerie's visit in 1888.<sup>74</sup> Thus, the Cardinal—with all of the newfound fervor and enthusiasm his campaign provoked—seemed to be a welcomed partner in the battle to cultivate British (and international) public opinion in favor of the anti-slavery movement.<sup>75</sup>

Cardinal Lavigerie likewise recognized the opportunity that a great meeting with some of the leading figures of the anti-slavery cause would present for him and his "anti-slavery crusade."<sup>76</sup> Lavigerie arrived in London with the intention of including the Anti-Slavery Society in the new anti-slavery network

---

<sup>72</sup> Lawrence C. Jennings, *French Reaction to British Slave Emancipation* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1988) vii. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 32-33.

<sup>73</sup> British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, *Sixty Years against Slavery*, 3. Also, Jennings, *French Reaction*, vii. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 32-33. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>74</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 32-33. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>75</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 20.

<sup>76</sup> As noted in the introduction, multiple sources (primary and secondary) refer to Lavigerie's campaign as a "crusade." For further examples of primary sources that use such language, see "Cardinal Lavigerie's Crusade against Slavery," 85-90; Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 5.

that he wished to cultivate, and he hoped that such a visit would bring about a lasting and meaningful connection between the Catholic Church's new initiative and the older, well-respected Anti-Slavery Society. The Anti-Slavery Society in Britain stood as the bulwark of an earlier wave of anti-slavery activism, and Lavigerie clearly saw the benefits of uniting his own cause with the enduring legacy of one of the oldest anti-slavery societies in Europe. Indeed, the Cardinal traveled to London in part to "secure [the Society's] approval" as he launched his own anti-slavery effort.<sup>77</sup> The very fact that the Cardinal chose to travel to London after his presentations in Rome and in Paris shows his reverence for the Society's enduring impact on the anti-slavery movement.<sup>78</sup> Yet he did not travel to London to simply build on the legacy of the older, more established society. Cardinal Lavigerie wanted his campaign to represent a truly ecumenical effort, and he sought to use the rhetorical tools available to him to carefully construct a message that was meant to appeal to the British in a particular way so as to gain their support in the fight to end the slave trade in Africa, thereby demonstrating his willingness to work with Christians of all denominations and nationalities.<sup>79</sup>

## **Section II: The Composition of the Meeting**

Despite waning popular interest in the Anti-Slavery Society's mission, the meeting in London in 1888 was a "crowded and enthusiastic" one.<sup>80</sup> The audience was noticeably diverse, with a decidedly ecumenical character. Along with the core members of the Society—most of whom were either Quaker or

---

<sup>77</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 4. Also, Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 20.

<sup>78</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 4.

<sup>79</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 20.

<sup>80</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 91.

belonged to other Nonconformist denominations—the audience also included “[s]everal Roman Catholic priests and clergymen of all denominations,” including the English Catholic Cardinal Henry Manning, who was a “member of the Directing Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society.”<sup>81</sup> Other notables included a number of older prominent men who played a large role in the early years of the Society, and Lord George Granville, the former Foreign Secretary, presided over the meeting.<sup>82</sup> Interestingly, the account later printed by the Society also mentions that “it was reported that His Majesty the King of the Belgians occupied a seat in the body of the hall,” a rather significant fact given Leopold II’s role in the important international conferences of the time and the “scramble for Africa” more broadly.<sup>83</sup> The meeting also included a large number of women, a fact that the Cardinal would later note in his speech.<sup>84</sup> While this mixture of politicians, kings, clergymen and ladies were perhaps drawn to the meeting for various reasons and with ranging levels of interest in the Cardinal’s message, it is important to note that the diversity of the crowd gathered at Prince’s Hall in London did not go unnoticed by both those within the audience and by the members of the press.<sup>85</sup>

Both those present and the British press following the event stressed how remarkable it was that Catholics and Protestants were united in the same room to peacefully discuss an issue of mutual interest. As many press reports pointed out,

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid. Also, Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 16.

<sup>82</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 203. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370.

<sup>83</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91. King Leopold II’s role in the convoking of the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890 will be examined in more detail in the Chapter 2.

<sup>84</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 13-14.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. Also, “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91-92.

these two groups had a long history of tense relations within Britain, and it was seen as particularly noteworthy that Catholics and Protestants could come together not to discuss a matter of theology or even an issue directly related to the wellbeing of Christians within Britain. Rather, these two groups came together to raise awareness about an issue of “humanitarian” importance: the abolition of slavery in Africa.<sup>86</sup> In fact, certain individuals made subtle gestures of goodwill towards those belonging to the other denomination even before the meeting began. For instance, Sir T. Fowell Buxton, grandson of the anti-slavery activist Sir Fowell Buxton, “forwarded a telegram to Earl Granville expressing his keen regret” that other duties kept him from attending the meeting, but he included a mention that he “recalled with pleasure the hearty manner in which Pope Gregory XVI had co-operated with his grandfather...in condemning the Slave-trade and Slavery.”<sup>87</sup> While this telegram may perhaps only be a side note concerning who did and did not attend the meeting, it is worth considering given the fact that the Society’s *Anti-Slavery Reporter* thought it so important as to mention it on the first page of its discussion of the meeting’s proceeding. This gesture of a well-respected British anti-slavery activist towards some memory of past collaboration between the Roman Catholic Church and the Society hints at a certain willingness on the part of Society to continue to collaborate to bring about the end of the slave trade in Africa.

### **Section III: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Appeal as a “New Witness”**

---

<sup>86</sup> “Press Notices of the Crusade,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 110–17. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370.

<sup>87</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91.

Echoing these sentiments of cooperation and goodwill, Cardinal Lavigerie opened his speech by acknowledging the national, religious, and linguistic differences between himself and most of the members of his audience. Apologizing for delivering his speech in French to a mostly British audience, Lavigerie began by demonstrating his earnestness to appeal to the Society's—and Britain's—long history of anti-slavery activism. With apparent admiration, Lavigerie noted, “The world knows the names of the writers who led this noble crusade... For half a century [the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society] has fought for this noble and holy cause.”<sup>88</sup> Before launching into what exactly defined this “noble and holy cause,” he prefaced his appeal by stressing that it was not a politician who came before those gathered in the Great Hall, but rather one who had “never been concerned... with other interests than those of the soul, humanity, and religion,” interests that seemed to align with the Society's own position.<sup>89</sup> As the Cardinal explained, he did not travel to London with the intention of inspiring pity from his audience or to bring to mind the “duties” of the past.<sup>90</sup> Rather, he sought to build on the well-known “narratives” of England's own explorers and to present himself as a “new witness” to the horrors of the slave trade in Africa.<sup>91</sup>

As he indicated in his London speech, the example of one prior “witness” in particular stood out in Lavigerie's mind as especially relevant: David Livingstone. Livingstone, a Scottish missionary who worked for a time with the

---

<sup>88</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 5.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*

London Missionary Society in southern Africa, had returned to England with “shocking” revelations about the horrors of the slave trade in Africa over thirty years before the Cardinal’s speech.<sup>92</sup> Indeed, the revelations that came about as a result of Livingstone’s extensive exploration into the African interior were well known, and the explorer’s legacy was well established at the time of Lavigerie’s visit to London. As Adrian Hastings points out, Lavigerie was “something of a Livingstone fan,” and he made this very explicit in his presentation to those assembled at Prince’s Hall.<sup>93</sup> Thus, the Cardinal made a very conscious attempt to tie himself to Livingstone’s legacy when presenting his own “testimony.”<sup>94</sup>

Lavigerie repeatedly mentioned Livingstone throughout his speech, but a particularly poignant moment came when he spoke about his visit to Westminster to visit Livingstone’s tomb. He expressed how it was his “wish, as an African of long standing, to visit the tomb of the great explorer,” and he also described what he saw there.<sup>95</sup> The Cardinal recounted how he “read with emotion...the last words traced by his hand...officially engraved on his tomb...‘I can do no more than pray that the richest blessings of Heaven may fall upon all those, be they English, American, or Turk, who shall help to wipe from the world the deadly stain of slavery.’”<sup>96</sup> This statement provoked loud applause from the audience, demonstrating how effective it was for the French clergyman to draw on the legacy of a man still held in such high esteem by his fellow countrymen.<sup>97</sup> Indeed,

---

<sup>92</sup> Hastings, *The Church in Africa*, 250.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>94</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 6.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6.



Lavigerie sought to call those in attendance to action by persuasively linking his own mission with the famous explorer's "last wishes," suggesting that the British were "the inheritors of his glory" and that they should be the "executors of his last wishes."<sup>98</sup> Yet the connection between the two men did not end there. The Cardinal understood that the position of a "new witness" came with the expectation that he could credibly testify to what was taking place in Africa, serving as a sort of Livingstone for his own time.<sup>99</sup>

Lavigerie's insistence that he was to serve as a "new witness" provides a window into how the Cardinal viewed himself and his mission. He presented himself as both an informed, knowledgeable "African of long standing," and as a devout Christian with a deep desire to right the wrongs of humanity.<sup>100</sup> He argued, "Africa needs not advocates but witnesses," suggesting that he did not travel to England to "*plead* the cause of the poor blacks."<sup>101</sup> Instead, the Cardinal stood before those in London—much like Livingstone had done decades before—to "testify" to the continued existence of slavery deep in the African continent as one who truly witnessed such atrocities. He acknowledged the dwindling interest in the anti-slavery cause in Britain in recent years, explaining how "[m]en seemed to have forgotten that slavery still existed upon the earth," having "even forgotten the Mussulman slave-trade."<sup>102</sup> The Cardinal largely credited recent explorers for having "affirmed" the horrors of the trade, and noted how these influential individuals "called upon the Christian world to interfere in favor of these

---

<sup>98</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 203. Also, Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 5.

<sup>99</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 6.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 4-5.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

unfortunate beings, who, though not, indeed, one with us in faith are, like ourselves, God's creatures."<sup>103</sup> He even went so far as to declare that it was Livingstone himself who "opened this new war," a statement that was perhaps more indicative of Lavigerie's own perspective and interests than of Livingstone's.<sup>104</sup>

But what sort of "testimony" did the Cardinal provide? While he assured his audience that he did not "intend to repeat anything" that they may have already heard from other sources, Lavigerie did not stray far from previous accounts of the persistence of the slave trade in the African interior.<sup>105</sup> Grounding his testimony in his experience as the "Primate of Africa" and as head of the Roman Catholic missions in the Sahara and in the area around Lake Victoria and Lake Tanganyika, the Cardinal began his testimony by recounting the struggles that his missionaries encountered on their journeys into the interior.<sup>106</sup> In fact, he stressed to his audience that the testimony he provided was not his alone, but rather his information came from his "legions of eye-witnesses," the North African-based White Fathers.<sup>107</sup> As he described, the White Fathers encountered many trials in their mission to evangelize the area south of the European-controlled regions in North Africa, with many succumbing to "the climate, to illness, to want, and to fatigue."<sup>108</sup> Others, however, "shed their blood by

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 203-204.

<sup>106</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 6-7. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 201. Also, Hastings, *The Church in Africa*, 254-255.

<sup>107</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 6. Also, Hastings, *The Church in Africa*, 255.

<sup>108</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 7.

martyrdom,” as a number of parties traveling into the Sahara were murdered.<sup>109</sup> Lavigerie did not share such stories out of any morbid sense of wanting to shock his audience; rather, he wished to “stamp their testimony with the seal of sacrifice, and to leave no doubt about the horrors they reveal.”<sup>110</sup> Thus, the Cardinal presented his testimony as one that was informed not only by his own direct experience, but also by the experiences of the hundreds of men under his control who served the Church in Africa.

As an experienced “witness,” Lavigerie described to his audience the nature of the slave trade that he and his missionaries had observed. Beginning with a description of the trade in North Africa, he explained how the slave trade still existed “in all of the Mahometan provinces” in the region.<sup>111</sup> Tellingly, the Cardinal gestured yet again towards the good work accomplished by the Anti-Slavery Society by suggesting that the slave trading caravans that used to pass through the region “fled far from our sight” as a result of European pressure, and he largely credited this to the work of Charles Allen, the Society’s secretary, “who, by his eloquent and indignant remonstrances, has forced these infamous traders to hide.”<sup>112</sup> However, Lavigerie pointed out that “the markets are still held in the interior, and several times each year the Mussulmans are seen there openly laying in a supply of human cattle.”<sup>113</sup> As these comments show, the Cardinal seems to have been particularly critical of the Muslims in the region. This seems to reflect what Bertrand Taithe characterizes as his “antagonistic view” of

---

<sup>109</sup> Ibid. Also, Hastings, *The Church in Africa*, 255.

<sup>110</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 7.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

Islam.<sup>114</sup> But if one considers the rest of his speech, Lavigerie's feelings towards Muslims appear slightly more nuanced.

Lavigerie very carefully qualified his description of the differences between the slave trade in the southern parts of North Africa and the trade as it existed "in the heart of Africa," yet his overall position towards Islam remained ambiguous.<sup>115</sup> As he described, "the domestic slavery" in Muslim-majority areas in North Africa was "far from showing the marks of incessant butchery."<sup>116</sup> In fact, the Cardinal stressed that Muslim households in this area showed their slaves "a certain amount of kindness," and he contrasted this with the situation further in the interior, whose horrors caused "the whole continent to writhe with anguish."<sup>117</sup> While he ultimately offered a few reasons for this "kindness" (such as the fact that, if the Muslims in North Africa treated their slaves badly, the Europeans would hear their "cries and groans"), it is perhaps significant that he acknowledged the possibility of kindness. One possible reason for such an acknowledgment could be that Lavigerie simply wanted to avoid any charge of exaggeration. Recognizing the temptation to disregard the information he provided as inaccurate and overblown, the Cardinal again linked himself to Livingstone by pointing out that the fear of such charges plagued the great explorer as well.<sup>118</sup> Yet Lavigerie tried to combat such sentiments by reminding his audience that "doubt in such a cause is its ruin, because doubt brings with it

---

<sup>114</sup> Bertrand Taithe, "Missionary Militarism? The Armed Brothers of the Sahara and Léopold Joubert in the Congo," in *In God's Empire*, eds. Owen White and J.P. Daughton (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 133.

<sup>115</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 8.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

hesitation, and hesitation at this moment means the destruction of the interior of Africa.”<sup>119</sup> By demonstrating that he recognized differences in the way slaves were treated across the continent, Lavigerie attempted to show a degree of insight and discretion, offsetting any charge of exaggeration and thereby avoiding any reason for his listeners to doubt the veracity of his speech.

Nevertheless, the Cardinal worked to inject a sense of urgency in his address in order to persuade his audience that now was the time to act, or the “atrocities” that occurred at the heart of the continent would only continue—and perhaps get worse. Noting how quickly the situation in Africa had changed in the twenty years since European explorers and missionaries first penetrated the African interior, Lavigerie described how “[w]ith ivory began the ruin of this unhappy country.”<sup>120</sup> He argued that the culpable parties behind the growth of the trade were a group he called the “Metis,” which he described as “a terrible race; springing from the Arabs and the blacks of the coast, and Mussulman in name, they are exactly fitted by nature to profess hatred and contempt of the negro race.”<sup>121</sup> Lavigerie explained that the Metis would often use slaves to carry ivory from the interior to the coast, and as the trade in ivory expanded so did the trade in slaves. Yet he also suggested a significant change had occurred in recent years. According to the Cardinal, ivory was becoming more and more scarce, and thus the slave trade shifted from trading primarily men to women and children.<sup>122</sup> And due to the enduring brutality of the trade, Lavigerie argued that fears of “the

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 8-10.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 10.

complete depopulation of Africa” were not overblown.<sup>123</sup> Indeed, it seems as if such a risk was one of the prime motivations for his campaign.

If the devastating fact that men, women, and children were being sold in a brutal trade did not move his audience to action, Lavigerie employed yet another persuasion tactic. As he suggested:

If Europe is untouched by motives of humanity, she should, at least, bear in mind the difficulty in which she will soon be placed, to know how to draw from these favored regions the wealth which they promised. When the population is at once destroyed, all labor, and, consequentially, all agriculture and real industry, will be impossible to the white man, who will be unaided by the manual labor of the natives... I repeat it once and for all, with all the force of conviction, if Europe does not quickly put a stop to these excesses by force, the heart of Africa will, in a few years, be only a desert.<sup>124</sup>

The Cardinal thus sought to appeal to the underlying economic motives for imperial expansion as a reason to end the slave trade. If the people of Africa were left undefended, they would become entirely consumed by the growing slave trade and any hopes that the European powers might have to utilize Africans as sources of labor for their own purposes would disappear along with them. It is worth considering to what extent this argument was meant to appeal to the audience assembled in London. Given the fact that most of the members in the audience were active in a society that fought for methods of abolition that were “of a moral, religious, and pacific character,” such an argument was perhaps not especially appealing to them.<sup>125</sup> Therefore, this was more likely meant as a line of argument by which anti-slavery activists could appeal to the wider public, particularly those in government.

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 11-12.

<sup>125</sup> British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, *Sixty Years against Slavery*, 3.

In terms of other groups to which the Cardinal attempted to make an especially tailored appeal, Cardinal Lavigerie made a very clear attempt to appeal to the women present in the audience. He suggested that their natural disposition led women to “feel more acutely” than men because they “know the road to the heart” better than their male counterparts.<sup>126</sup> Aside from the rather trite attempt to appeal to women’s natural inclinations, the Cardinal also pointed out that they should be especially drawn to this cause because the “the principal victims of this slavery are women and children.”<sup>127</sup> He also tried to appeal to their religious sensibilities. Lavigerie stressed the responsibility laid with the “Christian women of Europe” to “make such horrors everywhere known, and to rouse against them the indignation of the civilized world.”<sup>128</sup> Acknowledging the fact that most British women held very little political clout at this time, he nonetheless encouraged them to “[a]llow no peace to your fathers, husbands, and brothers; but make use of the authority which they possess by their eloquence, fortune, or position in the State, to stop the shedding of your sisters’ blood.”<sup>129</sup> In fact, this advice was not all that different from the advice he gave all members of the audience when discussing the way forward for the anti-slavery movement.

#### **Section IV: Cardinal Lavigerie’s Proposals to End the Slave Trade**

Cardinal Lavigerie ended his speech by arguing that “the duty of rescuing Africa falls first, without question, upon the governments of Europe,” and he

---

<sup>126</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 13.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*

highlighted the importance of societies like the Anti-Slavery Society.<sup>130</sup> He stressed that it was the role of societies like the one in Britain to pressure governments to follow through on their duties, encouraging them to renew their efforts to compel governments to hear their demands.<sup>131</sup> Yet he also seemed to communicate a certain amount of doubt as to whether the governments of Europe could really be trusted to follow through on their responsibilities. As he argued, “It is true that the European governments think of Africa: but up to the present time, they seem to have thought of it only to take possession of it. It is easy to meet in Congress in order to draw lines upon a map, and to parcel out empires; but Christian States cannot forget that duty corresponds to right.”<sup>132</sup> While still acknowledging the duty of the governments to lead the way on the African continent, he also addressed other ways of impeding the trade, such as the ransoming of slaves.<sup>133</sup> However, Lavigerie advocated for one response above all others: the creation of an armed force to defend the people of Africa.

