KELLAM, LYNDA M. Ph.D. Looking Forward: Sovereign Responsibilities in the United States and Great Britain, 1894-1920. (2023)
Directed by Dr. Mark Elliot. 237 pp.

This dissertation traces the idea of sovereign responsibility as it intermingled with transnational debates over good government, imperialism, self-determination, and race in the United States and Great Britain during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Based on the understanding that national sovereignty has limitations and states have obligations, sovereign responsibility is the idea that countries have a duty to protect their citizens or subjects from harm. Sovereign responsibility became a crucial tenet for the development of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle in the 2000s, but as this dissertation demonstrates, the idea has a longer intellectual lineage rooted in debates at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

The lives of two influential reformers, the American lawyer Moorfield Storey and the British politician and historian James Bryce, frame the trajectory of this dissertation as it follows their engagement with events both at home and abroad. Using a case study approach, this dissertation examines their writings, speeches, and correspondence with other reformers during the Armenian massacres (1894-1896), the Spanish American and Philippine American wars (1898-1902), the South African war (1899-1902), the anti-lynching campaign in the U.S. (c. 1893-1925), and the Armenian genocide (1915-1923). Each of these case studies provide a window into how the members of reform and anti-imperial networks understood the role of the state and its responsibilities. American anti-imperialists and their counterparts in Great Britain engaged in intellectual debates which helped develop the structure on which later domestic and international law could sit. Fundamentally, this structure served as a basis on which ideas about limits on state sovereignty continued to grow.

LOOKING FORWARD: SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN, 1894-1920

by

Lynda M. Kellam

A Dissertation
Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro

2023

Approved by

Dr. Mark Elliott
Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Lynda M. Kellam has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair

Dr. Mark Elliott

Committee Members

Dr. Watson Jennison

Dr. Jill Bender

Dr. Jeff Jones

February 17, 2023

Date of Acceptance by Committee

February 17, 2023

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have benefited from the support, guidance, and love of a number of people over many years. My heart remains in academia, and I thank all my professors for cultivating my curiosity. At the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Dr. Aili Tripp and Dr. Leigh Payne made me feel like my interests were relevant in political science. The questions I asked in this dissertation came out of our discussions during the MacArthur Foundation Fellowship on Peace and Security and my Fulbright Fellowship in Croatia. I am forever thankful for the personal and intellectual connections I made during those years, and while my work has shifted significantly, the influence remains to this day. My professors at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro's Department of History have been incomparable, especially my dissertation director, Dr. Mark Elliott, and my committee members, Dr. Jill Bender, Dr. Watson Jennison and Dr. Jeff Jones. They challenged me to think, argue, and research like a historian. I am lucky that I was in the right place at the right time to benefit from their knowledge and support.

As a librarian I am grateful to my colleagues in the libraries and archives that I visited or contacted. The archivists at the Massachusetts Historical Society, the National Archives and Records Administration, Library of Congress, and Swarthmore College guided me to the documents and let me figure out the connections. I am thankful for the staff at Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, especially the microfilm collection managers and interlibrary loan departments. Patrons often forget the people behind these operations, but they put in long hours to make our lives easier. Suzanne Schwartz at Cornell was my hero in figuring out a way to access microfilm remotely during the pandemic. Without her work, I would not have been able to read the letters between Moorfield Storey and James Bryce, which were critical to my project.

I've also had amazing classmates and friends over the years. I've enjoyed all the debates with my political science friends, especially Andy Winternitz, Dr. Simanti Lahiri, and others. My history classmates were delightful; I loved geeking out over history with Elizabeth Ellis-Beasley, Brittany Hedrick, Travis Byrd, Dr. Justina Licata, and Dr. Chrissy Flood. The Tuesday graduate student writing group led by Kayla Forrest kept me on track even when I'd rather go row than put in the hours. My dissertation benefited from the generosity of several readers. Commentators at the Southern Conference on British Studies and the SHAFR guided me towards resources. My friends provided invaluable assistance, especially Susan Farr and Jenny Dale who read versions of the early chapters. Thank you, many times over, to Simanti for her brilliant and honest thoughts on Chapter 5 and to Jonathan Bohan for reading the entirety.

I have been lucky to benefit from workplaces that viewed me as a whole person. UNCG gave me flexibility for taking classes without which it would have taken me years to finish. Dr. Bill Block at the Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research encouraged me to think of myself as a historian *and* a data librarian. Finally, the University of Pennsylvania Libraries gave me time during my week to write. Without those hours I would be working on this dissertation another few years. A heartfelt thank you goes to my boss Dr. Nicky Agate who advocates for her team with the ferocity of a lion. I am so grateful that I found the Research Data and Digital Scholarship team at University of Pennsylvania Libraries.