Dismissing the overall effectiveness of a large-scale ransom of slaves, Lavigerie instead argued that the creation of an armed, yet “pacific,” force would be the ultimate solution to the problem of slavery in Africa.<sup>134</sup> Stressing that such a force would only be used in a defensive manner, the Cardinal cited the success of the European naval forces in hindering the trade in the Indian Ocean, and suggested that “some light troops” on the continent strictly for the purpose of

---

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 12-13.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 14-15.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.



protecting slaves would be just as effective.<sup>135</sup> Lest the governments of Europe prove unwilling to provide such a force themselves, he proposed an interesting way around such a problem. Arguing that, if this were to be the case, “the duty passes from the governments to the Christian peoples,” Lavigerie contended that something akin to “the private associations” of the Middle Ages could serve as an effective way of “supplying that which the governments could not accomplish.”<sup>136</sup> In fact, he made a direct connection between the crusades of the Middle Ages and his own vision. He directly referred to the anti-slavery cause as a “noble crusade,” and perhaps his views towards Muslims also inform such a characterization. Thus, Lavigerie presented himself not only as a contemporary Livingstone, but also as a sort of Peter the Hermit for the nineteenth century.<sup>137</sup>

#### **Section V: The Cardinal’s Reception and the Underlying Tensions**

Both those gathered at Prince’s Hall and members of the press who later reported the event were quite receptive to Cardinal Lavigerie’s call for a new sort of “crusade,” and some even adopted such language to show their support. Indeed, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* itself referred to Lavigerie as “a second Peter the Hermit,” and numerous press reports referred to Lavigerie’s mission as a crusade, though it was sometimes referred to as a specifically “European” or “Anti-Slavery” crusade as well.<sup>138</sup> Lavigerie’s use of this terminology was intentional and deliberate; the Cardinal clearly sought to bring to mind the image

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> The author of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* directly compared Cardinal Lavigerie to Peter the Hermit, a medieval cleric who rallied the masses in support of the First Crusade. See “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Crusade against Slavery,” 85.

<sup>138</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 91-92. Also, “Press Notices of the Crusade,” 110-17.

of medieval crusaders in distant lands sent to combat offending Arab Muslim hordes when he described his vision of an armed force sent to Africa to protect susceptible populations against the threat of “Arab marauders.”<sup>139</sup> And one should not accept such language as simply symptomatic of Lavigerie’s rhetorical style. Rather, his use of the image of medieval crusaders reveals yet another window into how the Cardinal viewed his entire mission, specifically the importance of his position as a dedicated son of the Church and the significance of the role he ascribed to the Roman Catholic Church in the anti-slavery movement more broadly. Lavigerie saw himself as specially charged with the act of launching a new crusade at the behest of Pope Leo XIII. Thus, he believed he was fulfilling his filial duty by “preaching” the Pope’s crusade across Europe, and his call for the creation of medieval-style “private associations” to defend the peoples of Africa was fundamental to the advancement of this new and distinctly Christian crusade.<sup>140</sup>

Despite the apparent support his audience showed for Lavigerie’s crusade in general, it is clear from later press reports and from the resolutions passed by the Anti-Slavery Society following the Cardinal’s speech that not all members were on board with his assertion that the use of force would most effectively end the slave trade in Africa. As the Society repeatedly stressed throughout its history, its members dedicated themselves to methods of abolition that were “of a moral, religious, and pacific character,” and Lavigerie’s insistence on the use of force

---

<sup>139</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 110.

<sup>140</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 4, 15-16. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 367-372

conflicted with one of the Society's central tenets.<sup>141</sup> It is important to remember that the Cardinal presented this solution to a room full of mostly Quaker and Nonconformist pacifists, and in this respect his address appeared to hit something of a snag. The resolution the Society passed following Lavigerie's address made no mention of the Cardinal's proposed armed force.<sup>142</sup> Additionally, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter's* copy of the London speech printed for public consumption came with a disclaimer, stressing to the reader that "The '*force*' which the Anti-Slavery Society has always advocated is that of public opinion—a moral force which no Slave-holding Power can successfully resist."<sup>143</sup> Thus, the British Society did not endorse the formation of an armed force to suppress the slave trade, and thereby rejected this aspect of the Cardinal's vision. But did all members uniformly agree with the official position adopted by the Society?

As Amalia Ribí Forclaz argues, it would be wrong to see the anti-slavery movement as a "monolithic block," and the same is perhaps true when it comes to individual societies.<sup>144</sup> While Quaker and Nonconformist Protestants with pacifist leanings dominated the composition of the British Anti-Slavery Society, it seems as though a degree of division existed concerning the Cardinal's proposal to end the slave trade in Africa "by force."<sup>145</sup> Though Cardinal Lavigerie aimed to appeal to all Christians in London, it is perhaps a matter of no little significance that those most inclined to support—or at least be somewhat open to—his vision

---

<sup>141</sup> British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, *Sixty Years against Slavery*, 1-2.

<sup>142</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 108-110.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>144</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 2.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-20. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 31.

of an armed force were Catholic, though there were some notable exceptions.<sup>146</sup> For example, Cardinal Manning was the first to speak immediately following Lavigerie's address, and he offered the first resolution to be moved by the Society during the meeting in London.<sup>147</sup> Manning served as "a member of the Directing Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society," and thus was a person of some standing within the Society and not simply a casual member of the audience.<sup>148</sup> His proposed resolution aligned with the Society's official position, as it confirmed its commitment to support Lavigerie's mission through "the circulation of information upon the subject, and by urging the Governments of Europe to bring the pressure of public opinion to bear upon the rulers of all countries where Slavery exists."<sup>149</sup> However, Manning appeared to offer his own views regarding the use of force to end the slave trade soon after the resolution was passed. As *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* described, Manning declared that:

If he were a man of peace he was also a man of war; and when the weak were trampled on by the strong it was the duty of the stronger to protect the weak; and, therefore...there was no form of legitimate force which he did not consider ought to be used...He was confident that hundreds of men could be found to go on so sacred and Christian a mission. He did not wish to complicate Governments. The people could by voluntary action, without even committing any Government, do almost what was adequate for meeting the great evil.<sup>150</sup>

In this way, Manning backed Lavigerie's vision of an armed force composed of volunteers, and he also seemed to echo Lavigerie's skepticism regarding the efficacy of governmental action.<sup>151</sup> Nevertheless, the Society chose not to forward

---

<sup>146</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 4, 15-16.

<sup>147</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 108.

<sup>148</sup> Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 16. Also, "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 91.

<sup>149</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 108.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid. Also, Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 15.

Manning's resolution to Parliament, and instead chose one that more directly urged the British government to work with other European nations to end the slave trade in Africa.<sup>152</sup>

Reverend Horace Waller, an evangelical Christian and an old friend of David Livingstone, proposed the second resolution—which made no mention of the French Cardinal's suggestion of the use of armed force—and he offered a more measured commentary. Waller ended his response by expressing how he “hoped young men, instead of going to Africa to shoot big game, would join the Anti-Slavery Society, and help put down the Slave trade.”<sup>153</sup> This statement could be read either as a call for younger generations to take up arms with a different aim in mind or as an appeal for such men to simply take a general interest in anti-slavery activism. Regardless, he “described as a break in the clouds the determination of the Pope to start the present crusade,” thereby acknowledging the role of the papacy and even adapting the crusader language used by Lavigerie to describe the new campaign.<sup>154</sup> While Waller's response was perhaps more representative of the Society's overall position, it was nonetheless an ambiguous one. And while Manning's comments were perhaps meant to be taken as an offhand remark rather than as a statement of his actual position, the Catholic Cardinal's commentary demonstrates that Lavigerie's mention of the use of force was not completely ignored by all members of the Society as some have suggested.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 109-110.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>155</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 372.

## Conclusion

Despite the apparent differences in opinion regarding the use of violence to end the slave trade in Africa, the British Anti-Slavery Society nonetheless warmly received the Cardinal and his “crusade,” and the meeting in London concluded with the expectation that the Society would continue to cooperate and maintain connections with Lavigerie.<sup>156</sup> After the meeting, the French Cardinal returned to the continent to continue his “anti-slavery roadshow” and left Britain for Belgium in the hopes of establishing an anti-slavery society in the predominately Catholic nation.<sup>157</sup> Soon after he left Britain, however, the Cardinal wrote to Pope Leo XIII urging the pontiff to “thank the Anglican Church for the way in which it had received the Catholic cardinal during his stay in London,” and, perhaps most significantly, Lavigerie donated a portion of the funds the papacy provided for the support of the different anti-slavery societies to the Society.<sup>158</sup> This contribution would long be remembered by the Anti-Slavery Society as evidence of goodwill and common cause between the Catholic anti-slavery network and the Protestant Anti-Slavery Society in Britain and thus demonstrates the close bonds forged as a result of Lavigerie’s visit.<sup>159</sup>

For its part, the Anti-Slavery Society immediately took up measures following the meeting that would have major implications for the anti-slavery movement more broadly. The resolution that was discussed above was forwarded

---

<sup>156</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>157</sup> La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 389. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 372-374. Also, “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 117.

<sup>158</sup> La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” 392. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 381. Also,

“Cardinal Lavigerie,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 6 (November 1888): 201–204.

<sup>159</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie,” 201-204. Also, “The Late Cardinal Lavigerie,” 363-364.

to Lord Salisbury, the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, in an attempt to draw the attention of the British government to this most pressing issue.<sup>160</sup> In the subsequent months, members of the Society continued to agitate Parliament to hold a debate focusing on what should be done about the slave trade in Africa, and, significantly, this issue was debated in the House of Commons on March 26, 1889.<sup>161</sup> As will be discussed in the next chapter, this debate in the House of Commons directly influenced the British government's efforts to organize an international conference of the European Powers, which eventually gave way to the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890. Indeed, a direct line of causality can be drawn between Lavigerie's visit to London in July 1888 and the events that eventually led to the calling of the Brussels Conference.<sup>162</sup>

Nevertheless, Cardinal Lavigerie's visit to London stands as a significant event on its own terms, as it represents the coming together of two separate anti-slavery initiatives that originated from widely different backgrounds and with distinctly different visions for the future of the anti-slavery movement.<sup>163</sup> As described above, the Anti-Slavery Society was initially interested in hosting the Cardinal in an attempt to rouse public interest in a cause that had long fallen to the wayside in Britain.<sup>164</sup> For his part, Cardinal Lavigerie hoped that by establishing connections with the Society, he might be able to "secure the approval" of the respected organization, while also making a clear attempt to

---

<sup>160</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade," 109. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 39, 204.

<sup>161</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204.

<sup>162</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 164-166.

<sup>163</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 370-372. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>164</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 20.

bring in Christians from all denominations into his campaign.<sup>165</sup> As the documents examined above illustrate, Cardinal Lavigerie was able to elicit an altogether “positive” and “passionate” response from his audience, and he did so by presenting himself as a “new witness” to the horrors of the slave trade in Africa, and by appealing to the Anti-Slavery Society’s long history and Christian tradition.<sup>166</sup> Despite this largely positive reaction, however, it is important to note the discrepancies between the Cardinal and the Society—and even among the Society’s members—that emerged during this meeting, particularly the differences over the use of force to eradicate the slave trade.<sup>167</sup> The emergence of such tensions should be kept in mind, as the subsequent chapters will reveal how both Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society would attempt to navigate these differences as they continued to collaborate in the coming years.

## Chapter II: The Brussels Conference, 1889-1890

On March 26, 1889, the House of Commons debated the prospect of an international conference of the Great Powers to discuss what might be done about the continuing slave trade in Africa.<sup>168</sup> As *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* later pointed out, this particular debate was quite remarkable, as it drew a rather large crowd and focused exclusively on the issue of the suppression of the slave trade.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 18. Also, Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 6.

<sup>167</sup> “Anti-Slavery Crusade,” 109-110. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 372.

<sup>168</sup> Suzanne Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade* (New York: Africana Publishing Corporation, 1975), 230.

<sup>169</sup> “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 6 (November 1889): 243. Also, “The Slave-Trade: Great Debate in the House of Commons,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 2 (March 1889): 57. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230.



Sydney Buxton, an active member of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and a Liberal representative in Parliament, brought the issue before the House, and he largely led the discussion that followed.<sup>170</sup> In the opening of his address, Buxton argued that the “great awakening of public opinion,” which was taking place both within Great Britain and across Europe, suggested that the time was right to hold an international conference dedicated to arriving at a solution to eradicate the slave trade in Africa.<sup>171</sup> He suggested that a “humble address be presented to Her Majesty [Queen Victoria] that she will be graciously pleased to take steps calling together (in London, if possible) a Conference of the Powers in order to devise such measures for its repression.”<sup>172</sup> This resolution gave way to an impassioned discussion that drew in members from across the political spectrum, and most rallied in support of the resolution proposed by Buxton.<sup>173</sup> One idea, however, repeatedly resurfaced throughout the debate: the significance of public opinion in shaping both domestic and international interest in the anti-slavery cause, and imperial policy more broadly.

The debate held in the House of Commons in March 1889 directly contributed to the calling of the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890, a unique event that stands as a rather significant moment in the history of anti-slavery activism and imperial history more broadly. Despite the fact that historians often seem to forget this extraordinary event, the Brussels Conference represents an attempt on the part of the colonial powers to address an issue that had, by this

---

<sup>170</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230.

<sup>171</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 59.

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 54-56. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230.

point, received a great deal of public attention.<sup>174</sup> Indeed, the role of public opinion is central to the significance of the event as a whole, as the successful mobilization of public interest in the anti-slavery movement prior to the Brussels Conference helped to bring about its very convocation.<sup>175</sup> More specifically, the debate in the House of Commons described above was itself called as a result of the recent stirrings of public interest in anti-slavery activism caused by Cardinal Lavigerie's "anti-slavery crusade." Following the Cardinal's visit to London in 1888, the Anti-Slavery Society, as an effective pressure group, sought to agitate a response from Parliament, and it is clear that this mobilization of public interest and attention greatly affected the proceedings in both London and Brussels.<sup>176</sup>

With an eye toward the growing influence of public opinion on imperial policymaking, this chapter aims to address the roles of both governmental and non-governmental actors in shaping the proceedings of the Brussels Conference.<sup>177</sup> Seeking to place the Conference in its proper historical context, this chapter draws connections and lines of continuity with events that both immediately preceded and followed the Brussels Conference, such as the debate

---

<sup>174</sup> While historians such as William Mulligan and Suzanne Miers have shed more light on the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890 as a particularly significant moment in imperial and international history, they are also limited in their respective perspectives. Miers examines the Conference entirely from the point of view of the British, while Mulligan's assessment focuses exclusively on the Lavigerie's campaign, adopts an entirely transnational approach, and lacks a detailed discussion of the Conference itself. See Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, xi-xiii, 315-319. Also, William Mulligan, "Chapter 8: The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe, 1888-90," in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 19-151.

<sup>175</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 148-150.

<sup>176</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 206-209, 230.

<sup>177</sup> In her study of "the politics of anti-slavery activism" between 1888 and 1940, Amalia Ribí Forclaz highlights in particular the relationship between governmental and non-governmental actors. This chapter draws on Ribí Forclaz's use of these terms, as it most clearly communicates the interplay between civilian and government interests in relation to anti-slavery activism and imperial goals. See Amalia Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism: The Politics of Anti-Slavery Activism, 1880-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 1, 4.

in the House of Commons mentioned above. In particular, it looks at the influence of Cardinal Lavigerie's "anti-slavery crusade" in conjunction with contemporaneous attempts by the Anti-Slavery Society to shape the international anti-slavery debate, and it highlights in particular the ways in which their successful mobilization of public interest contributed to the convening of the Powers at Brussels.<sup>178</sup>

However, the successful mobilization of public opinion by Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society was not the sole factor in the European Powers' decision to hold an international conference. As Daniel Laqua, Amalia Ribi Forclaz, and William Mulligan have shown, the discourse of the revived anti-slavery movement complemented—and ultimately came to “define”—the “civilizing missions” of the European Powers, and thus the various governments were able to use this discourse to legitimize their own imperial and expansionist activities.<sup>179</sup> In fact, the General Act of the Brussels Conference, the seminal document of the Conference, was itself “a multilateral diplomatic agreement that detailed the ‘civilizing mission’ against African slavery,” and thus encapsulated the melding of the language of the anti-slavery movement propounded by Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society and the “civilizing missions” of the European governments.<sup>180</sup> As this analysis seeks to demonstrate, the convening of the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890 was the result of a

---

<sup>178</sup> Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 149, 164-166.

<sup>179</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 9, 31. Also, Daniel Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s” in *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 705-707, 713-719. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 148-150, 164-166. Also, Martin A. Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 96.

<sup>180</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 31.

confluence of interests, where both governmental and non-governmental actors were able to significantly shape the proceedings of one of the “landmark” moments in the history of anti-slavery activism.<sup>181</sup>

### **Section I: The Debate in the House of Commons**

As the debate in the House of Commons described above ultimately set the stage for the Brussels Conference, it is worth considering this event in more detail. The debate in the House of Commons was called as a result of the “awakening of public opinion” in Britain following Cardinal Lavigerie’s visit to London.<sup>182</sup> As Suzanne Miers describes, Lavigerie’s visit to London “breathed new life into the [anti-slavery] movement” in Britain, which, given its long history and internationally recognized leadership in all things related to anti-slavery, “could never lag behind in the anti-slavery cause.”<sup>183</sup> After the meeting in London, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, which had hosted Lavigerie in an attempt to stir up dwindling public interest in its mission, attempted to persuade Parliament to discuss what could be done about the continuing slave trade in Africa. In fact, the Society passed a resolution directed at Lord Salisbury, the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, during the meeting in an attempt to bring this very issue to the attention of the British government.<sup>184</sup> After agitating Parliament for months, the Society finally

---

<sup>181</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 319.

<sup>182</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 59.