Finally, to the people who have kept my soul and spirit alive. I love my friends far and wide dearly. Rebecca Gordon Conway and Chuck Carroll have known me longer than most. My Ithaca friends—Amy O'Donnell, Maureen Morris, Adriana Hernandez, Liz Bryson, and others—kept me strong during the long dark days of both winter in upstate NY and the pandemic. Finding rowing helped sustain me because of the physical activity and the friendships I've made

at Cascadilla Boat Club and Whitemarsh Rowing Club. I've missed Laurence Horton and Dylanne Dearborn so much and can't wait to laugh with them again. Every day I am thankful for Amy Harris Houk, Rachel Olsen, and David Jablow. The members of the Kellam and the Huntley families have not always understood what I do or what I am saying, but they listened and loved me anyway. Big hugs and love to mom and dad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The 1990s was a decade of cataclysmic change, beginning with shifts in the balance of power as the Soviet Union disintegrated and new states gained their independence. A period that began as a hopeful rebirth for human rights around the world quickly faced unanticipated challenges. War broke out in the former Yugoslavia, "ethnic cleansing" became a household phrase, and hundreds of thousands were killed in the Rwandan genocide as the international community failed to act. By the end of the decade, concerns about the ethnic cleansing of Albanians in Kosovo resulted in NATO's military intervention and air bombing of Serbia without United Nations Security Council approval. Out of these events emerged a debate over ways to protect humanity within an international system that was built on the assumption of state sovereignty. Kofi Annan's strong words at the 54th meeting of the UN General Assembly in September 1999 gave momentum to this debate. In his speech, he argued that sovereignty was being redefined by globalization and the rise of "individual sovereignty", or the idea that every person had the right "to control his or her own destiny."[1] Within his framework, the state was "widely understood to be servant of its people, and not vice versa."[2] Considering this rethinking of state sovereignty, the international system faced a dilemma—how to balance state integrity against the protection of human rights, especially in the face of atrocities.

In 2000, the Canadian Government established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) chaired by the former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans and Algerian diplomat Mohamed Sahnoun. The government gave the commission

[1] Kofi Annan, "Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization" (United Nations, September 20, 1999), A/54/PV.4, UN Digital Library, https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/403253?ln=en.
[2] Annan.

the mandate "to build a broader understanding of the problem of reconciling intervention for human protection purposes and sovereignty."[3] After a year of work, the ICISS issued a report to the Canadian Government recommending a new doctrine called the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P). The report proposed "to shift the debate from a focus on intervening states' right to humanitarian intervention to the responsibility of states and the international community to protect populations from mass atrocities."[4] The R2P principle maintains that states have the responsibility to protect their citizens from mass atrocity crimes, and if they are unable to fulfill those duties, they may be subject to non-military or, at last resort, military intervention by the international community. They argued that the principle was based in the recognition of an emerging understanding of sovereignty as having limits.[5]

Despite this recent history, the concept of limited national sovereignty for states that act irresponsibly towards their citizens has long historical roots that have been overlooked. This project argues that notions of sovereign responsibility can be found in debates over humanitarianism, good government, and empire in the United States and Great Britain during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This study takes a networked and transnational approach by studying the personal connections of reformers and anti-imperialists across issues, time, and space, to understand the ways they interpreted the responsibilities of states and empires to their

---

[3] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect: The Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.* (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001), 2.

[4] Philipp Rotmann, Gerrit Kurtz, and Sarah Brockmeier, "Major Powers and the Contested Evolution of a Responsibility to Protect," *Conflict, Security & Development* 14, no. 4 (August 8, 2014): 363, https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2014.930592.

[5] Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, "The Responsibility to Protect," *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 6 (2002): 99–110, https://doi.org/10.2307/20033347. Evans and Sahnoun were not the first to articulate this idea. Deng and Weiss as well as the constructivists within the academic discipline of international relations had made similar arguments since the early 1990s. The ICISS was the first to suggest a policy approach for the UN and international community.

citizens and subjects.

This dissertation begins its case studies in the mid-1890s and closes in the mid-1920s charting America's growth as an international power as well as the pathways of a generation of reformers. The first case, the Armenian massacres of the mid-1890s, serves as a pivotal moment when reformers in the U.S. and Great Britain engaged in debates over good governance and intervention during one of the largest responses to a humanitarian crisis at the time. Those ideas did not end with the abating of the massacres, however. They cascaded into interpretations of later international events, especially as the U.S. grew into an overseas empire with the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. During this period in the late 1890s, questions about the U.S.'s own governance and sovereign responsibility became central. At the same time, Americans observed and evaluated British actions toward the Boers in South Africa through the lens of their experiences with an imperial system. Many also turned this critical lens back to the U.S. and its lack of response to the violence of lynching against its own citizens. Finally, this study concludes with a brief return to the Armenians and the American response to its responsibilities as its international power grew after the Great War.

In addition to charting America's growth, each of these case studies provides a window into how the members of reform and anti-imperial networks understood the role of the state. Exploring the writings, speeches, and activities of these individuals illuminates the development of ideas that later serve as a basis for legal changes both in domestic and international laws. Not all of these figures were in direct contact, but American and British reformers and anti-imperialists borrowed language and ideas from each other about humanitarianism, imperialism, and the responsibilities of the state.

This dissertation draws a thread connecting several histories usually analyzed

independently of each other. Likewise, it draws on the scholarship on humanitarianism, human rights, and anti-imperialism, which is large but disconnected. Scholars tend to focus on particular movements, such as the Armenian relief campaign and the Anti-Imperial League but have not looked as closely at the connections between these groups. Additionally, earlier historians concentrated on particular groups within specific national or imperial contexts rather than using a transnational lens to examine the connections across borders. Often issues involving people of color in the United States and Great Britain have been isolated from the larger histories of humanitarianism and anti-imperialism. Finally, studies of humanitarian and anti-imperialist organizations have focused on the actions of leaders, overlooking the non-leaders within them and therefore the social movement characteristics of these groups.[6] Attempting to rectify these challenges requires drawing on a broad range of historiographies.