<sup>183</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, 39, 204. Also, “Anti-Slavery Crusade.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 4 (July 1888): 108-110.

succeeded in encouraging the House of Commons to debate this issue in March 1889.<sup>185</sup>

However, the British government perhaps did not need much of a push to consider the issue after Lavigerie's event in London. The government already had a distinct sense that "the public expected it to take the lead" when it came to anti-slavery issues, and this is reflected in the actions of the British Foreign Office shortly after Lavigerie's visit.<sup>186</sup> Anticipating the effect this highly publicized meeting would have on public discourse, the Foreign Office discussed the issues that the recent revelations of the terrible brutalities of the African trade brought to the surface in relation to British colonial policy before the debate in the House of Commons even took place.<sup>187</sup> As François Renault describes, "the government foresaw that Lavigerie's visit was going to give rise to awkward questions in Parliament," and members of the Foreign Office discussed the matter shortly after the French cardinal's visit.<sup>188</sup> Therefore, the debate in the House of Commons in March 1889 was perhaps not entirely a result of the work of anti-slavery pressure groups, but also a result of the British government's own interest and initiative.

It is important to note that the debate in the House of Commons in 1889 represented the second British attempt to instigate an international conference focused on the abolition of the slave trade in Africa. The first attempt had in fact originated from the Foreign Office itself. Lord Salisbury and other representatives at the Foreign Office recognized the need to address the issue of the slave trade in

---

<sup>185</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, 206.

<sup>188</sup> François Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet and Missionary* (London: The Athlone Press, 1994), 379.

Africa, as some members within Parliament were beginning to ask questions shortly after Lavigerie's visit. In an effort to head these concerns, the Foreign Office discussed the specific issues raised by Lavigerie's campaign and ultimately decided that an international conference of the European powers would be necessary to adequately address this subject. It appears the Cardinal loomed large over early discussions in the Foreign Office, as they also acknowledged that an international meeting "might also enable Britain to take advantage of the favourable trend of opinion evoked by Lavigerie to enlist greater co-operation from France against the export slave trade."<sup>189</sup> Thus, the Foreign Office not only sought to appease the rising tide of public opinion, but it also recognized the opportunities an international conference on anti-slavery might represent for the British government.

Following these early discussions, Lord Salisbury and members of the Foreign Office decided to contact Lord Vivian, the British ambassador in Brussels, to see if he might persuade King Leopold II to host an international conference.<sup>190</sup> The British were very aware that a meeting held in London might not be the best decision given Britain's "world-wide interests," which might lead to misinterpretations about the actual purpose of the conference.<sup>191</sup> Interestingly, the Foreign Office contacted Leopold after Lavigerie's visit in Brussels, which is where the Cardinal traveled after London.<sup>192</sup> This fact only further points to the importance of Lavigerie's campaign in getting a conversation started among the

---

<sup>189</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 208.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, 206

<sup>191</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 379. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 206-207

<sup>192</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 206-209.

European Powers regarding the issue of slavery. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Leopold himself “did not believe the conference would ever really meet, but if it did, it suited him well that any gathering to advance the cause of civilization in Africa should be held in Brussels.”<sup>193</sup> Despite his skepticism, Leopold consented and in late 1888 the British government successfully secured the King’s approval to host a conference in Brussels.<sup>194</sup>

However, the increasingly precarious situation in Africa jeopardized these early efforts. As Lord Salisbury engaged in conversations with King Leopold II, tensions in East Africa started to boil over, particularly among the British, Germans, and indigenous African peoples. Both the British and the German East African Companies were heavily engaged in the region, and the harsh labor measures of the German company (and later the German Empire) incited revolt along the coastal regions of East Africa. The British were disturbed by the rebellion, especially because it seemed to endanger their own position in the region. Likewise, the Germans were concerned that these revolts would in some way strengthen British claims in East Africa. Seeking a way to remedy the situation, the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck tried to reach some sort of agreement with the British. Bismarck asked Lord Salisbury if the British would participate in a naval blockade of the East Africa coast in the hopes of blocking any importation of arms that could be used to prolong the rebellion. Additionally, Bismarck also pitched the blockade as a way to prevent the exportation of slaves from the region. The Chancellor was well aware of the popularity of the anti-

---

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., 209.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid.

slavery cause and the ways in which anti-slavery activism could be used to legitimize imperial activity. Lord Salisbury agreed to participate, and thus for much of 1888 British and German forces were engaged in a naval blockade.<sup>195</sup> With these conditions in mind, it was decided that “circumstances were not favorable” for an international anti-slavery conference and eventually Lord Salisbury “withdrew” his proposal to the Belgian government for a meeting in Brussels in November 1888.<sup>196</sup> Nevertheless, plans for an international anti-slavery conference were revived by the spring of 1889. The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society had continued to agitate throughout the winter of 1888 for discussions among the Powers to continue, and eventually Sydney Buxton, a member of the Anti-Slavery Society, succeeded in bringing forth the issue to the House of Commons on March 26<sup>th</sup> 1889.<sup>197</sup>

The debate in the House of Commons highlighted both the growing perception that it was necessary to stop the existing slave trade in Africa and that an international conference of the European Powers was the best way to abolish such a trade. Indeed, these sentiments are present in Sydney Buxton’s opening remarks. Buxton stressed that, in light of the “increasing and extending” slave trade in Africa, the European Powers had a responsibility to stamp out the trade given their enhanced positions in Africa following the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885.<sup>198</sup> In fact, he suggested that the failure of the Berlin Conference to

---

<sup>195</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavignerie*, 379. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 209-216.

<sup>196</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavignerie*, 379. Also, “The Slave-Trade,” 59.

<sup>197</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230. Also, “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” 242-243.

<sup>198</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 57.



effectively deal with this issue was largely the fault of the British, as all of the powers “...naturally waited...for England to take the initiative.”<sup>199</sup> Nevertheless, Buxton argued that an international, rather than simply a British, project would most effectively eradicate the slave trade, as “[b]y international agreement [the Powers] would be able to deal with a larger area, and to serve a greater purpose.”<sup>200</sup> While he acknowledged that some might dismiss the idea given the failure of previous international conferences to adequately deal with this issue, Buxton stressed that the current domestic and international political climates promised that a new conference would be more effective than any held before.<sup>201</sup>

Buxton believed that now was the time to propose an international conference for two key reasons. First, he acknowledged that the recent stoking of public opinion in support of anti-slavery measures helped to make both domestic and international conditions amenable to such a proposal. In what was perhaps a rather pointed reference to Cardinal Lavignerie’s anti-slavery campaign, Buxton pointed out that “...the public conscience has been awakened and the public mind aroused on the subject of late in a way they have not been for some time past. A new crusade had been preached, and it is not alone nor especially in England that this feeling has been evoked, but in other countries as well.”<sup>202</sup> Indeed, the shift in public opinion in other European states made the situation particularly agreeable to such an idea. Specifically, Buxton referenced the shifts in opinion in Germany

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid.

<sup>201</sup> In particular, Buxton referenced previous conferences such as the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Congress of Verona in 1822, and, perhaps most importantly, the Congress of Berlin in 1878. See “The Slave-Trade,” 58-59.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 59.

and France, arguing that “...it has come about that Germany, the great irritant, and France, the great obstructive, in East African policies, have both of late declared their willingness, as far as they can, to assist in the great work.”<sup>203</sup> This openness on the side of the German and the French was a direct result of not only shifts in public opinion but also of the changing position of these two nations in Africa. According to Buxton, the situation in East Africa in particular inspired other European nations to take a more active interest in affairs in the region, thus contributing to the sense that now was a good time for a conference. He assured his audience that the “Anglo-German blockade” would “neither satisfy public opinion, nor [would] it be sufficient to check the rising of the Arabs against the Europeans,” and thus a true international conference of all of the European Powers was the only way to move forward.<sup>204</sup>

After establishing the need and viability of an international conference, members of the House of Commons laid out the “real and practical” measures that might be taken to most effectively wipe out the African slave trade.<sup>205</sup> To Buxton, four key measures seemed the most promising. He proposed:

In the first place...the *status* of Slavery should be no longer recognized by international law...Secondly, that the Slave-trade should, by international law, be declared piracy...Thirdly, that we should get rid of the difficulty which at present exists with regard to the right of search of suspected ships carrying other flags... And, fourthly, there ought to be greater restriction and supervision under international law of the import of arms and ammunition into Central Africa.<sup>206</sup>

Buxton’s proposals were received with cheers and cries of support, and it is clear that his proposals received the backing of most within the House. He argued that

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid.

such measures, particularly his suggestion that the slave trade should be declared piracy, would allow Britain and other European powers to take action against the growing trade, particularly if measures were taken which would adjust international law. It is worth noting that most of the measures Buxton proposed focused in particular on matters relating to the “traffic by sea,” reflecting the general preference among the British government to avoid engaging in large-scale land based efforts.<sup>207</sup> Buxton himself acknowledged this, suggesting that “[t]o engage in land operations would be absolutely fatal as a policy,” as it would require too much involvement in the interior and might lead the British away from engaging in more peaceful methods, which should be advocated above all else.<sup>208</sup> Another member of the House agreed that, if international naval forces worked together, the Powers could establish an “international police upon the coast” of Africa in order to better stem the trade.<sup>209</sup> Indeed, the debate in the House of Commons made it clear that, if an international conference were to take place, Britain would be especially concerned with naval affairs.

One maritime issue that the British seemed particularly eager to address was the issue of France’s apparent unwillingness to cooperate in naval searches on the basis of the “dignity of their flag,” making the French the “chief obstructives” in the region.<sup>210</sup> As Buxton explained to the House, “France has always refused to allow other nations a right of search over dhows carrying her flag; and, unfortunately, it is just the French flag that...has been a marketable

---

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., 68.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., 58.

commodity easily purchasable,” allowing traders transporting slaves across the Indian Ocean to escape any chance of being searched.<sup>211</sup> In fact, this issue had quite recently received international attention. In the midst of the British and German naval blockade of East Africa, British naval forces in the Indian Ocean observed a vessel suspected of carrying slaves flying the French flag, thereby embarrassing the French as the affair suggested that their flag was indeed beginning used to aid in slave trafficking. While the incident led the French to increase their naval presence around East Africa, they did not amend their policy to allow Britain or German forces the right to search French ships suspected of carrying slaves.<sup>212</sup> Buxton cited past declarations between the British and other European governments that engagement in the slave trade under their flags would be declared an act of piracy, allowing each agreeing nation the right to search suspected slave trading vessels no matter the flag. However, the French did not agree to this pact, and Buxton called on them to alter their policy.<sup>213</sup> Furthermore, he suggested that governments had not seen a major decline in the maritime slave trade because no true international agreement was put into place that would make it acceptable to search vessels flying other flags. Buxton believed that an international agreement granting the right of search to suspected vessels no matter the flag and an additional international agreement solidifying the trading of slaves as an act of piracy would radically halt the maritime slave trade.<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>212</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 213-214.

<sup>213</sup> He cited in particular a treaty signed in 1841 which was signed by England, Austria, Prussia, and Russia in which “the Slave-trade was declared to be piracy if carried on under their flags and under which reciprocal powers were given to search ship.” He stressed that France did not agree to these terms. See “The Slave-Trade,” 58, 60.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., 60-61.

Buxton's suggestion that the European Powers should curtail the "import of arms and ammunition into Central Africa" brings forth another key issue that would be discussed at length at the conference to come.<sup>215</sup> As mentioned above, the British and German blockade worked in particular to prevent the importation of arms to Africa in order to stamp out any chance of further rebellion in East Africa.<sup>216</sup> For Buxton, however, the restriction of arms and ammunition would help to allay another concern: the "depopulation" of Africa.<sup>217</sup> Indeed, he repeatedly mentioned this issue throughout his address, portraying it as one of the most pressing reasons for the European Powers to act.<sup>218</sup> He seemed to think that such a proposal hardly needed to be justified, as he suggested that he "...need not argue the advantages that would follow from the more careful supervision and restriction on the import of arms and ammunition. It is well-known that...by the possession of arms of precision the Arabs are able to master crowds of defenseless Africans, and to depopulate whole districts."<sup>219</sup> This was not an uncommon concern. In fact, Cardinal Lavigerie discussed the prospect of the eventual "depopulation" of the African interior in his own speech to the British Anti-Slavery Society in July 1888.<sup>220</sup> Therefore, the seemingly naïve assertion that the "depopulation" of entire groups of "defenseless Africans" was in fact possible was not an unheard of proposition, and when Buxton suggested this cries

---

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 60. Also, *General Act of the Brussels Conference Relative to the African Slave Trade, Signed at Brussels, July 2, 1890* (London : 1892), 38.

<sup>216</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 379. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 209-216.

<sup>217</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 63.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., 61, 63.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>220</sup> For more information, see the previous chapter. For Lavigerie's discussion of "depopulation," see Cardinal Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888* (Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 11-12.

of support could be heard throughout the House of Commons, pointing to the widespread belief among members of the British government that this was indeed a problem to be solved.<sup>221</sup>

Additionally, it is worth noting Buxton's specific reference to the "Arabs" behind the East African slave trade, as the relationship between the European Powers and the Arab world was repeatedly referenced throughout the debate in the House of Commons and would also become a significant factor in later plans for an international anti-slavery conference.<sup>222</sup> As Daniel Laqua argues, "In the late nineteenth century, many anti-slavery activists contrasted their civilizing mission with the havoc caused by 'Arab slave-traders'—a label which they also used for Swahili-speaking Muslim Africans."<sup>223</sup> Indeed, both Cardinal Lavigerie and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society made repeated mentions of the actions of "Arab" slavers in their anti-slavery discourse, and often with particular reference to the slave traders' relation to Islam.<sup>224</sup> In his address to the House of Commons, Buxton seems to have drawn on this discourse—which he would have been well acquainted with as a member of the Anti-Slavery Society—to bolster his claims.<sup>225</sup> He framed the interaction between the "Arab" slavers and the European Powers as essentially antagonistic, pointing out that the recent problems in East Africa had also led to increased tension between Europeans and the "Arabs" of the region. As he argued, "...whether it is due to fanaticism, to greed,

---

<sup>221</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 61.

<sup>222</sup> Ibid. Also, *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 54-56.

<sup>223</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 716-717.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid., 717. For examples of specific references to Muslims by Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society, see Cardinal Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888* (Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 5, 7-9; "Mohammedanism in Its Relation to Slavery." *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 1 (January 1889): 32-33.

<sup>225</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 54-56. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230.

or to a real struggle for existence, certain it is that, unless checked, one principal result of this fresh upheaval will be that the Slave-trade will be enormously increased, and that the cause of civilization and humanity in Africa will be thrown back a decade.”<sup>226</sup> Buxton clearly saw the European Powers on the side of “civilization and humanity,” yet he did suggest that “countries in which Slavery is still recognized” should be invited to the international conference so the Powers could exert their “moral pressure” on presumably Muslim countries to persuade them to abolish slavery in their own lands.<sup>227</sup> Such a suggestion received a great deal of support from many within the House, with most agreeing that it was necessary to include predominately Muslim countries in anti-slavery discussions.<sup>228</sup>

In terms of additional ways in which anti-slavery activists affected governmental discourse about the slave trade, it is perhaps worth examining the degree to which Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign figured into the debate in the House of Commons. Indeed, various references to the Cardinal were made by many within the House, some praising his efforts and others criticizing weaknesses in his campaign.<sup>229</sup> Buxton, for his part, did not specifically mention Lavigerie, but his description of the “new crusade” that had “awakened” public opinion across Europe seemed to serve as a nod to the Cardinal’s own “crusade.”<sup>230</sup> The first to outright mention Lavigerie during the debate was Sir

---

<sup>226</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 60.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., 60, 62.

<sup>228</sup> However, some, such as Sir J. Ferguson, voiced his concern that “there would be great difficulty in her Majesty’s Government proposing to Mohammedan countries to abolish the slave trade.” See “The Slave-Trade,” 65-66, 71, 81.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., 65, 69.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 59.

John Kennaway, a member of the Conservative party in Parliament.<sup>231</sup>

Interestingly, he mentioned the Cardinal in conjunction with the ongoing debate concerning the need for the French to allow other countries the right to search suspected slave trading ships flying the French flag. Kennaway referenced an exchange between Charles Allen, the secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and Monsignor Brincat, a Roman Catholic cleric who had traveled to London with Lavigerie in July 1888 and the manager of the French anti-slavery society started by Lavigerie.<sup>232</sup> Allen had written to the anti-slavery society in France in the fall of 1888 inquiring whether something might be done about the “abuse” of the French flag in the Indian Ocean. Brincat responded by stressing that it would be “utterly impossible to obtain the consent of Parliament and of public opinion in France, to the right for English cruisers to search French boats sailing under the national flag,” which in turn would make it difficult for the French society to openly support such an idea.<sup>233</sup> However, as Sir Kennaway pointed out, Brincat had suggested that French anti-slavery activists might be able to back an initiative that “would...treat the question from the general point of view, of agitating for a rule common to all nations, by which they should be authorised to search any suspected ships under whatever flag they might be sailing,” and Brincat was quick to point out that Lavigerie himself felt similarly.<sup>234</sup> Kennaway seemed to offer this information in the hopes of inspiring

---

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., 63. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 230.

<sup>232</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 65. Also, C. H. Allen, “An Interview with Cardinal Lavigerie in Paris,” in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 8, no. 5 (September 1888): 153.

<sup>233</sup> Letter from A. Brincat to Mr. C.H. Allen in “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 6 (November 1889): 254.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 254



those within the House to have faith that an international conference might finally convince the French to change their policy. Others, however, were more skeptical of French anti-slavery activists' commitment to such an idea.

Sir John Kennaway's mention of Cardinal Lavigerie in reference to the "right of search" issue opened a discussion in the House of Commons as to whether Lavigerie's efforts were to be applauded or suspected. For instance, A.E. Pease, who responded directly after Kennaway, suggested that "[t]he fact that the French flag sheltered the worst Slave-trading in that part of the world was a curious comment upon Cardinal Lavigerie's crusade."<sup>235</sup> While Pease acknowledged Lavigerie's admirable efforts, "he thought the first lesson needed was for him to teach the French nation, and the French Republic, that they should do something to prevent the carrying on of the Slave-trade under the French flag"<sup>236</sup> Pease's comments aroused cries of support within the House, indicating an apparent tension between members wanting to support Lavigerie's anti-slavery efforts while also remaining wary of his ties to France. Indeed, his comments seemed to suggest a certain discomfort with the fact that the Cardinal felt free to preach the anti-slavery cause across Europe without first making sure that his own homeland adequately addressed the issue.

Other members of the House were more openly supportive of the French cardinal and his campaign. Sir J. Fergusson seemed to adopt a view similar to the one expressed by Sir John Kennaway. He proposed that Lavigerie's work represented a sort of openness on the side of the French to more actively support

---

<sup>235</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 69.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid.

measures that would help to end the slave trade, suggesting that France “might be induced to join with other nations in the good work and to surrender an immunity which did them no honor.”<sup>237</sup> However, Fergusson not only mentioned Lavigerie in reference to the “right to search” issue, but he also drew the House’s attention to the Cardinal’s proposal of an armed “corps of volunteers” which would “operate under an international committee...[to] interfere with the passage of slave caravans.”<sup>238</sup> While he did not see Lavigerie’s proposition as one that would realistically work, Fergusson argued that “...it did not follow that because Cardinal Lavigerie’s scheme...did not commend itself as practical that something in some measure upon its lines might not be thought of.”<sup>239</sup> In particular, Fergusson saw Lavigerie’s proposal as representative of the need for international cooperation and united action, thereby using the Cardinal’s campaign in an attempt to support calls for an international anti-slavery conference.

Despite the variety of opinions expressed, the debate in the House of Commons nonetheless demonstrated the influence of Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign in Britain. While members of the House also mentioned other famous individuals throughout the debate such as David Livingstone and Henry Morton Stanley, Lavigerie was a figure whose views they felt they had to consider and contend with.<sup>240</sup> Given the attention paid to the importance of public opinion throughout the debate, the Cardinal’s role in rallying interest in the anti-slavery cause was something that the members of the House were perhaps unable

---

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., 78.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., 78-79.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., 63.

to avoid.<sup>241</sup> Many seemed to think it was necessary to acknowledge the Cardinal's role in attracting interest in anti-slavery activism, and most conceded that Lavigerie was indeed a commendable activist who succeeded in bringing both international and domestic attention to the continuing slave trade in Africa.<sup>242</sup> As William Mulligan points out, "The pressure of public opinion had the most significant impact on the British government. In conjunction with the unrest in East Africa and threats to British and German commercial interests there, Lavigerie's campaign provided an important domestic political stimulant to great power action."<sup>243</sup> However, it is important to also recognize the role of the British Anti-Slavery Society in shaping the proceedings in the House of Commons, as the debate was a direct result of their persistent efforts.<sup>244</sup> Indeed, the debate held in the House of Commons on March 1889 indicates the degree to which various non-governmental actors were able to effectively influence plans for an international conference of the European Powers.

Nevertheless, the debate also allowed members of the government to voice their own concerns and interests in regards to East Africa and the slave trade. Topics such as the suppression of arms and the need to persuade the French to put aside the "dignity of their flag" became key talking points at the Brussels Conference, thereby suggesting continuity between the goals articulated by members of the British government in March 1889 and the objectives put forth during the international conference which convened only months later in

---

<sup>241</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 164.

<sup>242</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 65, 69, 71, 78-79.

<sup>243</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 164.

<sup>244</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 204.

November 1889.<sup>245</sup> While these were measures readily supported by the Anti-Slavery Society (and, to some degree, Lavigerie himself), one should also consider other influences that may have shaped the government's interest in implementing these measures outside of the pressures provided by public opinion.<sup>246</sup> For instance, it is difficult to separate the concerns expressed in the debate from the broader international and political climate, particularly in regards to the Anglo-German blockade. As William Mulligan suggested, "threats to British and German commercial interest" in East Africa played a substantial role in stimulating the government's interest in an international conference.<sup>247</sup> Thus, one should not disregard the role of imperial competition and other strategic pressures that may have contributed to the British government's interest in pursuing an international anti-slavery conference, but should instead view the debate in its full historical context—with both the interests and motivations of non-governmental and governmental actors in mind—in order to better understand the circumstances which led to the calling of the Brussels Conference.

## **Section II: Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society Prepare for the Brussels Conference**

While the efforts of Cardinal Lavigerie and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to stoke public interest in the anti-slavery campaign following the meeting in London shaped the debate in the House of Commons in various ways, their influence on what would become the Brussels Conference did not stop there.

---

<sup>245</sup> "The Slave-Trade," 58, 60. Also, *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 37-58.

<sup>246</sup> An interview with Cardinal Lavigerie printed in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* also pointed to Lavigerie's support of such measures. See Allen, "An Interview with Cardinal Lavigerie, 153-154. Also, "The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels," 241-243, 247, 251-254.

<sup>247</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 164.

For instance, Lavigerie was embroiled in his own efforts to organize an international anti-slavery event at very same time that members of the British government were discussing the possibility of an international conference of the European Powers.<sup>248</sup> Immediately following his visit to London, Lavigerie embarked on a tour across Europe to both form new anti-slavery societies and forge connections among the various societies—from France to Germany, Belgium to Italy.<sup>249</sup> As proposals for a “diplomatic meeting” of the Powers started to gain more momentum, the Cardinal sought to bring the societies together “as a prelude” to such a conference.<sup>250</sup> When the prospect of a meeting in Brussels started to falter, an anti-slavery conference made up of representatives from the various societies seemed all the more crucial. By the spring of 1889, plans for a congress of anti-slavery activists started to crystalize and preparations were made for an anti-slavery congress to be held at Lucerne on August 4, 1889.<sup>251</sup>

Although the Lucerne Conference (and the reasons for its dissolution) will be discussed at length in the next chapter, it is worth briefly mentioning here as yet another example of the ways in which Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign successfully pressured governments to take action to halt the slave

---

<sup>248</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380. Also, “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” 242-243. Also, Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents et Membres des Comités Antiesclavagistes, pour les Inviter a un Congrès International de Leur Œuvre, qui Se Réunira a Lucerne, le 4 Aout 1889,” in *Documents Sur La Fondation de l’Oeuvre Antiesclavagiste*, (Saint-Cloud: Imprimerie V<sup>o</sup> Eugène Belin et Fils, 1889), 448.

<sup>249</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 20-28. Gianni La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” in *The papacy and the new world order: Vatican diplomacy, Catholic opinion and international politics at the time of Leo XII, 1878-1903*, ed. Vincent Viane (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005) 391.

<sup>250</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid. Also, Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents,” 448. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380. “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 3 (May 1889): 113–14.

trade. As François Renault describes, Lavigerie’s plans to hold a conference of the societies at Lucerne “...caused anxiety in political quarters,” as “[i]t was feared that some very awkward subjects would be discussed, and perhaps some guilty secrets revealed, in a Congress not constrained by tactical political considerations.”<sup>252</sup> Despite the fact that the meeting of representatives from various societies was eventually postponed and did not actually take place until after the Brussels Conference, it is important to note that the very prospect of an international conference of anti-slavery activists from across Europe perhaps accelerated governmental efforts to address the problem of slavery in Africa.<sup>253</sup> Indeed, this seems to suggest an underlying unease in governmental circles in regards to the activities of non-governmental actors when it appeared that these actors might endanger official political or diplomatic goals.

But how did Lavigerie influence the Brussels Conference once it became a reality? While some have suggested that the Cardinal had largely “reduced” his activities following his tour across Europe, it is clear that Lavigerie did not suddenly become irrelevant after launching his “crusade” in the summer of 1888.<sup>254</sup> Despite his failure to organize a congress of the anti-slavery societies, Cardinal Lavigerie still attempted to shape the proceedings of the meeting of the European Powers in a tangible way. As François Renault recounts, “Lavigerie used this occasion to compile a volume of ‘Documents Concerning the Foundation of the Anti-Slavery Campaign,’ a compilation made up of mostly

---

<sup>252</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 380-385. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709-710

<sup>254</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 379. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 150.

letters the Cardinal had sent to Pope Leo XIII and the various presidents of the anti-slavery societies that he had made contact with during his travels across Europe.<sup>255</sup> Indeed, Cardinal Lavigerie “sent a copy to each of the participants in the Brussels meeting to remind them of the existence of private anti-slavery societies which, he thought, should have the right to rely on governments for protection...for their activities in Africa,” thus demonstrating the Cardinal’s awareness of the delicate interplay between the goals of the societies and of the governments.<sup>256</sup>

Like Lavigerie, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society also found ways to more directly influence the proceedings of the Brussels Conference. An account printed in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* describes how, despite the fact that “the Society could take no part officially in the sittings of a Conference composed entirely of representatives of the Powers,” the Society nonetheless “resolved to send a Deputation to Brussels, with the view of affording such information respecting the Slave-trade as opportunity might allow them to give.”<sup>257</sup> For instance, the Society composed a letter addressed to Lord Salisbury outlining the Society’s views about what should be done concerning the slave trade, and this letter was forwarded to all of the ambassadors of the attending Powers.<sup>258</sup> Additionally, the men from the Society had brought with them “[a] large map of Africa, covered with Slave routes, according to the latest reliable information,”

---

<sup>255</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 382-383. Also, Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie, *Documents Sur La Fondation de l’Oeuvre Antiesclavagiste*, (Saint-Cloud: Imprimerie V<sup>ve</sup> Eugène Belin et Fils, 1889).

<sup>256</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 383.

<sup>257</sup> “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” 245.

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*, 246.

which was “specially prepared for the use of the deputation, and this map, which was always on view, was inspected by a number of gentlemen engaged in the work of the Conference.”<sup>259</sup> Thus, the British Anti-Slavery Society’s deputation was able to express its opinions and demonstrate its expertise to the wider Conference. By sending a special delegation, the Society demonstrated its desire—and ability—to continue its active role in the formation of imperial policy, even outside of its own domestic sphere.

### **Section III: The Brussels Conference**

Despite the initial difficulties in organizing a conference of the various European Powers, the Brussels Conference finally opened on November 18, 1889.<sup>260</sup> The Conference largely followed the model of the Berlin Conference, as “each power was represented by one or two plenipotentiaries and as many delegates as were wanted to give technical advice.”<sup>261</sup> Hosted by King Leopold II, the Conference received delegations from Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden and Norway. Additionally, non-European countries were represented, including the United States, the Congo Free State, Persia, the Ottoman Empire, and Zanzibar.<sup>262</sup> However, as Miers points out, “The size of the delegations directly reflected the importance placed upon the conference by the various governments,” with Spain, Austria, Sweden and Norway, Denmark, the Ottoman

---

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 245.

<sup>260</sup> Ibid., 243.

<sup>261</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 236.

<sup>262</sup> “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” 244.



Empire, and Persia only sending one representative.<sup>263</sup> Thus despite the fact that the conference seemed set to be a truly international affair, it is clear that not every Power demonstrated the same level of enthusiasm or exerted the same amount of influence during the Conference.

While a detailed agenda was not set prior to the arrival of the delegates, it was decided that the Conference should split into a Maritime and a Land Commission.<sup>264</sup> As expected, the British were particularly invested in the Maritime Commission, bringing forth "...proposals for a comprehensive agreement to replace their existing hodge-podge of treaties which were all different and largely out of date."<sup>265</sup> Indeed, the British delegation clearly communicated their belief that maritime issues should be at the top of the list of priorities, and they took care to not completely alienate the French delegation by suggesting that the right to search suspected slave vessels might be restricted to a limited zone in the Indian Ocean.<sup>266</sup> The French, for their part, tried to resist Britain's proposals by encouraging measures that would "render the right to search unnecessary by stringent regulations to prevent abuse of national flags."<sup>267</sup> Eventually, an agreement was reached that required both Britain and France to compromise their respective positions yet left both feeling more or less satisfied.<sup>268</sup> In what became Chapter III of the General Act of Brussels, the Powers codified the precise "maritime zone" in which slavery still existed in the

---

<sup>263</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 236.

<sup>264</sup> *Ibid.*, 238. Also, "The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels," 251.

<sup>265</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 240.

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid.*, 240-241.

<sup>267</sup> *Ibid.*, 241.

<sup>268</sup> *Ibid.*, 244-245.

Indian Ocean and it reaffirmed the existing agreements between the various nations that previously agreed to mutual “rights of search”—France not included.<sup>269</sup> However, the Act also ensured harsher prosecution laws for suspected slave traders in addition to stricter flag and vessel regulations, which appealed the British.<sup>270</sup>

Another key issue addressed at the conference was the restriction of “the arms traffic” in Africa.<sup>271</sup> This was, of course, a topic that the German delegation felt especially interested in, given the recent blockade of East Africa and the steps taken during that time to limit the flow of arms in African territories. However, these earlier efforts led by the Germans and the British seemed to be an attempt on the side of the Europeans to simply quell the rebellion in East Africa.<sup>272</sup> In the General Act, the arms trade issue took on wider significance and held greater implications. As Chapter I Article VIII explains:

The experience of all nations who have intercourse with Africa, having shown the pernicious and preponderating part played by fire-arms in Slave Trade operations, as well as in intestine wars between native tribes; and the same experience having clearly proved that the preservation of the African populations, whose existence it is the express wish of the Powers to safeguard, is a radical impossibility if restrictive measures against the trade in fire-arms and ammunition are not established; the Powers decide, in so far as the present state of their frontiers permits, that the importation of fire-arms...is... prohibited in the territories comprised between the 20<sup>th</sup> parallel of north latitude and the 22<sup>nd</sup> parallel of south latitude, and extending westward to the Atlantic Ocean, and eastward to the Indian Ocean and its dependencies...<sup>273</sup>

Echoing earlier concerns expressed in the House of Commons, this section of the General Act struck a paternalistic tone, where the Great Powers felt the need to

---

<sup>269</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 44.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, 46-54. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 244.

<sup>271</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 261.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, 209-216, 261. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 379.

<sup>273</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 40.

“safeguard” vulnerable African populations from the threats posed by the importation of arms into the African continent.<sup>274</sup> At the Conference, it was suggested that the arms traffic should be curtailed for the safety of the Africans, who were portrayed as on the verge of being wiped out due to the influx of arms in the region.<sup>275</sup> While there was some debate over exactly what regions of Africa would be affected by these restrictions, it was generally agreed that the restrictions were necessary.<sup>276</sup> This is not to say that the original motive—quelling “Arab” and African resistance in East Africa—was no longer the driving concern. On the contrary, the discussion of the arms trade presents the clearest example of the Powers “presenting in humanitarian guise a set of measures wanted for political or commercial reason,” as it is clear that these efforts were nonetheless intended to “cripple” resistance to European control in Africa.<sup>277</sup>

It is also worth noting that, as the members of the House of Commons had hoped, the Great Powers succeeded in securing representatives of predominately Muslim countries.<sup>278</sup> Chapter IV of the General Act dealt specifically with countries where slavery—domestic slavery in particular—was still legal, namely the Ottoman Empire, Persia, and Zanzibar.<sup>279</sup> In fact, the Act included three separate articles for each of these countries.<sup>280</sup> As Suzanne Miers explains, the European Powers largely believed that “...the only completely effective method of suppressing the export slave traffic was to close the markets,” and thus the role

---

<sup>274</sup> Ibid. Also, “The Slave-Trade,” 61.

<sup>275</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 40.

<sup>276</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 261-270.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., 270.

<sup>278</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 65-66, 71, 81.

<sup>279</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 54.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., 55.

of these countries in the continuation of the slave trade was highlighted in particular.<sup>281</sup> Several of the articles in the General Act stressed that the authorities of these regions should undertake “active supervision” of their coastal waters in an attempt to exert more regulatory control over the importation of specifically African slaves into their territories.<sup>282</sup> It should be noted, however, that Zanzibar, Persia, and the Ottoman Empire had already taken some measures to curb the trade in anticipation of the international conference, which were mostly aimed at putting into place the mechanisms to more severely prosecute “slave dealers” in those areas.<sup>283</sup> Yet the measures agreed upon at the Conference did not completely satisfy the “Christian powers,” as “[t]here was no undertaking to end slavery, and no means was devised to end the import of trade slaves under guise of domestic slaves.”<sup>284</sup> Thus, this section of the Act also fell short of the stated desires of the British as outlined at the debate in the House of Commons.<sup>285</sup> Nevertheless, the simple inclusion of these Muslim powers in the proceedings of the Brussels Conference was in itself significant. Despite the fact that their invitation was perhaps initially motivated by a desire on the part of the European Powers to not appear unduly prejudiced against Muslim nations, the presence of the Ottoman Empire, Persia, and Zanzibar at the Conference nonetheless represented the realization of the hopes expressed by members of the British government that Muslim powers might be included in an international anti-slavery conference—though their hope that the “moral pressure” of the European Powers

---

<sup>281</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 245.

<sup>282</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 54-56.

<sup>283</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 245-251.

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, 250-251.

<sup>285</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 62.

would ultimately persuade the Muslim countries to take a more definitive stand against slavery did not turn out as the British had expected.<sup>286</sup>

In addition to these measures, the General Act agreed upon by the members of the Brussels Conference also included another particularly significant point: the need for the Powers to limit liquor consumption in Africa.<sup>287</sup> Like the section that outlined the importance of curtailing the arms trade, the Act's discussion of the sale of liquor in Africa was couched in "humanitarian" and paternalistic terms.<sup>288</sup> The Act stressed the "moral and material consequences" of the "abuse of spirituous liquors...on the native populations," and, like the section on the arms trade, it defined the "zone" in which the liquor trade should be restricted.<sup>289</sup> This section of the General Act fell in line with the stated aims of a number of "humanitarian" groups, such as the Aborigines' Protection Society and the United Committee for the Prevention of the Demoralisation of Native Races by the Liquor Traffic.<sup>290</sup> While the Brussels Conference received numerous petitions arguing for restrictions on the liquor trade in Africa from groups in different countries (even one from a society in France which argued that "smoking was just as demoralizing as alcohol"), most of the petitions received were from British societies, reflecting the significant influence British "humanitarians" had on the proceeding in Brussels.<sup>291</sup> In an effort to satisfy the "humanitarian and temperance societies" back home, the British delegation was

---

<sup>286</sup> Ibid. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 231.

<sup>287</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 60-61.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid., 40, 56-61. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 270.

<sup>289</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 60.

<sup>290</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 275-276. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 715-716.

<sup>291</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 275-276. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 715-716.

particularly eager to back such restrictions, though these measures also received support from the French and the Germans.<sup>292</sup>

Thus, the General Act of the Brussels Conference saw the “overlap between anti-slavery and temperance” issues, which, in effect, seemed to nudge the Conference away from its “original anti-slave trade purpose.”<sup>293</sup> This shift away from the “original” purpose of the Conference is especially clear if one considers the stated goals of those who played a significant role in bringing the Conference together. The need to restrict the liquor trade did not figure into the debate in the House of Commons examined above, and, as Daniel Laqua notes, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society—unlike other “humanitarian” societies—felt that the “liquor question” diverted too much attention away from the central issue of the abolition of the slave trade.<sup>294</sup> Therefore, the inclusion of restrictions on the liquor trade can be seen as an example of the ways in which the Brussels Conference diverged from the goals outlined during the debate in the House of Commons and from the objectives of the British Anti-Slavery Society more broadly, shedding light not only on the tensions between the ambitions of government and non-government actors but also among various “humanitarian” groups who used the Conference to further different aims.<sup>295</sup>

Additionally, it should be noted that the General Act also included measures to set up international institutions to “insure the execution of the

---

<sup>292</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 272-284.