First, this is an episode in the larger history of human rights as a global concern. The history of human rights is a newer field that generated a lively debate about the origins of the norms of universal human rights. Samuel Moyn is the primary proponent of the "recent origins" history, focusing on 1970s Helsinki Framework activism as the starting point for the birth of the modern norm regime.[7] Others, especially Lynn Hunt, have argued for a longer history, encompassing the Enlightenment period as a critical juncture for the emergence of human rights thinking.[8] Unfortunately, this origin question has led to a limited debate with two sides claiming

---

[6] Jim Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism: Essays on Mark Twain and the Anti-Imperialist League* (West Conshohocken, Pa.: Infinity Pub., 2007), 3.

[7] Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010); Samuel Moyn, *Human Rights and the Uses of History* (London: Verso, 2014); Samuel Moyn, "The End of Human Rights History," *Past & Present* 233, no. 1 (November 2016): 307–22, https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtw038.

[8] Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007); Akira Iriye, *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Eric D. Weitz, *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019). Iriye takes a middle ground arguing that the "transnational realization" of human rights did not take

specific periods as the key to the story. At times, the debate has been at the expense of a nuanced understanding of the possible strains that influenced the emergence of international human rights. New norms develop over time and through the complex interplay of movements and individual thinkers. "Norm entrepreneurs" are those individuals who express ideas that are on the cutting edge of norm change.[9] Many times their ideas falter and die or mutate into new ones. Because of the nature of norm change, historians need to look beyond origin stories and work to disentangle the strains of thought that influence the emergence of human rights as an idea.[10] Distinguishing these components shifts historians from finding origins to asking questions about the conditions that made human rights possible. Such an approach asks about the influences, the major players, and the embedding of ideas in public discourse.

Second, this dissertation incorporates debates about whether humanitarian movements are connected to the human rights genealogy. Keith Watenpaugh and Moyn, for example, argue for a distinction between human rights and humanitarianism. While Moyn is stringent in his criteria, Watenpaugh and others have more nuanced views of the relationship. Watenpaugh maintains that historians should not assume a linear relationship "connecting modern humanitarianism to the legal and cultural formulation of modern individual human rights."[11] Further, humanitarians

---

place until later in the twentieth century but that the ideas of human rights could be traced to the Enlightenment. Weitz connects the development of human rights with the emergence of the nation-state, arguing that notions of rights are embedded in the governance mechanisms of nation-states.

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

[10] Kenneth Cmiel, "The Recent History of Human Rights.," *American Historical Review* 109, no. 1 (2004): 117–35; Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Michael Barnett, *The Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011); Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2012). Kenneth Cmiel argued that historians of human rights need to be careful about "attending to its different uses" (35). Others explore the lineages of international humanitarianism or the international human rights regime.

[11] Keith David Watenpaugh, *Bread from Stones: The Middle East and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015), 21; Weitz, *A World Divided*.

may have an idea of common humanity underlying their desires to assist, but, as Watenpaugh argues, "shared humanity itself does not constitute a rights formula." Nevertheless, it is possible to look to humanitarian movements to see strains of human rights thinking. Watenpaugh posits, "the ideas, practices, and historical participants in human rights and humanitarianism are intertwined in the sense that where humanitarianism failed, it created space in which human rights thinking and innovation was one of several possible alternatives."[12]

Likewise, these humanitarian networks served as a basis for the creation of future human rights efforts.[13] Rather than seeing a break between humanitarians on the one hand and rights advocates on the other, Bruno Cabanes argues for continuity especially in the aftermath of World War I as the humanitarian campaigns became more secularized and professionalized and less often focused on charity.[14] I maintain that the anti-imperialist movement and its subsequent offshoots served as a basis for the move beyond charity. For example, the Anti-Imperialist League's focus was not about providing relief or uplift but on ensuring justice and independence for the Philippines. In the minds of the League members, sovereign responsibilities were not about relief efforts but about ensuring the right to the consent of the governed.

One of the crucial elements needed for the emergence of the norm of human rights is a belief that a state has limitations on its sovereignty, including obligations to protect people within its borders from harm. "Negative" human rights, such as the right to life and security, imply that states must refrain from certain behaviors.[15] These rights only exist in an environment

---

[12] Watenpaugh, *Bread from Stones*, 22.
[13] Bruno Cabanes, *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918–1924* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
[14] Cabanes, 4.
[15] Luke Glanville, *Sharing Responsibility: The History and Future of Protection from Atrocities* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021), 7.

in which state sovereignty is limited. Moreover, the limitation of sovereignty allows for the guarantee of human rights by implying that a state has a duty to provide protections for its people. Many political scientists have written on the limitations of sovereignty.[16] Francis Deng examines the idea of "sovereignty as responsibility" as based on the dual nature of sovereignty with an internal and external face. In past scholarship, the external face was based in a more traditional understanding of a state's sovereignty in relation to other states. In his formulation of sovereignty as responsibility, the state sees itself as a member of an international system "that is responsive to the needs of humankind beyond the boundaries of narrowly defined sovereignty."[17] Moreover, states have an internal sovereignty or "the responsibilities of good and legitimate government", standards to which the state would be held by its own people. As Deng notes, this good governance "should comprise a political, economic, social, and cultural system that ensures an equitable place for all identity groups, a broad-based participatory democracy, respect for fundamental rights, and special protection for vulnerable minorities."[18] Moreover, Thomas Weiss affirmed "a growing consensus that states must be held accountable for certain intolerable kinds of behavior."[19] Even supporters of more traditional notions of sovereignty who have opposed the "sovereignty as responsibility" approach noted a shift away from the unity of state control in the face of globalization.[20] Richard Haas situates this shift in an emerging world order based on the