<sup>293</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 716. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 165.

<sup>294</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 57-81. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 716.

<sup>295</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 716. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 165.

General Act,” such as the creation of an “international maritime office” which was meant to aid in the distribution of relevant information to all of the various signatories of the Act.<sup>296</sup> Indeed, an entire chapter of the Act was devoted to describing how the Powers were to communicate and cooperate with each other in the most effective manner, indicating the degree to which the various governments were aware of the steps that needed to be put into place to actually ensure that the terms outlined in the Act were followed and that the appropriate mechanisms were put into place to guarantee their enforcement.<sup>297</sup> Through the establishment of offices in Brussels and Zanzibar, the Powers were expected to “communicate to each other to the fullest extent, and with the least delay” concerning information related to the slave trade and the “traffic in arms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors,” and to “supervise the working of the Brussels Act” in general.<sup>298</sup> However, not all of the delegates were supportive of this idea. As Miers describes, this particular part of the act formed “[a]n integral part of the whole British plan for the suppression of the slave trade,” but the Turks, Portuguese, Italians, Russians, and French “all objected to the right to criticise, comment on or even draw conclusions from the information presented to it.”<sup>299</sup> While such a provision represented an admirable attempt to ensure international cooperation and the proper execution of the General Act, debates over this particular provision nonetheless revealed tensions within this

---

<sup>296</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference*, 56-61.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>298</sup> *Ibid.*, 58. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 284.

<sup>299</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 284-285.

international project, thus fully displaying the “considerable differences between the various national perspectives” of those represented at the Conference.<sup>300</sup>

### **Conclusion**

On July 2, 1890, the Brussels Conference finally drew to a close after all of the European Powers—with the notable exception of the Dutch—signed the General Act, though the Act itself was not ratified until 1892.<sup>301</sup> In the end, the General Act proved to be a rather “toothless” agreement.<sup>302</sup> The practice of slavery and the slave trade in Africa continued well into the twentieth century, and, as the Powers’ additional aims of restricting the arms and liquor trade also failed, the Act altogether foundered as “an experiment in international co-operation.”<sup>303</sup> However, the significance of the Brussels Conference and the General Act perhaps lies not with the success or the failure of its particular provisions, but rather in the ways in which it was received and what it seemed to represent. While the Brussels Conference has been noted for ushering in the “development of international trusteeship” and for the ways in which it served to “legitimize” and “justify” imperial expansion in the late nineteenth century, an examination of the Conference’s relationship to the initiatives of anti-slavery activists reveals the ways in which this particular event also encapsulated the

---

<sup>300</sup> Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 31.

<sup>301</sup> The Dutch delegation was opposed to certain measures pertaining to “Congo import duties,” but they soon accepted the measures “at the last possible moment.” See Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 286-293. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 31.

<sup>302</sup> Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule*, 96.

<sup>303</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 305, 319. For more details on the continuation of the slave trade in Africa following the ratification of the General Act, see Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 292-305.



delicate interplay between governmental and non-governmental interests in the shaping of imperial policymaking during the late nineteenth century.<sup>304</sup>

According to William Mulligan, “there was little indication that the [European Powers] had any plans to take concerted anti-slave trade measures” prior to the launching of Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign, and a detailed analysis of the events leading up to the Brussels Conference confirms the influence of the Cardinal’s campaign on governmental action.<sup>305</sup> As the debate in the House of Commons demonstrates, Lavigerie’s visit to London and the subsequent actions of the Anti-Slavery Society helped to stimulate governmental plans to host an international conference focused on the issue of the slave trade in Africa through their ability to successfully arouse public interest in the anti-slavery campaign.<sup>306</sup> Indeed, the influence of these anti-slavery activists extended beyond their ability to encourage discussions about the issue in governmental circles, as even the concerns and discourse shared by anti-slavery activists largely shaped the ways in which governmental actors also conceived and talked about the abolition of the slave trade in Africa.<sup>307</sup>

Nevertheless, the relationship between the European Powers and the anti-slavery activists of the late nineteenth century was not one-sided. Indeed, the decisions of the delegates at Brussels significantly impacted the ways in which these non-governmental actors conceived of the future of the movement, and this

---

<sup>304</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 319. Also, Klein, *Slavery and Colonial Rule*, 96.

<sup>305</sup> Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 165.

<sup>306</sup> “The Slave-Trade,” 59-82. Also, Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 206, 230.

<sup>307</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 705-707, 713-719. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 148-150, 164-166.

is especially clear in an examination of Cardinal Lavigerie's efforts to organize an anti-slavery conference of the societies.<sup>308</sup> As the next chapter endeavors to show, the transnational anti-slavery network established by Cardinal Lavigerie also had to contend with the interference of national and other particular concerns in the organization of an international project—a tension with which the governmental actors at Brussels also had to contend.<sup>309</sup>

---

<sup>308</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 384.

<sup>309</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 710-713.

### Chapter III: Cardinal Lavigerie's Anti-Slavery Congress, 1890

On September 21, 1890, representatives of the European anti-slavery societies met in Paris to discuss the outcome of the Brussels Conference. While they had originally hoped to meet at Lucerne prior to the gathering of the European Powers, the event in Paris nonetheless represented the apogee of Cardinal Lavigerie's anti-slavery "crusade," as it brought together members of the various societies that Lavigerie had established connections with over the course of his campaign.<sup>310</sup> In fact, such an interpretation of the Paris Congress is reflected in the pageantry of the Congress's opening ceremony. The Congress opened with Mass at St. Sulpice, the very church where Cardinal Lavigerie had launched his anti-slavery campaign two years earlier. Unsurprisingly, the Cardinal himself figured prominently in its proceedings. For his homily, Lavigerie delivered an address that focused specifically on the significance of his campaign. Providing his own narrative of the trajectory of the "crusade" that had brought his audience together, the Cardinal recounted the events that had led him to that point and he outlined his vision for the future of the international anti-slavery movement. Indeed, his tone seemed to be rather celebratory as he looked back on what his anti-slavery campaign had accomplished thus far.<sup>311</sup> However, the way forward for Cardinal Lavigerie's transnational anti-slavery movement was all but clear by the time the anti-slavery societies met in Paris in 1890.

---

<sup>310</sup>"Proceedings at the Congress." *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 213–15. Also, François Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet and Missionary* (London: The Athlone Press, 1994), 384.

<sup>311</sup>"Cardinal Lavigerie's Sermon," *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 204–212.

Following the Conference of the European Powers at Brussels, the various anti-slavery societies had to adjust their goals and overall outlook according to the positions adopted by the European Powers. As François Renault describes, the “[r]ecent agreements on Africa involved changes in the perspective of the anti-slavery movement,” and a conference of the anti-slavery societies presented a chance for the societies to meet and discuss the implications of the decisions made by the Powers at Brussels.<sup>312</sup> For instance, the question of whether or not each anti-slavery society should limit their activities to specific “spheres of action,” meaning that their efforts would largely be limited to territories in Africa where the society’s nation of origin already exerted control over, was a topic of concern for many of the societies, especially the British.<sup>313</sup> Presented as a measure that would align more closely with the organizational methods put forth by the Powers at Brussels, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society nonetheless objected to such a proposal, arguing that it would interfere with the Society’s particular commitment to the “universal supervision of Slavery and the Slave-trade, which the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was formed to carry out.”<sup>314</sup> Thus, the Paris Congress represented an attempt on the part of the anti-slavery societies to balance transnational and national interests in a post-Brussels world—a tension that surfaced amongst the societies well before the Congress in Paris.<sup>315</sup>

---

<sup>312</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavignerie*, 384.

<sup>313</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 216.

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, 213. Also, “Cardinal Lavignerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress at Paris.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 210-211.

<sup>315</sup> Daniel Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s” in *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 719.

Through an examination of publications and letters specifically related to Cardinal Lavigerie's attempts to organize an anti-slavery congress first at Lucerne and then at Paris, this chapter seeks to examine the ways in which the various anti-slavery societies attempted to reconcile their international pretensions with their particular interests, specifically in light of the decisions made at the Brussels Conference. As Daniel Laqua points out, congresses such as the one Cardinal Lavigerie sought to organize represented "manifestations of anti-slavery internationalism," yet members often "planned their international efforts along national lines."<sup>316</sup> This is particularly clear in the attempts by some participants to encourage societies to limit their influence to specific to "spheres of action," as described above. In addition to national interests, particular religious concerns also added to the tensions among societies and complicated efforts to organize a congress of the different societies—especially in reference to the proposed conference at Lucerne. Indeed, the controversy surrounding Cardinal Lavigerie's decision to postpone the conference initially planned for Lucerne points to underlying suspicions rooted in religious interests.<sup>317</sup> Yet as the continued cooperation between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society demonstrates, the national and religious tensions that surfaced during the planning of an international conference of the anti-slavery societies did not override the common cause that brought these very different parties together.<sup>318</sup>

### **Section I: Cardinal Lavigerie's Transnational Anti-Slavery Network**

---

<sup>316</sup> Ibid., 710.

<sup>317</sup> Ibid., 709. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380-383.

<sup>318</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 383-385.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Cardinal Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign informed governmental efforts to organize an international anti-slavery conference. Indeed, his campaign has been acknowledged—during his own time and by scholars today—as having brought about the “awakening of public opinion” which roused governments across Europe (and beyond) to take action to halt the slave trade in Africa.<sup>319</sup> The last chapter focused in particular on the impact of Lavigerie’s campaign on the British government’s efforts to harness the rising tide of popular interest in anti-slavery activism, and it also demonstrated how the British had the most direct influence on the proceedings of the Brussels Conference.<sup>320</sup> While it referenced the lingering effects of Cardinal Lavigerie’s visit to London in 1888 and his continued interactions with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the previous chapter also briefly mentioned the Cardinal’s attempt to organize an international conference of the various anti-slavery societies at Lucerne before the European Powers met at Brussels.<sup>321</sup> In an attempt to determine the overall significance of the failed Lucerne Conference beyond its depiction as an event that shaped preparations for the Brussels Conference, the first section of this chapter investigates the circumstances

---

<sup>319</sup> Suzanne Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade* (New York: Africana Pub. Corp., 1975), 206-209, 230. Also, William Mulligan, “Chapter 8: The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe, 1888-1890,” in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 153, 164-166. Also, “The Slave-Trade: Great Debate in the House of Commons,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 2 (March 1889): 59, 71, 78-79. “The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 6 (November 1889): 242. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 378-385. Also, Gianni La Bella, “Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign,” in *The papacy and the new world order: Vatican diplomacy, Catholic opinion and international politics at the time of Leo XII, 1878-1903*, ed. Vincent Viane (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005) 391. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 390-391.

<sup>320</sup> Miers, *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade*, 206-209, 230. Also, Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 164-166.

<sup>321</sup> See Chapter 2

surrounding its conception and dissolution in order to show the ways in which it shaped the later Paris Conference of 1890.

One month after the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society succeeded in persuading the House of Commons to host a debate on the abolition of the slave trade, Cardinal Lavigerie invited members of the various anti-slavery societies across Europe to an international meeting of anti-slavery activists.<sup>322</sup> The purpose of this meeting was to bring together representatives of the various anti-slavery societies that Lavigerie had either helped to form or that he had worked to establish connections with over the course of his campaign to discuss the prospect of an international conference of the European Powers.<sup>323</sup> Since he had first launched his anti-slavery crusade in the summer of 1888, the Cardinal had traveled throughout Europe to spread his message, founding a transnational anti-slavery network whose most active branches were found in Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland.<sup>324</sup> It should be noted, however, that most of the societies on the continent that were associated with Lavigerie's campaign maintained strong connections with the Catholic Church—a factor that would

---

<sup>322</sup>“The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 6 (November 1889): 242-243. Also, Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents et Membres des Comités Antiesclavagistes, pour les Inviter a un Congrès International de Leur Œuvre, qui Se Réunira a Lucerne, le 4 Aout 1889,” in *Documents Sur La Fondation de l’Oeuvre Antiesclavagiste*, (Saint-Cloud: Imprimerie V<sup>o</sup>c Eugène Belin et Fils, 1889), 448.

<sup>323</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380-383.

<sup>324</sup> While anti-slavery “national committees” were also formed in Austria, Spain, and Portugal, they exerted very little influence and did not gain much momentum. See, Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 28. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 707.

become particularly important as plans for a meeting of the societies started to crystalize.<sup>325</sup>

As touched upon in the introduction, Cardinal Lavigerie stated throughout his tour across Europe that his anti-slavery campaign was placed under the direct patronage of Pope Leo XIII, and he would continue to claim that his anti-slavery movement owed much to the actions of the pontiff by the time plans were made for an international meeting of the societies.<sup>326</sup> It should not be forgotten that the Cardinal's campaign truly began on May 4 1888, when he was "publically charged" with the task of "appeal[ing] to the Christian world to join in an international crusade" to end the slave trade in Africa by the Pope himself.<sup>327</sup> In addresses delivered in Paris, London, and Brussels, Lavigerie always presented himself as a loyal or dutiful son who was simply carrying out his father's will—a rather humble and almost Christ-like presentation that his audiences seemed to pick up on and even replicated in their own descriptions of an apostolic man who traveled the capitals of Europe preaching a holy cause.<sup>328</sup> While it has been shown that Cardinal Lavigerie "took the lead" in establishing a transnational anti-slavery movement, the deference the Cardinal paid to Leo XIII should not be

---

<sup>325</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 17-23. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 707-709. Also, La Bella, "Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign," 388-394.

<sup>326</sup> For an example of Cardinal Lavigerie's insistence that the anti-slavery campaign remained under the patronage of the pope, see Lavigerie, "Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents," 461. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 707. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 381.

<sup>327</sup> La Bella, "Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign," 388.

<sup>328</sup> In the speech delivered in London, Cardinal Lavigerie made explicit mention of his "filial respect" towards the Pope, which he demonstrated by first launching his crusade in Rome before speaking in Paris and London. See Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888*. Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 4. For more information on this topic, see Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 381. For an example of a primary source that praises Cardinal Lavigerie as something of an "Apostle," see Richard F. Clarke, *Cardinal Lavigerie and the African Slave Trade* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889), vi.



disregarded.<sup>329</sup> Indeed, it shaped the entire framing of Lavigerie's movement. As previously discussed, the Pope looked to the French cardinal to "create a range of continental Catholic anti-slavery societies to orchestrate fundraising and collect donations from the churchgoing public," and he did so in the hopes of "put[ting] the Catholic Church at the forefront of anti-slavery action in Europe."<sup>330</sup> This desire to put the Catholic Church at the head of anti-slavery efforts did not die away by the end of Lavigerie's summer tour, or even after the European Powers met in Brussels. In fact, the plan to bring together representatives of the various anti-slavery societies could perhaps be interpreted as yet another attempt on the part of the Catholic Church to once again prominently insert itself into and shape anti-slavery dialogues.

Yet, as repeatedly suggested, Lavigerie was not hesitant to develop close relationships with non-Catholics, and his continued association with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society complicates any attempts to typify Lavigerie's campaign as a strictly Catholic affair.<sup>331</sup> As the first chapter demonstrated, both the French cardinal and the Anti-Slavery Society were more than willing to work together to bring about the abolition of the slave trade in Africa.<sup>332</sup> Despite their religious differences, both Lavigerie and the Society built on "themes of shared sympathy, Christian and European duty, and the right to intervene in Africa," and thus they shared a common "discourse" that underlay most of their interactions

---

<sup>329</sup> Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 153.

<sup>330</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 17-18.

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-20. Also, La Bella, "Leo XIII and the Anti-Slavery Campaign," 391. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 709. Also, Mulligan, "The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe," 153-155.

<sup>332</sup> See Chapter 1.

and informed communications between them.<sup>333</sup> While members of the Anti-Slavery Society disagreed with some of the ideas put forth by Lavigerie (such as his proposal of the organization of an “armed force”), the Society nevertheless remained supportive of the Cardinal’s overall effort.<sup>334</sup> As the last chapter showed, the British themselves suggested that it was because of Lavigerie’s campaign that interest in the mission of the Anti-Slavery Society started to gain popular attention once again.<sup>335</sup> For his part, Lavigerie actively worked to include the Protestant society in the campaign on the continent. Outside of examples of shared correspondence, the French cardinal also took active steps to support the Anti-Slavery Society’s work in Britain. Shortly after his visit to London, Cardinal Lavigerie made a substantial donation to the British Society from the funds allocated to him by Pope Leo XIII, “thus saving the British organization from its dire financial situation.”<sup>336</sup> As Lavigerie himself pointed out in a letter to the Society, he donated 300,000 francs to the British, which was the same amount that he had “given to some Societies in Catholic countries out of the truly regal bounty which His Holiness charged [Lavigerie] to distribute in his name.”<sup>337</sup> Members of the Society saw this move as “tangible proof that in the great cause of human freedom no political or religious difference are allowed to interfere.”<sup>338</sup> Thus, there was little doubt that an international meeting of the societies would be

---

<sup>333</sup> Mulligan, “The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe,” 154. Also, Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709.

<sup>334</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-20.

<sup>335</sup> “The Slave-Trade: Great Debate in the House of Commons,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 2 (March 1889): 71, 78-79.

<sup>336</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 18-23. Also, “Cardinal Lavigerie,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 8, no. 6 (November 1888): 201–3.

<sup>337</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie,” 201.

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid.*, 202.

more than a simple meeting of Catholic anti-slavery activists given Cardinal Lavigerie's close connections with the Anti-Slavery Society.

It is worth noting that this willingness to collaborate with anti-slavery activists from different religious backgrounds was not specific to Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society, but this openness can also be observed in interactions between the continental societies and their British counterparts more broadly. As Daniel Laqua describes, "Even at the national level, the new anti-slavery societies professed their openness for non-Catholic allies," as he found expressions of "solidarity" in letters exchanged between members of the French and the British societies.<sup>339</sup> Amalia Ribí Forclaz also discovered examples of warm sentiments in her examination of the letters shared among the various societies. As she explains, despite their confessional, linguistic, and national differences "[t]hese transnational connections were celebrated like family bonds and dispatches from the Catholic organizations to the British were peppered with references to 'notre sœur ainée' while the British referred to Catholic organizations as 'notre sœur cadette.'<sup>340</sup> Indeed, these communications show the significant degree of respect that these newer societies afforded to the older Protestant society, a sentiment that Lavigerie expressed during his own visit to London.<sup>341</sup> Despite their differences, these new societies understood the importance of forming a positive relationship with an organization that had decades of experience and whose influence in both governmental and non-governmental circles was well established.

## **Section II: The Conference at Lucerne**

---

<sup>339</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 709

<sup>340</sup> Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 29.