---

[16] Jarat Chopra and Thomas G. Weiss, "Sovereignty Is No Longer Sacrosanct: Codifying Humanitarian Intervention," *Ethics & International Affairs* 6 (March 1992): 95–117, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.1992.tb00545.x; Francis M. Deng, "Frontiers of Sovereignty: A Framework of Protection, Assistance, and Development for the Internally Displaced," *Leiden Journal of International Law* 8, no. 2 (1995): 249–86, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156500003320; Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*; Thomas G. Weiss, "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas," *Security Dialogue* 31, no. 1 (March 2000): 11–23, https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010600031001002; Rotmann, Kurtz, and Brockmeier, "Major Powers and the Contested Evolution of a Responsibility to Protect."
[17] Deng, "Frontiers of Sovereignty," 273.
[18] Deng, 273.
[19] Weiss, "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas," 19.
[20] Richard Haass, "World Order 2.0," *Foreign Affairs* 96, no. 1 (February 2017): 2–9.

idea of "sovereign obligation," or the notion that states have an obligation to each other, especially on global issues like climate change and health. While it is understandable that these debates emerged in the 1990s, this dissertation maintains that discussions of the limitations of sovereignty have been ongoing. Reformers and anti-imperialists in these networks asked similar questions about the nature of sovereignty in the late 1890s.

The "new" conception of sovereignty as responsibility rather than "sovereignty as control" was the foundation for the development of the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect (R2P).[21] Continuing on the themes of his United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) speech, Secretary-General Kofi Annan argued in 1999 that

> States are now widely understood to be instruments at the service of their peoples, and not vice versa. At the same time individual sovereignty ... has been enhanced by a renewed and spreading consciousness of individual rights. When we read the charter today, we are more than ever conscious that its aim is to protect individual human beings, not to protect those who abuse them.[22]

After the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) issued their report, Kofi Annan created a UN High-Level Panel (UNHP) in September 2003. The UNHP issued its report in December 2004 and endorsed the R2P principles with slight modifications.[23] Supporters lobbied the UNGA to endorse R2P at the 2005 World Summit, which it did in Paragraphs 138 and 139 of the Outcome document.[24] In 2009, Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon

---

[21] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect: The Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.*, 8 & 13.
[22] Kofi Annan, "Two Concepts of Sovereignty," *The Economist*, September 18, 1999, Gale Business Insights: Global.
[23] Alex J. Bellamy, "Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit," *Ethics & International Affairs* 20, no. 2 (June 2006): 155–56, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00012.x.
[24] United Nations General Assembly, "2005 World Summit Outcome" (United Nations, 2005), A/RES/60/1, UN Digital Library, https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_60_1.pdf.

renewed the R2P discussion with his report "Implementing the Responsibility to Protect," which introduced the three pillars of R2P: 1) every state has an obligation to protect its people from mass atrocity crimes, including genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing; 2) the international community has the responsibility to assist states in achieving the goal of protection; 3) if the state cannot protect its population, the international community has the obligation to act with measures in accordance with the UN Charter.[25] At the time the articulation of these principles was groundbreaking, but this dissertation posits that it is possible to see antecedents to the R2P principles within discussions at the turn of the previous century, especially around the benefits or drawbacks of America's imperial expansion.

Most of the discussions of the limits of sovereignty do not examine the historical development of the idea because they assume it emerged out of the 1990s. This study argues that the idea of sovereign responsibility has manifested in various forms depending on specific historical contingencies.[26] Luke Glanville in his study of sovereignty and R2P argues that the idea of limitations on state sovereignty has a long and rich history, situating its roots in early modern Europe and its development with the rise of popular sovereignty in the Enlightenment period.[27] Using Deng's construct of internal and external facing sovereignty, he maintains that "evolutions of domestic conceptions of sovereignty have time and again gradually fed into

---

[25] United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG), "Implementing the Responsibility to Protect. Report of the Secretary-General," January 12, 2009, UN Doc. A/63/677; Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, "Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: The 2009 General Assembly Debate: An Assessment," August 2009, https://www.globalr2p.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2009-UNGA-Debate-Summary.pdf; Ivan Šimonović, "The Responsibility to Protect," *UN Chronicle*, December 2016, https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/responsibility-protect.

[26] For example, the British imperial notion of humanitarian governance assumed that the empire had some obligations to its colonized populations and therefore some limitations on sovereignty. At the same time, this notion of humanitarian governance was a historically contingent idea that shifted over time. Alan Lester and Fae Dussart, *Colonization and the Origins of Humanitarian Governance: Protecting Aborigines across the Nineteenth-Century British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[27] Luke Glanville, *Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect: A New History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), 15.

international society's construction of sovereignty."[28] In other words, scholars need to examine domestic understandings of the obligations of a state in order to comprehend sovereignty's manifestation on the international stage.[29] Without examining both faces of sovereignty, our scholarship cannot fully grasp the development of the idea of sovereign responsibility. Glanville's work provides a starting point, but his study does not delve deeply into particular historical moments to examine how people understood sovereign responsibility at the domestic level. Furthermore, in his recent work on intervention to protect others from atrocities, Glanville argues that while histories of human rights have proliferated, few have examined "past thinking about duties to vindicate these rights."[30] This dissertation aims to build on Glanville's work by situating these ideas within a specific time period and networks of reformers, especially the anti-imperialists.