<sup>341</sup> Ibid. Also, see Chapter 1.

Plans for the Lucerne Conference developed out of the atmosphere of international cooperation and mutual respect that existed among the societies following the conclusion of Cardinal Lavigerie's European tour. As François Renault explains, ideas for such a conference were initially "...elaborated during the early part of 1889 when the prospect of an international conference [of the Powers] began to seem more and more remote."<sup>342</sup> At the very same time plans for an international conference of the European Powers were being rehashed in the House of Commons in the spring of 1889, Cardinal Lavigerie formulated a proposal for a meeting of the societies.<sup>343</sup> On April 25, 1889, he wrote letters addressed to the presidents and members of the anti-slavery "committees" to invite them to a meeting to discuss their work, which was set to meet for one week on August 4 of the same year.<sup>344</sup> Motivated by a desire to keep the anti-slavery cause at the forefront of public attention, Lavigerie wanted to guarantee that the concerns of the various societies would be addressed whether or not the European Powers decided to hold a meeting of their own.<sup>345</sup> However, the letters the presidents received were more than simple invitations detailing the time and place the societies should meet; it also provided a detailed outline of his vision for the anti-slavery movement going forward.

In terms of his conceptualization of the meeting itself, Cardinal Lavigerie clearly envisioned his international meeting operating according to national lines and interests. As he described, it was understood that "absolute independence

---

<sup>342</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380.

<sup>343</sup> "The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels," 242-243. Also, Lavigerie, "Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents," 448.

<sup>344</sup> Lavigerie, "Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents," 448.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380.

[was] necessary for each of the National Committees, for the greater success of their own work,” as the current state of international and diplomatic affairs showed that “it [was] not possible to hope that the members of the various nations might [submit] to one another and receive...direction from abroad.”<sup>346</sup> While he acknowledged the reality of the international conditions that made it difficult for the European Powers to plan their own meeting, the Cardinal nonetheless made it clear that, despite these national divisions and tense relations, the societies—and, perhaps, even the public more broadly—had an obligation to bring the issues wrought by the slave trade in Africa to light. As he quite poignantly asked his reader, “If governments forget [their] sacred commitments, do not the peoples have the right and the duty to force them to remember?”<sup>347</sup> Therefore, Lavigerie recognized the reality that national interests would inevitably shape the proceedings of an international meeting of the societies, and, in order to better fulfill their obligations and pursue their common goals, such a meeting would have to conform to this state of affairs.

To perhaps ensure that these national divisions did not interfere entirely with the calling of an international conference, the Cardinal reminded his reader of the shared interests that untied all of the societies and the particular benefits that could only be gleaned from such a meeting. Indeed, Lavigerie referred to the “powerful motives of religion, humanity, progress, and civilization” (all staples of the “civilizing mission” as it was articulated during this time), and he also

---

<sup>346</sup> Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents,” 449.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*, 450.

addressed the very practical ends that only a conference could provide.<sup>348</sup> For instance, he argued that “[n]ot only could resources... be more abundantly grouped, but, better still, the moral authority and experience of some would benefit others, and the enlightenment of all... would shed more light on the issues that each Council might have to resolve.”<sup>349</sup> Though he acknowledged that increased communication among the societies and even the success of their publications had already made the achievement of these goals much easier, Lavigerie stressed that only an actual meeting of the societies could bring about the ability to “communicate more easily and more intimately, and for this purpose, closeness and free personal discussions [were] indispensable.”<sup>350</sup> As Lavigerie saw it, a conference composed of the members of the various societies was not only possible but also necessary and beneficial for all parties.

Additionally, the Cardinal outlined a detailed agenda for the meeting in the letter that was forwarded to the presidents. He divided the practical measures to be discussed at the conference into two groups: what could be done in regards to Africa and what could be done in Europe. In terms of actions to be taken in Africa, Lavigerie stressed the importance of the “moral action of religious missions, of education, of commerce, [and] of the peaceful exploitation of the riches of the soil.”<sup>351</sup> Significantly, he also highlighted “the action of force... either on the part of governments, or on the part of particular leaders assisted by the natives themselves,” indicating his continued encouragement of

---

<sup>348</sup> Ibid.

<sup>349</sup> Ibid.

<sup>350</sup> Ibid., 450-451.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., 452-453.

such a measure.<sup>352</sup> As for measures to be taken in Europe, the Cardinal prioritized “means of triumphing over the resistances of governments” by way of rousing public opinion, signifying once more his belief that the governments needed to be persuaded to take any sort of meaningful action towards the abolition of the slave trade.<sup>353</sup> While he also addressed the importance of “securing the necessary resources,” and the need for Europeans to “[exert] a peaceful but firm continuous pressure on the Muslim States to force them to suppress...the sale of slaves,” Lavigerie affirmed that the stimulation of public opinion in Europe was most important.<sup>354</sup> Though he was particularly attentive to the role of the press and the work already accomplished by the skilled writers of anti-slavery pamphlets, it should be noted that the Cardinal also introduced the rather unique idea of organizing an open contest “for talented authors...as is done in the academies,” as this idea would be built upon in the future.<sup>355</sup> In addition, Lavigerie also highlighted the need for the various societies to meet and discuss the “administrative rules” for the entire anti-slavery movement going forward. Should the movement organize a “permanent central committee, elected in the committees...to bring all the members into regular communication” and to deal with the most pressing anti-slavery matters in between congresses?<sup>356</sup> The Cardinal felt that such matters should be discussed by all involved in the transnational anti-slavery movement.

---

<sup>352</sup> Ibid., 453. For his earlier discussion of the use of force to abolish the slave trade, see Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888* (Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888), 15-16.

<sup>353</sup> Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents,” 453.

<sup>354</sup> Ibid., 453-454. For his earlier discussion of the efficacy of governmental efforts to end the slave trade, see Lavigerie, *Slavery in Africa*, 12-16.

<sup>355</sup> Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents,” 454-456.

<sup>356</sup> Ibid., 455-457.

As he closed his address, Cardinal Lavigerie reaffirmed that the conference was “intended only to prepare [or] second the opinion of the actions of the governments,” thereby indicating that Lavigerie did not intend to rival governmental efforts to organize a conference but rather to supplement the governments’ decisions.<sup>357</sup> It should also be noted that the Cardinal did not firmly state whether his anti-slavery conference would meet before or after the meeting of the European Powers, which, perhaps, was a result of it being unclear at the time when the Brussels Conference would take place—if at all.<sup>358</sup> But this uncertainty did not stop Lavigerie from setting the date and location of his conference. As he described, the Cardinal believed it would be particularly beneficial to hold the conference at Lucerne in Switzerland because of its “central position and complete neutrality,” which would only add to the “international character” of the event.<sup>359</sup> He announced that it would open on August 4, and he asked that each of the societies nominate at least one member to represent them at the meeting. He extended an invitation to “all those whose particular titles...naturally relate to the Anti-Slavery Work,” but he also noted that the “public meetings” would be open to all, though, interestingly, he highlighted in particular his desire to include women and the “free citizens of Haiti, of Liberia, [and] the millions of blacks in the United States” in the discussions.<sup>360</sup> Lavigerie closed his letter by assuring his reader of his “ardent wishes for the complete

---

<sup>357</sup> Ibid., 455.

<sup>358</sup> Ibid.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid., 457-458.

<sup>360</sup> Ibid., 458-459.



success of this Assembly,” and he somewhat prophetically suggested that it might be the last at which his “infirmities will permit [him] to appear.”<sup>361</sup>

The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society largely supported the Cardinal’s effort to organize an anti-slavery conference, as they announced in the May/June 1889 issue of *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* that the Society would take part in its proceedings. For the benefit of its readers the article also included the list of topics that the Cardinal suggested should be discussed at the Lucerne Conference, with the Society adding that it would advocate for the inclusion of a “proposal for the abolition of the legal status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba.”<sup>362</sup> In addition to “members of the official staff,” the Society nominated five men to represent them: General Sir Frederic Goldsmid, the Reverend Horace Waller, the Bishop of Salford (who was nominated to represent Cardinal Manning), Mr. J.V. Crawford, and Mr. W. H. Wylde.<sup>363</sup> Three of these men prepared papers on a range of topic that they intended to present at the conference; Sir Goldmid, a noted “Orientalist,” prepared a paper entitled “The Mohammedan Idea of Slavery,” Mr. Crawford wrote on the issue of the use of public opinion versus the use of force in the suppression of the slave trade, and Mr. Waller’s presentation focused on the abolition of the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar.<sup>364</sup> As the delegation prepared for the congress, the Anti-Slavery Society

---

<sup>361</sup> Ibid., 461.

<sup>362</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 3 (May 1889): 113–14.

<sup>363</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 4 (July 1889): 157.

<sup>364</sup> Frederic J. Goldsmid, “The Mohammedan Idea of Slavery” in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 4 (July 1889): 162–66. Also, J. V. Crawford, “The Suppression of the Slave-Trade,” in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 4 (July 1889): 167–69. Also, Horace Waller, “The

noted that “[a]ctive steps were taken to do full honour to the prominent position which Cardinal Lavigerie had given to the Anti-Slavery Society,” a fact which one again pointed to the level of esteem afforded to the British society.<sup>365</sup> However, a telegram, which arrived just “two or three days before the deputation was to have started for Lucerne,” dashed the Society’s hopes for the congress quite abruptly, as they were notified that Lavigerie’s meeting had been canceled.<sup>366</sup>

Multiple explanations have been offered as to why the Lucerne Conference was canceled. In the letter he addressed to the presidents of the societies on July 24, 1889, Lavigerie himself suggested that the cancelation was due to the domestic political situation in France. Citing the upcoming General Elections in his native country, the Cardinal explained that he was compelled to “postpone” the Lucerne Conference because “almost all of the prominent Frenchmen who had originally given me reason to hope for their presence cannot now come on account of the General Elections, which are approaching in regular course in their country.”<sup>367</sup> As he put it, he could not “...admit the idea of an International Congress, in which would be discussed the interests and projects of all in the great question of African civilisation, in the absence of the representatives of one of the great Catholic Powers in Europe,” and he even articulated his support for his fellow countrymen as he argued that “their duty is

---

Immediate Ertinction of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar,” in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 4 (July 1889): 170–75.

<sup>365</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Congress,” 157.

<sup>366</sup> Ibid.

<sup>367</sup> Ibid., 160.

first of all to their country at so important a crisis.”<sup>368</sup> At face value, it would appear that in this instance the Cardinal had chosen patriotism over international duty.

Interestingly, the Anti-Slavery Society itself propagated the claim that the Lucerne Conference had been canceled for political reasons. In its account of the abrupt change in plans, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* spoke for the Society when it said:

So little does the Society attach any blame to the Cardinal...that it is quite ready to condole him upon the great disappointment to which he has been subjected in thus being compelled, for *political reasons* quite outside his sphere of action, to put so lamentable a check upon the great Anti-Slavery work to which he had set his hand. His Eminence is a Frenchman, and his patriotism is well known, and we can imagine the struggle that took place in his mind before he could consent to allow that the interests of his African flock should be sacrificed to the exigencies of party politics in France.<sup>369</sup>

While clearly upset by the recent cancelation, the Society urged the reader to “...understand that something much more important than appears on the surface must have caused this abrupt postponement.”<sup>370</sup> However, the *Reporter* did not indicate what that might have been. Perhaps due in part to its anticipation of the suspicions—based on national and religious concerns—the situation would raise, the Society seemed insistent on the fact that the Cardinal was compelled by political circumstances outside of his control, and the *Reporter* would maintain this interpretation of events well into the next year—never offering another possible explanation or publicly expressing doubts concerning Lavigerie’s

---

<sup>368</sup> Ibid.

<sup>369</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>370</sup> Ibid.

motives.<sup>371</sup> Yet the Society's discussion in their account of the fact that Lavigerie had reportedly fell seriously ill at the same time that the Lucerne Conference was due to meet was perhaps meant to indicate an alternative reason for why the Conference was canceled.<sup>372</sup> In the resolution passed at their meeting on August 2, 1889, the Society congratulated the Cardinal on his recent recovery, but it also stressed that "the Congress at Lucerne...should be held at as early a date as possible, in order that the report of its deliberations may be made public before the assembling of the Slave-Trade Conference of the Powers, which [was] expected to take place in Brussels in October next."<sup>373</sup>

Perhaps the most convincing explanation for the Lucerne Conference's cancellation, however, is the one offered by François Renault. According to Renault, Lavigerie was "...anxious that the societies founded under his patronage should remain in Catholic hands, and he was afraid that others would move in and take the credit for the Church's work," and the Cardinal believed that he "perceived such a danger in the preparations being made for the Lucerne Conference."<sup>374</sup> To support this claim, Renault cites evidence of correspondence between Lavigerie and Bishop Mermillod of Fribourg, who "warned him about the German-speaking Protestants," a group that was particularly critical of Lavigerie's campaign and threatened to dominate the entire Conference.<sup>375</sup> Though Lavigerie tried to guarantee a strong Catholic showing to offset this

---

<sup>371</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie and the Lucerne Conference," in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 9, no. 5 (September 1889): 188.

<sup>372</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie's Anti-Slavery Congress," 158.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>374</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 381-382.

<sup>375</sup> *Ibid.*, 382.

threat, when he arrived to Lucerne two weeks early he found the situation to be just as he had feared. This fact, compounded by the effects of his poor health, led the Cardinal to postpone the conference in on July 24, 1889.<sup>376</sup>

Daniel Laqua also seems to find Renault's account to be an altogether convincing one. In his brief description of the circumstances surrounding the Lucerne Conference, Laqua cites Renault's assessment to demonstrate the ways in which "religious tensions" informed Cardinal Lavigerie's decision to cancel the conference. Yet Laqua is careful to point to the ways in which nationalist tensions surfaced as a result of Lavigerie's actions as well.<sup>377</sup> Indeed, many of his contemporaries interpreted the Cardinal's decision to cancel the conference as his attempt to ensure French—rather than strictly Catholic—dominance over the proceedings in Lucerne.<sup>378</sup> Lavigerie himself perhaps inspired much of the reasoning behind these suspicions, as the letter he circulated among the societies seemed to suggest as much. His own letter specifically claimed that he was unable to "...admit the idea of an International Congress" without a strong French presence, and if his own patriotic sentiments did not inform his decision-making in anyway why use political reasons to justify the postponement?<sup>379</sup>

Nevertheless, if one takes into account Renault's reasoning, Lavigerie's letter takes on a different light. Lavigerie specifically said that he could not allow the Lucerne Conference to go forward "...in the absence of the representatives of one of the great Catholic Powers in Europe," thereby inserting a distinctly

---

<sup>376</sup> Ibid.

<sup>377</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 709.

<sup>378</sup> Clarke, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, vi.

<sup>379</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie's Anti-Slavery Congress," 160.

religious coloring as to his reasons for suspending the conference.<sup>380</sup> Thus, it would appear that the Anti-Slavery Society was correct in suggesting that “something much more important than appears on the surface” underlay Lavigerie’s message.<sup>381</sup>

Indeed, it is possible that the reality behind Lavigerie’s decision to postpone the conference was a confluence of factors—patriotic, religious, and personal.

### **Section III: The Paris Congress of 1890**

In late August 1889, the British Foreign and Anti-Slavery Society received two letters from Cardinal Lavigerie and his associates. In a letter addressed to all of the presidents of the societies, Lavigerie sought to defend himself against the charges leveled against him since his cancelation of the Lucerne Conference almost one month earlier. He attempted to reassure the various societies that his decision to cancel the conference was due to nothing more than his desire to safeguard against “the possibility of unfair representation of the Committees,” and he indicated that in his developing plans for another conference each society “shall be represented by an equal number of members” to ensure that the problems which ensnared the Lucerne Conference would not happen again.<sup>382</sup> Other than broad outlines for the conditions of the next conference, he did not indicate where or when this next meeting would take place. He only suggested that he had “decided that the meeting, which could not be held at Lucerne, shall take place at the time which will be determined by the majority of the

---

<sup>380</sup> Ibid.

<sup>381</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>382</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie and the Lucerne Conference,” 187-188.

Committees, under the conditions which experience dictates.”<sup>383</sup> The other letter, however, revealed a little more about the developing plans.

Dated the same day as the one drafted by Lavigerie, Charles Allen, the secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, received a letter that was written on behalf of Monseigneur Brincat, a close confidant of Lavigerie. It included an update on the status of the Cardinal’s health, which assured that he was swiftly recovering in the Pyrenees. It also provided the first real inkling of what the plans for the next meeting might look like. As the letter indicated, it appeared that the Cardinal was leaning towards holding the next conference in Paris in October 1890 rather than before the Brussels Conference as previously planned.<sup>384</sup> And, indeed, another letter that arrived a month later seemed to confirm these plans. Addressed to the presidents of all of the anti-slavery societies, the letter revealed that “the greater number of the Anti-Slavery Committees agree[d]...that the Conference had better not be held until after the meeting of the representatives of the Powers at Brussels,” which, as *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* stressed, was “not the view taken by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.”<sup>385</sup> While it is questionable whether the decision to hold the conference after the Brussels Conference was truly decided by the “greater number” of the committees or simply by Lavigerie himself, it was not long after the dissolution of the Lucerne Conference that plans for a new international conference of the societies started to develop, presenting a new vision of the societies meeting in Paris after the Powers had concluded their own anti-slavery proceedings.

---

<sup>383</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>384</sup> Ibid., 187-189.

<sup>385</sup> Ibid., 189.

Bringing together representatives from Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Spain, France, Great Britain, Italy, and Portugal, Cardinal Lavigerie's anti-slavery congress of the societies finally opened in September 1890 at Paris.<sup>386</sup> While the actual proceedings of the congress did not open until September 22, the event began with a series of "public demonstrations," the first of which was the organization of a solemn Mass at St. Sulpice on September 21.<sup>387</sup> Held at the very church where Lavigerie had launched both his priestly career and his anti-slavery crusade, the ceremony at St. Sulpice set the tone for the entire congress.<sup>388</sup> It was a rather extravagant affair, with a crowd of about 8,000 to 10,000 assembled. Those present participated in the celebration of the Mass, listened to "a special Anti-Slavery Cantata" led by "some of the best voices in Paris," and they also witnessed a special presentation of "fourteen native Christian youths, who had arrived from Uganda the previous day...[and were] seated upon the altar steps, whilst a sort of body-guard of ten of the *Pères Blancs*...stood like bronzed statues on the steps right and left of the pulpit."<sup>389</sup> The formal and religious tone of the event was further augmented by the presence of the Papal Nuncio and other prominent churchmen, who were seated just in front of pulpit and before all of the foreign delegates representing the various societies.<sup>390</sup> Indeed, the pageantry of

---

<sup>386</sup> "Proceedings at the Congress" in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 213-214.

<sup>387</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 384.

<sup>388</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie's Anti-Slavery Congress at Paris," 204. Also, "Cardinal Lavigerie's Sermon." *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 206.

<sup>389</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie's Anti-Slavery Congress at Paris," 205.

<sup>390</sup> *Ibid.* Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 709.



the entire event seemed to be quite conspicuously Catholic by design, and some would later openly lampoon the affair for its decidedly “clerical character.”<sup>391</sup>

Lavigerie’s homily stood as the focal point of this carefully choreographed ceremony. In his lengthy address to those assembled at St. Sulpice, the Cardinal outlined his objectives for the congress that was just about to begin. But before he described his ideas concerning what the representatives of the various societies should discuss, the Cardinal first offered a brief history of the anti-slavery campaign that he had launched two years before. In his homily, Lavigerie recounted how only two years earlier he had “...stood in this same pulpit, by the order of Pope Leo XIII, to begin the peaceful crusade against African Slavery.”<sup>392</sup> In fact, he repeatedly highlighted the Pope’s influence in particular, and he reminded his audience that the campaign to end slavery in Africa truly began after the Pope had issued his papal encyclical *In plurimis*, which celebrated the abolition of slavery in Brazil in 1888.<sup>393</sup> Looking back on his travels from Rome to Paris to London and beyond, the Cardinal presented an altogether triumphal picture of the campaign, as he stressed the significant effect that his “crusade” had on shaping public opinion throughout Europe. For instance, he specifically pointed to the ways in which his campaign influenced action in Britain, describing how the British, “...having heard [his preaching], urged their own Government to persuade all the States of Europe to unite, as [he] had insisted they should unite,

---

<sup>391</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

<sup>392</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Sermon,” 206.

<sup>393</sup> Ibid. Also, “In Plurimis (May 5, 1888) | LEO XIII.” Accessed September 18, 2016. [http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_05051888\\_in-plurimis.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_05051888_in-plurimis.html)

for the repression and destruction of African slavery.”<sup>394</sup> Indeed, the overall tone of his speech was a celebratory one, as he marveled how he stood before those assembled “...after hardly two years, to rejoice...that the civilized world had generously taken up so noble and so just a cause, has accepted the combat, drawn up its laws, and thus secured its success,” thereby suggesting that Lavigerie interpreted the recent actions of the Powers in Brussels and the overall shift in public opinion across Europe to be indicators of the success of his campaign.<sup>395</sup>

While he celebrated the good work already accomplished, Cardinal Lavigerie’s homily also indicated his vision for the future of the transnational anti-slavery movement that he had established over the course of two years. First, he stressed that public opinion, in the words of Pope Leo XII, remained the “queen of the world.”<sup>396</sup> He urged his audience to continue their attempts to shape public opinion, and he stressed the importance of using the press to do so—even if some of the coverage they received remained unsupportive of their mission.<sup>397</sup> It was important to keep the anti-slavery cause before the public at all times, and he argued that only a “conspiracy of silence” could effectively harm the anti-slavery campaign.<sup>398</sup> Additionally, the Cardinal drew on the decisions made at the Brussels Conference to highlight specific issue that he felt the various societies should consider. For instance, he described how the Powers assembled in Brussels discussed the various “works of civilisation” and the ways in which these “works”

---

<sup>394</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Sermon,” 207.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, 206.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, 208-209.

<sup>398</sup> *Ibid.*, 209.

could be better supported.<sup>399</sup> In particular, he mentioned how the Brussels Conference discussed the importance of “administration, science, industry, commerce, education, and...the Christian Mission.”<sup>400</sup> Lavigerie stressed the importance of supporting these “works of civilisation,” especially through educational and missionary efforts.<sup>401</sup> However, the influence of the Brussels Conference on the Cardinal’s thinking is perhaps most clear in his discussion of the need to establish a “division of labours” among the societies in order to better organize the anti-slavery movement going forward.<sup>402</sup>

It is worth highlighting Cardinal Lavigerie’s discussion of the need to “organize a division of labour” among the various anti-slavery societies, as the question over whether each of the societies should be “...concerned, in Africa, with the region placed under the influence of the nation to which itself belongs” became a topic of significant debate.<sup>403</sup> While Lavigerie had previously mentioned the importance of preserving the “absolute independence...of each of the National Committees” in his letter detailing his vision for the Lucerne Conference, in this instance the Cardinal used the ways in which the Powers had conducted themselves at Brussels to justify his view.<sup>404</sup> Indeed, Lavigerie described how his “...crusade ha[d] decided, according to the example of the States in their political action, to organise a division of labour among [the] several

---

<sup>399</sup> Ibid.

<sup>400</sup> Ibid.

<sup>401</sup> Ibid., 209-210, 212.

<sup>402</sup> Ibid., 210-211.

<sup>403</sup> Ibid., 210.

<sup>404</sup> Ibid., 210-211. Also, Lavigerie, “Lettre de S. Ém. le Cardinal Lavigerie a MM. les Présidents,” 449.

committees.”<sup>405</sup> As he put it, “If the various Powers had insisted upon working together, without distinction or division, at the civilising of Africa, their action would have ended in confusion, in rivalries, in sterile contentions, and, perhaps, in a disorder worse than that of mere primitive barbarism.”<sup>406</sup> Rather than resorting to such chaos, the Powers “...wisely resolved to work within limits and to respect the boundaries of each distinct sphere of influence,” and it was this imposition of limits that Lavigerie sought to emulate in the organization of his own anti-slavery congress.<sup>407</sup>

Following this rather ostentatious presentation, the congress officially opened its proceedings the next day on September 22 in a large hall of the Paris Geographical Society—a location perhaps no less symbolic than St. Sulpice given its imperialistic connotations.<sup>408</sup> Despite his predominate position during the opening ceremony, Cardinal Lavigerie played a more subdued role throughout the rest of the congress. While Lavigerie officially opened the congress from the president’s chair and personally welcomed the representatives from each of the anti-slavery societies, he quickly vacated that position and left it to a representative of the French society.<sup>409</sup> Though he would return to deliver his closing statement at the end of the congress, it seems the Cardinal did not override or overly dictate the terms of discussion during the meeting itself.<sup>410</sup>

---

<sup>405</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Sermon,” 210.

<sup>406</sup> Ibid.

<sup>407</sup> Ibid.

<sup>408</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid., 215.

As for the ways in which the various anti-slavery societies actual conducted their business, the societies decided the majority of their deliberations behind closed doors, though over the course of two days the congress also held “public meetings” which drew large crowds of both men and women into the large hall of the Paris Geographical Society.<sup>411</sup> These public meeting certainly fell in line with the anti-slavery movement’s continued commitment to the cultivation of public opinion.<sup>412</sup> Yet while the public meetings seemed to be generally aimed at educating the public on the most pressing anti-slavery issues, the private meetings focused on discussions of how the anti-slavery movement should be organized and what its priorities should be.<sup>413</sup> In these meetings, the representatives of the societies discussed topics such as the congress’s preference for “pacific measures” (which undoubtedly pleased the British society) which aimed to “elevate the blacks,” and the “question of Mohammedan African fanaticism.”<sup>414</sup> Additionally, the Congress also addressed rather novel measures to be taken by the societies to support their cause. For instance, the representatives discussed the possibility of raising “an annual collection for the necessities of the Anti-Slavery work,” and they also debated the idea of establishing an “open competition” of literary works devoted to the theme of anti-slavery activism, which would help to publicize the mission of the anti-slavery movement.<sup>415</sup> But the issue that seemed to arouse the most debate among the societies was the

---

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., 214-215.

<sup>412</sup> Ibid., 213.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid., 214-215. Also, “Resolutions of the Congress.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 216–20.

<sup>414</sup> “Resolutions of the Congress,” 217, 219.

<sup>415</sup> Ibid., 218, 220.

question of the role of the “National Committees” and the limits imposed upon them.<sup>416</sup>

As described above, Cardinal Lavigerie strongly advocated the idea that each of the anti-slavery societies should limit their activities and interests in Africa to the regions that their own nations of origin laid claim over, and that each society would do so with full independence.<sup>417</sup> Lavigerie argued that this would better conform to the precedents set by the Brussels Conference, and he also suggested that it would lead to less conflict among the societies as it would allow each group to pursue their own interests or goals without interference.<sup>418</sup> This vision for the organization of the international anti-slavery movement found enough support to become the second resolution set before the Paris Congress, but it did not pass without question.<sup>419</sup> In fact, the representatives of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society led the challenge against this proposal. As the report provided by *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* describes, the British delegation objected to the idea that each society should be limited to a particular “sphere of action,” as such a limitation would hamper “the universal supervision of Slavery and the Slave-trade, which the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was formed to carry out.”<sup>420</sup> Indeed, the debate over this resolution exposed the tensions inherent in a transnational movement that included members with universal pretensions and others who wanted to conform more to particular, nationalist interests.

---

<sup>416</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

<sup>417</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Sermon,” 210.

<sup>418</sup> Ibid.

<sup>419</sup> “Resolutions of the Congress,” 216.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid. Also, “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

Interestingly, the British delegation also objected to one other measure proposed by the other members of the Congress: the “annual collection...devoted to works of charity and missions” which would be “under the direction of the Pope.”<sup>421</sup> While the specific reasons for the British representatives’ rejection of such a measure were not given publicly, it appears that this resolution also seemed to align too closely to particular—in this case, religious rather than national—interests, which the British society felt it could not support.<sup>422</sup> However, the British delegation’s rejection of such a proposal did not, as one might expect, cause any sort of rift in the proceedings. Rather, the British society’s position was “received in the most friendly spirit,” and their objection to the resolution detailing how the “National Committees” were to be organized was dealt with in a similarly cordial manner.<sup>423</sup> The various delegates agreed amongst themselves that the details surrounding the establishment of an “annual collection” would be dealt with without the inclusion of the British society, and they also decided to alter the previous resolution which would have limited each society to a particular “sphere of action,” according to the wishes of the British.<sup>424</sup> Instead of imposing any sort of limits upon the various societies, the congress agreed upon a resolution that stressed the independence of each society rather than their restriction to any one “sphere of action.”<sup>425</sup> In this way, the British society used the tremendous amount of “deference” afforded to them by the other societies to their advantage,

---

<sup>421</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

<sup>422</sup> Ibid.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid.

<sup>425</sup> “Resolutions of the Congress,” 216.

and they were able to reshape key resolutions according to their own ideals and interests.<sup>426</sup>

The objections of the British delegation and the ways in which they were addressed by the other anti-slavery societies demonstrate that disagreements—some significant, others less so—did arise at the Paris Congress, yet these differences in opinion were dealt with in an atmosphere that was both cordial and receptive. Indeed, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* repeatedly assured its readers as much.<sup>427</sup> A particular moment during the closing ceremony perhaps most poignantly illustrates the continued existence of such warm relations. In a public meeting held to mark the closing of the congress, Charles Allen, the secretary of the British Anti-Slavery Society, offered “a vote of thanks” to the Cardinal that had brought the representatives of the various societies together, praising all that Lavignerie had accomplished thus far. Cardinal Lavignerie, who was presented and again seated in the president’s chair, was visibly moved and arose to embrace the Englishman.<sup>428</sup> Thus, the Paris Congress concluded with an emotional affirmation of the close relationship between the British society and the Cardinal who had brought them into the orbit of his anti-slavery campaign.

### **Conclusion**

Despite the controversy and difficulties that had preceded it, Cardinal Lavignerie’s Paris Congress 1890 stands as a compelling example of non-governmental actors attempting to wrestle with the question of how to balance international and particular national and religious interests. As the circumstances

---

<sup>426</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 213.

<sup>427</sup> Ibid.

<sup>428</sup> Ibid., 215.



surrounding the plans for the Lucerne Conference suggest, national and religious interests did indeed interfere with the Cardinal's efforts to organize an international conference, as Lavigerie largely decided to cancel the conference following the poor showing of French—and Catholic—delegates.<sup>429</sup> Interestingly, however, the Cardinal's decision to abruptly cancel the conference did not completely endanger his relations with the Protestant Anti-Slavery Society. On the contrary, the Society and the Cardinal demonstrated their continued admiration for each other once the international conference of the anti-slavery societies finally did take place in 1890, as the warm embrace shared by Charles Allen and Cardinal Lavigerie so poignantly illustrated.<sup>430</sup>

However, the tensions between international pretensions and national interests surfaced in yet another way in the context of the organization of an international conference of the societies. Division existed as to how the anti-slavery movement should be organized, and this particular issue came to the fore as the societies looked to the workings of Brussels Conference for guidance as to how to best organize their own international movement.<sup>431</sup> While Lavigerie argued that each anti-slavery society should limit their activities to specific “spheres of action,” the Anti-Slavery Society preferred the more “international approach.”<sup>432</sup> Nevertheless, both those who supported Cardinal Lavigerie's vision and those who supported the point of view of the British society were able to arrive at a compromise, where the independence of each society was to be

---

<sup>429</sup> Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism,” 709-710. Also, Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 380-385.

<sup>430</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” 215.

<sup>431</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 384.

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.* Also, “Proceedings at the Congress,” 216.

respected.<sup>433</sup> Thus, the Paris Congress of 1890 signifies a decisive moment at which the strength of the transnational connection between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society was tried, tested, and confirmed.

---

<sup>433</sup> “Resolutions of the Congress,” 216.

## **Conclusion: Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society's Relationship After 1890**

Soon after the closing of the Paris Congress of 1890, the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society wrote a “congratulatory letter” to Cardinal Lavigerie, “thanking his Eminence for the kind reception given to its representatives.” The letter also included a formal invitation to hold the next anti-slavery congress of the societies in London in the summer of 1892.<sup>434</sup> In January 1891, it was reported that Lavigerie had accepted the Anti-Slavery Society’s offer to host the next anti-slavery congress.<sup>435</sup> As the General Act of Brussels would also be ratified in 1892, *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* seemed to anticipate that the various societies would have a lot to discuss “if some of the most stringent Articles of the General Act have not been effectively carried out.”<sup>436</sup> However, it appears that the London Congress of 1892 did not take place. There is no mention of such a congress in the relevant secondary literature or in any of articles in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* in 1892. Rather than reports focusing on the coming together of the various societies to once again talk about the most pressing anti-slavery issues, the July 1892 edition of *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* includes letters written by Charles Allen on behalf of the Anti-Slavery Society to the press in an attempt to distance the British society from the Belgian anti-slavery society’s use

---

<sup>434</sup> “Proceedings at the Congress,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 10, no. 5 (September 1890): 214.

<sup>435</sup> “Cardinal Lavigerie’s Anti-Slavery Conference,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 11, no. 1 (January 1891): 6.

<sup>436</sup> Ibid. Also, Daniel Laqua, “The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s” in *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 712.

of force in the Congo, citing the affirmation of the independence of each society arrived at during the Paris Congress of 1890.<sup>437</sup>

Indeed, the proposed Congress of London seems to have fallen apart in the planning stages, and there are perhaps multiple reasons for its dissolution. The first possible explanation is the increase in tensions on the African continent. Like the earlier situation leading up to the Brussels Conference where the outbreak of conflict in East Africa prevented the European Powers from coming together for an international anti-slavery conference in 1888, the outbreak of tensions in the regions of Buganda and the Congo might help to explain the dissolution of the plans for an anti-slavery congress in London.<sup>438</sup> As Charles Allen's letters to the press suggest, tensions between the societies themselves might have flared up as a result of the issues on the African continent, thus making it difficult for the various societies to come together in 1892.<sup>439</sup> The second possible explanation rests with Cardinal Lavigerie himself. Despite his determination to remain involved in anti-slavery affairs in the years after the Paris Congress of 1890, "...the early months of 1892 [was] the period when Lavigerie's energies began to flag," and his health would only continue to decline until his death on November 26, 1892.<sup>440</sup>

While another anti-slavery congress of the societies was held in Paris in 1900, the notable gap between meetings speaks to the importance of Cardinal

---

<sup>437</sup> "Mr. C. H. Allen to the Press," *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 12, no. 4 (July 1892): 196–99.

<sup>438</sup> François Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet and Missionary* (London: The Athlone Press, 1994), 379, 416–422.

<sup>439</sup> "Mr. C. H. Allen to the Press," 196–99.

<sup>440</sup> Renault, *Cardinal Lavigerie*, 424–426.

Lavigerie's role in bringing the various anti-slavery societies together.<sup>441</sup> As Daniel Laqua suggests, "Lavigerie's death in 1892 deprived the anti-slavery associations in mainland Europe of their figurehead," and it also represented the loss of the Anti-Slavery Society's source of connection to the societies on the continent.<sup>442</sup> As the lengthy obituary printed in *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* stressed, the Cardinal's death represented the Society's loss of a "warm friend," signaling the closeness of the relationship between Cardinal Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society by 1892.<sup>443</sup> While the British, French, and Italian societies maintained some degree of contact through personal correspondence until the outbreak of World War I, it is important to note that these connections were only made possible due to each societies' relationship with Cardinal Lavigerie and his anti-slavery campaign.<sup>444</sup> Indeed, the Cardinal's "crusade" was the central link that brought the British and continental anti-slavery societies together, and, given the centrality of the figure of Lavigerie to the overall campaign, the dissolution of the proposed London Congress of 1892—and the subsequent ten year gap between anti-slavery congresses—is perhaps not entirely surprising.<sup>445</sup>

While Cardinal Lavigerie's "anti-slavery crusade" had largely lost most of its momentum by the time of the Cardinal's death, a focused analysis on the years just before his passing presents an image of an incredibly influential and dynamic anti-slavery campaign—one that led to an "awakening of public opinion" and a

---

<sup>441</sup> "Proposed Anti-Slavery Congress at Paris," *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; *London* 19, no. 5 (November 1899): 205-208. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 710, 714-716.

<sup>442</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 719.

<sup>443</sup> "The Late Cardinal Lavigerie," *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* 12, no. 6 (November 1892): 363-64.

<sup>444</sup> Amalia Ribí Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism: The Politics of Anti-Slavery Activism, 1880-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 28. Also, Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 719.

<sup>445</sup> Laqua, "The Tensions of Internationalism," 710, 719.