The final major historiography involves the emergence of American anti-imperialism and their British counterparts. Histories of the American anti-imperial movement are abundant, but much of that literature is narrative-based, elite-focused, nationally limited, and temporally bound by the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars.[31] Few scholars have moved beyond the

---

[28] Glanville, 3.

[29] In Glanville's work, he primarily examines the writings of political philosophers such as Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, and leaders during the American and French Revolutions. In one chapter, he briefly discusses humanitarian intervention in the late 19th centuries but focuses on legal theorists.

[30] Glanville, *Sharing Responsibility*, 10.

[31] Fred H. Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 22, no. 2 (1935): 211–30, https://doi.org/10.2307/1898467; Robert L. Beisner, *Twelve against Empire; the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968); E. Berkeley Tompkins, "The Old Guard: A Study of the Anti-Imperialist Leadership," *The Historian* 30, no. 3 (1968): 366–88; Daniel Schirmer, *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co.; distributed by General Learning Press, 1972); E. Berkeley Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972); Richard E Welch, *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979); Jim Zwick, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921," in *Whose America?: The War of 1898 and the Battles to Define the Nation*, ed. Virginia Marie Bouvier (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001), 171–92; Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*; Erin L. Murphy, "Women's Anti-Imperialism, 'The White Man's Burden,' and the Philippine-American War: Theorizing Masculinist Ambivalence in Protest," *Gender and Society* 23, no. 2 (2009):

leaders of the anti-imperial organizations and attempts to influence American foreign policy to instead explore how those leaders came to an anti-imperialist perspective or how their ideas about anti-imperialism influenced later events and other organizations. Similar to the Armenian relief campaign, the anti-imperialist movement was primarily organized and fueled by elites in urban areas. As a result of their limited reach and impact on American foreign policy at the time, much of the earlier scholarship dismissed the anti-imperialists as failures.[32] James Zwick, however, challenged those conclusions. According to Zwick, anti-imperialism was best viewed as a grassroots social movement, rather than an elite organization focused solely on national elections and foreign policy formulation.[33] He argued that the local branches especially in the Midwest were populated by "radical reformers," many of whom had been influenced by Henry George's writing on the single tax and other "radical" ideas of the day. The difficulty for historians has been finding a way to tap into that local influence on the wider anti-imperial movement.

In addition, many discussions of the anti-imperialists have been temporally bound, often focused on a short two-year period from 1898 to 1900. Few historians study the movement's precursors. Zwick noted the influence of the Armenian relief movements in one of his footnotes, maintaining that the Anti-Imperial League (AIL) as a solidarity organization had precursors in

---

244–70; Michael Cullinane, "Transatlantic Dimensions of the American Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1899-1909," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 8, no. 4 (December 2010): 301–14, https://doi.org/10.1080/14794012.2010.522324; Michael Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Erin L. Murphy, *No Middle Ground: Anti-Imperialists and Ethical Witnessing during the Philippine-American War* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2020).

[32] Primarily these authors are the older generation. Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900"; Beisner, *Twelve against Empire; the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*; Tompkins, "The Old Guard"; Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*; Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*; Welch, *Response to Imperialism*.

[33] Sadly, Zwick passed away before he could develop this idea in his research. Much of Michael Cullinane's arguments, however, follow from Zwick's work. See Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*; Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*.

the Society of American Friends of Russian Freedom and the Friends of Armenia.[34] He posited that the major difference between these earlier organizations and the AIL was that they were critical of other states while the AIL was critical of the U.S. Despite this difference, the movements shared membership, tactics, and an understanding of sovereign responsibilities. Moreover, newer scholarship attempts to extend the history of the anti-imperialist movement. Scholars in the mid-2000s, primarily Michael Cullinane and Erin Murphy, argued for a wider anti-imperial movement that extended its reach into twentieth century humanitarian causes, such as the Belgian Congo response.[35] Nevertheless, while historians hint at what became of the AILs outside of their work with the League, often commenting on the fact that many died in the new century, few have made connections between the interests of anti-imperialists in international issues and their activities at home. Historians of the League often remark in their conclusions that Moorfield Storey became a President of the NAACP, but do not seek to understand his path from anti-imperialism abroad to fighting for legal rights at home. Similarly, many anti-imperialists became involved in the humanitarian response to renewed atrocities against Armenians during WWI. This dissertation employs a longer view of the anti-imperialist movement, exploring its activities both at home and abroad.

Finally, few authors have examined British connections to the American anti-imperial movement.[36] Although only a small number of British reformers rejected the British empire

---

[34] Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*, 181.
[35] Murphy, "Women's Anti-Imperialism, 'The White Man's Burden,' and the Philippine-American War: Theorizing Masculinist Ambivalence in Protest"; Cullinane, "Transatlantic Dimensions of the American Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1899-1909"; Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*; Murphy, *No Middle Ground*.
[36] Nicholas Owen, *The British Left and India: Metropolitan Anti-Imperialism, 1885-1947* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Mira Matikkala, *Empire and Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in Late-Victorian Britain* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011); Jennifer Ann Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism" (Dissertation, St. Louis, Missouri, Washington University in St. Louis, 2012), ProQuest Dissertations.

altogether, many of them sympathized with the critical perspectives of empire held by the American anti-imperialists. James Bryce, for instance, shared similar concerns about the responsibilities of the state and often weighed in on American actions both domestically and internationally. Each chapter of this dissertation examines the personal connections between reformers in the United States and Great Britain to uncover how their ideas about sovereign responsibilities influenced each other.

In addition to those historiographies, this dissertation employs a multi-level approach to analyzing these reformers. In other words, understanding how reformers thought about sovereign responsibilities requires attention to both domestic and international politics simultaneously. For example, in both the United States and Great Britain, this period saw the emergence of civic based public welfare programs and social services. Historian Susan Pearson in her study of the protection of animals and children in the late nineteenth century notes that the times were marked by the expansion of state power, encouraged by non-state actors, especially with the goal of "protection." She argues that these reformers "made 'cruelty' into a social problem" and "wedded sentimentalism to liberal rights discourse in expanding public and state responsibility for animals and children."[37] Moreover, the idea of "good government", closely related to this expansion, became a rallying cry in domestic politics in the late nineteenth century on both sides of the Atlantic.

This humanitarian ethos at various times fed into many domestic reform movements.[38] For example, in October 1894, *The Golden Rule* magazine published a curriculum for the study

---

[37] Susan J. Pearson, *The Rights of the Defenseless: Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 19.
[38] Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006); James Vernon, *Hunger: A Modern History* (London, England: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007); Pearson, *The Rights of the Defenseless*.

of civics with the purpose of creating "good citizens." The article noted that the time period was seeing a "revival of civic patriotism," tying this renewal to a variety of burgeoning organizations and movements including the YMCA, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Evangelical Alliance, and various municipal reform organizations including one led by the Bostonian lawyer Moorfield Storey. Citing James Bryce, author of the *American Commonwealth*, the author of the article argued that the main failure of American life was the failure of municipal governance, which was why so many of these organizations had emerged. He created this course of study to rectify those failures. These efforts to educate the public in the U.S. and Great Britain about their responsibilities and rights as citizens was connected to the wider good government movement. These movements were not isolated to domestic issues alone, however, but helped to inform interpretation of international events, such as atrocities in the Ottoman Empire, the Spanish-American and Philippine-American war, and the South African war. These events have often been analyzed within frameworks of civilizational discourse or geopolitical considerations; a connection to the domestic concerns in American and British societies is often missing from those analyses.[39]

Two of the most influential figures who contributed to ideas about the limitations of sovereignty and sovereign responsibilities, although they did so in different ways, were the American lawyer Moorfield Storey and the British historian James Bryce. The lives of these two men frame the currents of debates flowing through the late 19th into the early 20th century. The experiences and writings of Bryce and Storey and the changes in their ideas over time provide a

---

[39] Some scholars have considered the impact of national identity and culture on imperial identity. See for example, Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001); Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002); Paul A Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

window into negotiations over the meaning of good governance, empire, and the responsibilities of the state. Neither Bryce nor Storey was a political leader, but both were prolific writers who commented frequently on the affairs of the time in leading magazines and publications and gave speeches that were quoted in the mainstream press. Moreover, their views influenced other writers and reformers. Bryce was quite prolific and well-known for his *The American Commonwealth* and for his articles in the *Nation.* Storey was not as well-known but gained influence in communities outside of the Boston elite with which he is usually associated. In addition, he was well known in the Filipino political community, the African American community, and beyond for his work to uphold the ideals of justice.[40]

The two shared many commonalities over the course of their lives, but also diverged in their interpretations of state responsibilities. Moorfield Storey, as a former mentee of Senator Charles Sumner, brought a commitment to the abolitionist principles of the earlier generation. At the same time, he became an active advocate for municipal reform that promoted the idea of "good governance." Similarly, James Bryce, an historian and Liberal Party M.P, often grappled with questions of empire in relation to good government, especially over Home Rule and national self-determination. He viewed good government as the efficient functioning of civil order that could secure life and property and remain responsive to change.[41] Furthermore, both were seen as independent thinkers. Bryce's biographer notes that he identified with his "fellow travellers," the American Mugwumps with whom Storey is often associated.[42] Even though Bryce was staunchly liberal, he was perennially in the outer circles of the Liberal Party because

---

[40] William B. Hixson, "Moorfield Storey and the Struggle for Equality," *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (December 1968): 533, https://doi.org/10.2307/1891012; William B. Hixson, *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).
[41] John T. Seaman, *A Citizen of the World: The Life of James Bryce* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006), 201.
[42] Seaman, 148.

of his nuanced scholarly approach to policy making and speech writing. Finally, both became entangled in the leading international issues of the day. Bryce was involved with the Armenian massacres campaign from the mid-1890s because of his experience and interest in the region and its people. His role in the government also gave him a front row seat to debates over imperial politics later in the decade and into the twentieth century. Storey's international engagement intensified with the Spanish-American War, but he served as legal counsel for refugees during the Armenian massacres and later became a leading figure in responses to the Armenian genocide.