“revival” in anti-slavery activism across Europe.<sup>446</sup> Indeed, a concentrated and detailed look at key moments in the development of Lavigerie’s relationship with the Anti-Slavery Society in Britain provides a compelling view of the dynamism of the Cardinal’s anti-slavery campaign. As the first chapter of this analysis demonstrated, Cardinal Lavigerie’s visit to London in 1888 represented a significant turning point in the “anti-slavery revival” of the late nineteenth century, as it represents the transformation of Lavigerie’s anti-slavery campaign into a truly ecumenical and transnational effort. Indeed, the collaborative efforts of the Society and the Cardinal that resulted from this initial meeting led to an “awakening of public opinion” through out Europe, and the influence of this collaboration is especially clear in an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the convening of the Brussels Conference of 1889-1890.<sup>447</sup> The abilities of both Lavigerie and the Anti-Slavery Society to overlook significant differences in national and religious backgrounds and discrepancies in their overall visions for the future of the anti-slavery movement are especially highlighted in the attempts to organize an anti-slavery conference of the societies, which in some ways aped the Brussels Conference of the European Powers. When examined in aggregate, these individual moments of exchange and collaboration point to the ways in which these non-governmental actors—a French Roman Catholic cardinal and members of a mostly Protestant British organization—were

---

<sup>446</sup> Ibid., 719. Also, “The Slave-Trade: Great Debate in the House of Commons,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter*; London 9, no. 2 (March 1889): 57. Also, Ribi Forclaz, *Humanitarian Imperialism*, 16. Also, William Mulligan, “Chapter 8: The Anti-slave Trade Campaign in Europe, 1888-1890,” in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 149-150, 164-166.

<sup>447</sup> The Slave-Trade,” 57

able to negotiate significant differences in background, vision, and influences in their attempts to create transnational connections across Europe, while at the same time revealing the particular national, religious, and broader imperial tensions that underlay such negotiations.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

### Digital Archives

The Anti-Slavery Reporter and Aborigines' Friend - ProQuest.

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu/publication/7056>.

Empire Online

[http://gdc.galegroup.com/gdc/ncco?p=NCCO&u=mlin\\_m\\_tufts](http://gdc.galegroup.com/gdc/ncco?p=NCCO&u=mlin_m_tufts)

The Times Digital Archive

[http://find.galegroup.com/ttda/start.do?prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=mlin\\_m\\_%09uts](http://find.galegroup.com/ttda/start.do?prodId=TTDA&userGroupName=mlin_m_%09uts)

### Periodicals

*The Anti-Slavery Reporter*

*The Times*

### Published Sources

Banning, Émile Théodore Joseph Hubert. *Africa and the Brussels Geographical Conference* /. London: 1877.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t11n85x9g>.

British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, Anti-Slavery International, and Adam Matthew Digital. *Sixty Years against Slavery a Brief Record of the Work and Aims of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1839-1899 ; with an Article on the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery by Joseph G. Alexander*. Empire Online. Section 5, Race, Class, Imperialism and Colonialism, 1607-2007. London: Published at the Offices of the Society,



1900.

<http://proxy.bc.edu/login?url=http://www.empire.amdigital.co.uk/contents/document-detail.aspx?sectionid=621>.

“Catholicae Ecclesiae (November 20, 1890) | LEO XIII.” Accessed September 18, 2016. [http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_20111890\\_catholicae-ecclesiae.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_20111890_catholicae-ecclesiae.html).

Clarke, Richard F. *Cardinal Lavigerie and the African Slave Trade*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889.

Cust, Robert Needham. *Africa Rediviva Or, the Occupation of Africa by Christian Missionaries of Europe and North America*. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, 1891.

*General Act of the Brussels Conference Relative to the African Slave Trade, Signed at Brussels, July 2, 1890*. / London : 1892.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.35112104560067>.

“In Plurimis (May 5, 1888) | LEO XIII.” Accessed September 18, 2016.  
[http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_05051888\\_in-plurimis.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_05051888_in-plurimis.html).

Klein, Félix. *Le Cardinal Lavigerie et Ses Oeuvres d’Afrique*. Nouvelle edition, completement refoandue. Tours: 1897.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433082385372>.

Koschorke, Klaus, Frieder Ludwig, Mariano Delgado, and Roland Spliesgart.  
*History of Christianity in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, 1450-1990: A*

*Documentary Source Book*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.

Lavigerie. *Slavery in Africa: A Speech Made at the Meeting Held in London July 31, 1888*. Boston: Cashman, Keating, 1888.

Lavigerie, Charles. *Oeuvres choisies de Son Eminence le Cardinal Lavigerie, archevêque d'Alger. Première partie, Tome premier et tome second [seuls]*. Paris: Poussielgue frères, 1884.

Lavigerie, Charles Martial Allemand. *Documents Sur La Fondation de l'Oeuvre Antiesclavagiste*. Saint-Cloud, 1889.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433075934723>.

———. *Instructions aux missionnaires*. Maison-Carrée (Alger: Impr. des missionnaires d'Afrique (pères blancs), 1939.

Royal Commonwealth Society, ed. *Empire and Commonwealth: Archives of the Royal Commonwealth Society from Cambridge University Library*. Marlborough, Eng: Adam Matthew Publications, 2002.

## Secondary Sources

### Articles

Andrews, Naomi J, and Jennifer E Sessions. "The Politics of Empire in Post-Revolutionary France." *French Politics, Culture & Society* 33, no. 1 (n.d.): 1–10.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent." *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (June 1985): 166–203.

Brendebach, Jonas. "Ideologies of Empire in the Modern World." In *H-Net Reviews in the Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1–4, 2014.

- Clavin, Patricia. "Defining Transnationalism." *Contemporary European History* 14, no. 4 (November 2005): 421–39.
- Clavin, Patricia. "Time, Manner, Place: Writing Modern European History in Global, Transnational and International Contexts." *European History Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 2010): 624–40.  
doi:10.1177/0265691410376497.
- Davis, David Brion. "Reflections on Abolitionism and Ideological Hegemony." *The American Historical Review* 92, no. 4 (1987): 797–812.  
doi:10.2307/1863947.
- Ford, Lisa. "Anti-Slavery and the Reconstitution of Empire." *Australian Historical Studies* 45, no. 1 (March 2014): 71–86.  
doi:10.1080/1031461X.2013.877502.
- Frader, Laura. "Race in France: Introduction." *French Politics, Culture & Society* 18, no. 3 (October 1, 2000): 1–4.
- Grant, Kevin. "Christian Critics of Empire: Missionaries, Lantern Lectures, and the Congo Reform Campaign in Britain." *Journal of Imperial & Commonwealth History* 29, no. 2 (May 2001): 27–58.
- Huzzey, Richard. "Free Trade, Free Labour, and Slave Sugar in Victorian Britain." *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 2 (2010): 359–79.
- Huzzey, Richard. "Minding Civilisation and Humanity in 1867: A Case Study in British Imperial Culture and Victorian Anti-Slavery." *Journal of Imperial & Commonwealth History* 40, no. 5 (December 15, 2012): 807–25.  
doi:10.1080/03086534.2012.730835.

- Jones, D. H. "The Catholic Mission and Some Aspects of Assimilation in Senegal, 1817-1852." *Journal of African History* 21, no. 4 (November 1980): 323–40.
- Kieran, John A. "Some Roman Catholic Missionary Attitudes to Africans in Nineteenth Century East Africa." *Race : The Journal of the Institute of Race Relations* 10, no. 5 (1968): 341–59.
- Laidlaw, Zoë. "Slavery, Settlers and Indigenous Dispossession: Britain's Empire through the Lens of Liberia." *Journal of Colonialism & Colonial History*, 3/ 1/2012 2012, 9–9.
- Laqua, Daniel. "The Tensions of Internationalism: Transnational Anti-Slavery in the 1880s and 1890s." *The International History Review* 33, no. 4 (2011): 705–26. doi:10.1080/07075332.2011.620742.
- Lenz, Jessica. "The Nation State and Beyond: Governing Globalization Processes in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century." In *H-Net Reviews in the Humanities & Social Sciences*, 1–5, 2010.
- Martinez, Jenny S. "Antislavery Courts and the Dawn of International Human Rights Law." *The Yale Law Journal* 117, no. 4 (2008): 550–641. doi:10.2307/20455804.
- Nworah, Kenneth D. "The Aborigines' Protection Society, 1889-1909: A Pressure-Group in Colonial Policy." *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne Des Études Africaines* 5, no. 1 (1971): 79–91. doi:10.2307/484052.
- O'Donnell, J. Dean Jr. "Cardinal Charles Lavigerie: The Politics of Getting a Red

Hat.” *Catholic Historical Review* 63, no. 2 (April 1977): 185–203.

O’Sullivan, Kevin, Matthew Hilton, and Juliano Fiori. “Humanitarianisms in Context.” *European Review of History* 23, no. 1/2 (February 2016): 1–15. doi:10.1080/13507486.2015.1117422.

Quirk, Joel, and David Richardson. “Anti-Slavery, European Identity and International Society: A Macro-Historical Perspective.” *Anti-Sklaverei, Europäische Identität Und Internationale Gesellschaft: Eine Makrohistorische Perspektive*. 7, no. 1 (June 2009): 68–92.

Walker-Said, Charlotte. “Science and Charity: Rival Catholic Visions for Humanitarian Practice at the End of Empire.” *French Politics, Culture & Society* 33, no. 2 (Summer 2015): 33–54. doi:10.3167/fpcs.2015.330203.

Ward, James E. “Cardinal Richard Versus Cardinal Lavigerie: Episcopal Resistance to the “Ralliement.”” *Catholic Historical Review* 53, no. 3 (October 1967): 346–71.

———. “The Algiers Toast: Lavigerie’s Work or Leo XIII’s?” *Catholic Historical Review* 51, no. 2 (July 1965): 173–91.

#### Books

Anstey, Roger, Christine Bolt, Seymour Drescher, and Rockefeller Foundation, eds. *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey*. Folkestone, Eng.; Hamden, Conn.: W. Dawson ; Archon Books, 1980.

Arteche, José de. *The Cardinal of Africa, Charles Lavigerie; Founder of the White Fathers*. London: Catholic Book Club, 1964.

- Attwater, Donald. *The White Fathers in Africa*. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1937.
- Ballard, Martin. *White Men's God: The Extraordinary Story of Missionaries in Africa*. Oxford, England; Westport, Conn.: Greenwood World Pub., 2008.
- Barnett, Michael N. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Belmessous, Saliha. *Assimilation and Empire: Uniformity in French and British Colonies, 1541-1954*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Bender, Thomas, John Ashworth, David Brion Davis, and Thomas L Haskell. *The Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Benton, Lauren A. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400--1900*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . *Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400-1900*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.30961>.
- Brown, Christopher Leslie, and Omohundro Institute of Early American History & Culture. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

- Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Cohen, William B. *The French Encounter with Africans: White Response to Blacks, 1530-1880*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.
- Conklin, Alice L. *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Conrad, Sebastian, and Dominic Sachsenmaier. *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s-1930s*. New York: Palgrave, 2007.
- Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, 1997. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.02494>.
- Cox, Jeffrey. *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700*. New York; London: Routledge, 2008.
- Daughton, J. P. (James Patrick). *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880-1914*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Davis, David Brion, and Rogers D. Spotswood Collection. *Slavery and Human Progress*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

- Drescher, Seymour. *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Etherington, Norman, ed. *Missions and Empire*. The Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Foster, Elizabeth Ann. *Faith in Empire: Religion, Politics, and Colonial Rule in French Senegal, 1880-1940*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Getz, Trevor R. *Slavery and Reform in West Africa: Toward Emancipation in Nineteenth-Century Senegal and the Gold Coast*. Western African Studies. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004.
- Geyer, Martin H, Johannes Paulmann, and German Historical Institute in London. *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War*. London; Oxford; New York: German Historical Institute ; Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Grant, Kevin. *A Civilised Savagery: Britain and the New Slaveries in Africa, 1884-1926*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Gray, Richard. *Black Christians and White Missionaries*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Gray, Richard, and Lamin O Sanneh. *Christianity, the Papacy, and Mission in Africa*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2012.
- Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.



- Hamilton, Keith, and Patrick Salmon. *Slavery, Diplomacy and Empire: Britain and the Suppression of the Slave Trade, 1807-1975*. Brighton [England] ; Portland, Or.: Sussex Academic Press, 2009.
- Harms, Robert W, Bernard K Freamon, and David W Blight. *Indian Ocean Slavery in the Age of Abolition*, 2013.
- Hastings, Adrian. *The Church in Africa: 1450-1950*. Oxford History of the Christian Church. Oxford : New York, Oxford: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, Clarendon, Clarendon Press ;Oxford ; Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Heartfield, James. *The Aborigines' Protection Society: Humanitarian Imperialism in Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Canada, South Africa, and the Congo, 1836-1909*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Hogan, Edmund M. *Catholic Missionaries and Liberia: A Study of Christian Enterprise in West Africa, 1842-1950*. Cork: Cork University Press, 1981.
- Huzzey, Richard. *Freedom Burning: Anti-Slavery and Empire in Victorian Britain*. 1st ed. Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Iriye, Akira, and Pierre-Yves Saunier. *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*. Basingstoke [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Jennings, Lawrence C. *French Anti-Slavery: The Movement for the Abolition of Slavery in France, 1802-1848*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Johnston, Anna. *Missionary Writing and Empire, 1800-1860*. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture 38. Cambridge, U.K. ; New

York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Keck, Margaret E, and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Klein, Martin A. *Breaking the Chains: Slavery, Bondage, and Emancipation in Modern Africa and Asia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993.

———. *Slavery and Colonial Rule in French West Africa*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Kollman, Paul V. *The Evangelization of Slaves and Catholic Origins in Eastern Africa*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2005.

Leahy, Ellen Mary Agnes. *Light in Darkest Africa : Charles Cardinal Lavigerie, 1825-92*. Dublin : Catholic Truth Society, 1922.

<http://archive.org/details/lightindarkestaf00leahuoft>.

Linden, Ian, and Jane Linden. *Catholics, Peasants, and Chewa Resistance in Nyasaland, 1889-1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Louis, William Roger, Nicholas P Canny, Alaine M Low, P. J Marshall, A. N Porter, Judith M Brown, and Robin W Winks. *The Oxford History of the British Empire*. Oxford [England]; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Lovejoy, Paul E. *Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Maughan, Steven S. *Mighty England Do Good: Culture, Faith, Empire, and*

*World in the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1850-1915.*

Studies in the History of Christian Missions. Grand Rapids, Michigan:

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014.

Maxwell, John Francis. *Slavery and the Catholic Church: The History of Catholic*

*Teaching Concerning the Moral Legitimacy of the Institution of Slavery.*

Chichester and London: Barry Rose Publishers, in association with the

Anti-Slavery Society for the Protection of Human Rights, 1975.

McEwan, Dorothea. *A Catholic Sudan: Dream, Mission, Reality.* Rome:

Stabilimento tipografico Julia, 1987.

Médard, Henri, and Shane Doyle. *Slavery in the Great Lakes Region of East*

*Africa.* Oxford: James Currey, 2007.

Miers, Suzanne. *Britain and the Ending of the Slave Trade.* New York: Africana

Pub. Corp., 1975.

Miers, Suzanne, and Martin A Klein. *Slavery and Colonial Rule in Africa.*

Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1999.

Miers, Suzanne, and Igor Kopytoff. *Slavery in Africa: Historical and*

*Anthropological Perspectives.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press,

1977.

Miers, Suzanne, and Richard L Roberts. *The End of Slavery in Africa.* Madison,

Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Morgan, Kenneth. *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America.*

Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Mulligan, William, and Maurice J. Bric, eds. *A Global History of Anti-Slavery*

*Politics in the Nineteenth Century*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Nemer, Lawrence. "Anglican and Roman Catholic Attitudes on Missions: An Historical Study of Two English Missionary Societies in the Late Nineteenth Century (1865-1885)." In *Anglican & Roman Catholic Attitudes on Missions: An Historical Study of Two English Missionary Societies in the Late Nineteenth Century (1865-1885)*, 1, 1981.

O'Donnell, Joseph Dean. *Lavigerie in Tunisia: The Interplay of Imperialist and Missionary*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1979.

Oliver, Roland Anthony. *The Missionary Factor in East Africa*. London; New York: Longmans, Green, 1952.

Peterson, Derek R. *Abolitionism and Imperialism in Britain, Africa, and the Atlantic*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2010.

Pétre-Grenouilleau, Olivier. *From Slave Trade to Empire: Europe and the Colonisation of Black Africa, 1780s-1880s*. London, U.K.; New York: Routledge, 2004.

Pitts, Jennifer. *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Quirk, Joel. *The Anti-Slavery Project: From the Slave Trade to Human Trafficking*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhp3h>.

Reginald Coupland Sir. *The British Anti-Slavery Movement*. [2d ed.]. New York, London: Barnes & Noble, FCass, 1964.

- Renault, François. *Cardinal Lavigerie: Churchman, Prophet, and Missionary*. London; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Athlone Press, 1994.
- Renault, François. *Lavigerie: l'esclavage africain et l'Europe : 1868-1892*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1971.
- Renault, François. "Le Cardinal Lavigerie, 1825-1892: L'Eglise, l'Afrique et La France." In *Cardinal Lavigerie, 1825-92: The Church, Africa, and France.*, 1, 1992.
- Shaw, Caroline. *Britannia's Embrace: Modern Humanitarianism and the Imperial Origins of Refugee Relief*, 2015.
- Shorter, Aylward. *The Cross and Flag in Africa: The "White Fathers" During the Colonial Scramble (1892-1914)*. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 2006.
- Sluga, Glenda. *Internationalism in the Age of Nationalism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.  
<http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=3442218>.
- Stovall, Tyler Edward. *Transnational France: The Modern History of a Universal Nation*, 2015.
- Temperley, Howard. *British Antislavery, 1833-1870*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1972.
- Todd, John Murray. *African Mission; a Historical Study of the Society of African Missions Whose Priests Have Worked on the Coast of West Africa and Inland, in Liberia, the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togoland, Dahomey and Nigeria, and in Egypt, since 1856*. London: Burns & Oates, 1962.
- Toniolo, Elias, and Richard Leslie Hill. *The Opening of the Nile Basin: Writings*

*by Members of the Catholic Mission to Central Africa on the Geography and Ethnography of the Sudan, 1842-1881.* New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1975.

Tournier, Jules. *Le Cardinal Lavignerie et Son Action Politique (1863-1892).* Paris, 1913. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015064374500>.

Trans-National History Symposium, Ann Curthoys, and Marilyn Lake. *Connected Worlds: History in Trans-National Perspective.* Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005. <http://www.doabooks.org/doab?func=fulltext&rid=14846>.

Viane Vincent. *The papacy and the new world order: Vatican diplomacy, Catholic opinion and international politics at the time of Leo XII, 1878-1903.* Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.

Walvin, James. *Questioning Slavery.* London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

White, Owen, and J. P Daughton. *In God's Empire: French Missionaries and the Modern World.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Yerxa, Donald A. *British Abolitionism and the Question of Moral Progress in History.* Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2012.