The time period in which they were active was marked by the actions and interactions of empires, in particular the decline of the Ottoman and Russian, the coalescing of Britain's global reach, and the emergence of the American and German. Humanitarians and anti-imperialists during this period responded to various circumstances within and across these imperial environments, sometimes questioning the actions of their governments. Politicians and leading figures in both Great Britain and the United States called for interventions to assist the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. The failure of the great powers of Europe to intervene on behalf of the Armenians shaped later insistence on American intervention in Cuba. Many people supported the imperialist turn of the United States as it became an empire reaching from the Caribbean to the Philippines. Others, however, turned their criticisms inward to question the actions of their own states and those states' imperial ambitions. Through this inward turn, it is possible to see the emergence of domestic conceptions of sovereign responsibility and limitations on a state's ability to act without consideration for domestic inhabitants.

Using the lives of these two influential intellectuals as bookends, starting with Bryce and ending with Storey, this dissertation examines the intellectual development of the idea of

sovereign responsibilities nested within the late 1890s into the new century. The goal of this work is not to establish an origin story. Rather than searching for roots of the idea of sovereign responsibility, this dissertation illuminates the routes the idea took through transatlantic reform networks as they responded to atrocities both at home and abroad.[43] This project examines the social currents and events that influenced American anti-imperialists, particularly Moorfield Storey, and their British counterparts, primarily James Bryce. Building on Luke Glanville's work on sovereign responsibility and Michael Cullinane's writing on the American Anti-Imperial League, it charts the history of this idea as it moved from the Armenian massacres in mid-1890s to the aftermath of World War I.

While more voices are incorporated along the way, this study contends that Bryce and Storey served as nodes, or central actors, within a larger transatlantic web of reformers whose work spanned issues, perspectives, and time periods. As such, the primary methodology for this study is network analysis. Networks have been used in histories of the British Empire to understand material, financial, and ideational linkages, and as a way to move from a unidirectional metropole to colony approach to a method that examines the empire as a web, network, or circuit of relationships.[44] This framework allows the exploration of interrelationships

---

[43] I borrow the idea of routes from Amy Kaplan as not only implying physical travel but the movement of ideas, which she posits from Paul Gilroy's *Black Atlantic*. See Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993); Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*, 174.

[44] Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London; New York: Routledge, 2001); Simon Potter, *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire, c.1857-1921* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2004); Zoë Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections 1815-45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 2005); Alan Lester, "Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire," *History Compass* 4, no. 1 (January 1, 2006): 124–41, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2005.00189.x; Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Barry Crosbie, "Ireland, Colonial Science, and the Geographical Construction of British Rule in India, c. 1820–1870," *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 04 (2009): 963–87; John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

and links of people and ideas as they flow across space and time within an empire. Historians of the British Empire have used this method to examine a variety of issues, including humanitarian governance. In addition, historians of the United States have used similar approaches to examine humanitarian campaigns.[45] Using a network approach informed from British Imperial studies, this project examines both direct interpersonal connections and the sharing of ideas across borders and issues.

In addition, these networks are analyzed as *inter-imperial*. The British Empire and the American state (and emerging empire) did not operate in hermetically sealed spaces. American humanitarians and reformers often visited Great Britain (and vice-versa) to give speeches and to learn from people within their networks. These interactions helped to shape their writings, the tactics they developed in their organizations, and their ideas about the state and its obligations. Through this methodology it is possible to move away from a focus on one particular group and its actions to see a larger shift in an idea and its movement through the "networks" of humanitarian, reform, and anti-imperial thought.

To accomplish this networked approach, this dissertation relies on the writings of James Bryce and Moorfield Storey, their published speeches, as well as their correspondence with each other and their colleagues. This dissertation draws on the archives of Moorfield Storey and James Bryce as well as the papers of American peace advocates Edwin and Lucia Ames Mead, the writings of British author George Russell, and documents from many other reformers. Their writings are supplemented with the vast newspaper coverage of all four issues as well as the sets of petitions sent to Congress during the Armenian massacres and the South African War. This

---

[45] These approaches do not always use the idea of a network as with the British literature. Instead, they incorporate transnational frameworks or approaches that hint at the idea of a network. Ian R Tyrrell, *Reforming the World the Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

study investigates how and why these individuals became involved in specific issues, traces changes in their ideas over time, and follows the impact of those ideas on wider understandings of sovereign responsibility.

This project contends that the development of the idea of sovereign responsibilities requires looking across issues because reformers learned from past experiences and applied those lessons to new events. In this sense, the title *Looking Forward* does not imply a simple understanding of historical progress. Rather it assumes that people learn from their contexts and experiences; those personal histories shape how they grapple with ideas about the future. The case studies provide a structure for illuminating the reformer networks that were discussing these ideas. Admittedly, however, Bryce and Storey had wonderfully complex lives connected to many issues of their time; by necessity, much is left out of this story.

Linking these seemingly disparate movements is the emerging idea of the state and its obligations in the face of imperial and sovereign ambition. A major characteristic of the American humanitarian movements of the 1890s is that many focused on the policies of other states rather than criticizing the actions of the United States.[46] At the same time, it is crucial to disentangle examinations of humanitarian movements from a focus solely on American foreign policy. Indeed, if the focus of the study of humanitarianism is on shaping social norms, then a different picture emerges. In examining the language used by humanitarians in Great Britain and the United States both privately and in the press and speeches, it is possible to see these individuals shift to criticizing their own countries and these countries' imperial actions. This is the critical connection between humanitarianism and anti-imperialism that emerged in the late 1890s in both the United States and Great Britain. The humanitarian and anti-imperial social

---

[46] Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*.

movements may not have had significant impacts on the policies of the states that they lobbied, a criticism often lobbed at the Anti-Imperialist League, but they shaped the development of ideas about appropriate state behavior both at home and in dealings with other countries.

The key to examining these networks and the ideas they developed is comprehending the complex interplay between domestic life and international concerns. Throughout the dissertation, the term "domestic" is used to mean the national sphere, the events at home as opposed to abroad. At the same time, that distinction between the domestic and the international is not always coherent. As Amy Kaplan notes "domestic metaphors of national identity are intimately intertwined with renderings of the foreign and the alien, and that the notions of the domestic and the foreign mutually constitute one another in an imperial context."[47] The imperial growth of the United States in the late 1890s did not occur in a vacuum. As such, this work documents the language that Bryce, Storey, and others used about sovereign responsibilities both within the domestic sphere and internationally.

This dissertation is organized in a rough chronology. Chapter two opens with the 1894 outbreak of the Armenian massacres in the Ottoman Empire, which generated a tremendous outpouring of sympathy and support from people in the U.S. and Great Britain. There were many reasons for these responses. Beyond general humanitarian interest, the British had a long-standing relationship with the minorities in the Ottoman Empire, while Americans had a large missionary presence that owned property in the Anatolian portion of the empire. An undercurrent in the debates about and responses to the massacres was a belief that the Ottoman Empire was acting out of the bounds of "civilized behavior" appropriate for a modern state. Some used this rhetoric to justify intervention either by Great Britain or even the United States. As such, this

---

[47] Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*, 4.

chapter focuses on the development of the idea that states have a responsibility to assist in the protection of people outside their borders, especially if they are ruled by a state that is unable to govern. The chapter will explore the theme of appropriate state behavior using the writings of James Bryce, George Russell, and others in relation to the Armenian massacres, and the influence of these writings on the American petition campaign targeting members of the U.S. Congress.

By the late 1890s, both the U.S. and Great Britain engaged in wars that initiated debates over sovereign responsibility in relation to their own country's imperial ambitions. Chapter three concentrates on the writings and speeches of Moorfield Storey and other members of the Anti-Imperialist League in response to the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. Their criticisms of American actions especially in the Philippines shaped their critiques of America's imperial endeavors. Pointing to the use of racial rhetoric in the U.S.'s actions in the Philippines, the AIL argued that the U.S. was also acting outside the bounds of civilization in treating the Filipinos as "inferior." The Filipinos deserved the ability to govern themselves, not to have the U.S.'s version of "good governance" forced upon them.

In Great Britain, a similar argument was made by the remnants of George Russell's Liberal Forwards as they responded to British actions during the South African War in 1899. Chapter four narrates the buildup to the war and examines the small but vocal opposition. While the media often grouped the opposition as "Pro-Boers," the individuals brought divergent perspectives. Moreover, the AIL and the "Pro-Boers" intersected on this question of injustice of the South African war especially through the writings of Edwin Mead and the diary and writings of Lucia Ames Mead. While the Pro-Boers were not anti-imperialists in the same sense as the AIL, they shared a common language about state responsibilities.

Finally, as the entrance into the new century brought a lull in the League's activity, some members, such as Moorfield Storey, turned their attention to other issues, including finding a solution to the crime of lynching. Chapter five examines the anti-lynching movement from its start in Ida B. Well's work through to the NAACP campaign in the next century. In response to the atrocities being committed against African Americans and the hardening of the color line in daily life, Moorfield Storey and others used arguments about sovereign responsibility to criticize American inaction. Rather than being seen as a moral leader in the world as it grew in stature on the world stage, the United States was acting hypocritically in not providing protections for its own citizens. This chapter illuminates the internal face of sovereignty in which the state needs to provide protections for its own citizens and describes how those debates helped to reinvigorate a movement to reclaim the rights of African Americans using the 14th amendment and national enforcement of citizens' constitutional rights.

By 1915 and as the NAACP began its anti-lynching campaign, events leading to the Armenian genocide in the Ottoman Empire returned attention to questions about legitimate state actions on an international level. The accounts of forced deportation and marches into the desert galvanized the British and American publics and brought James Bryce and Moorfield Storey together in the same campaign. The conclusion provides a brief discussion of their final days as they helped to create the largest humanitarian response in the U.S. at the time. Despite their efforts, following the end of World War I, few perpetrators were brought to justice and relations between Turkey and the U.S. normalized. Although the United States and Great Britain did not intervene in the conflict to protect citizens, and the United States rejected the idea of their responsibility to the Armenians, the notion that a state has limitations on its sovereignty and a responsibility to its people remained. By the late 1940s following World War II and the

responses to the Holocaust, these notions became entrenched in the emerging human rights regime.[48] Even though many question direct intervention in another state's affairs, the ideas that sovereignty has limits and therefore a state has a responsibility to protect its own citizens from harm are reflected in the basic principles within the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, especially in Article 3 that protects the right to life, and later in the principle of the Responsibility to Protect.[49]

In the end, this is a complex and messy human rights story. As discussed, the norm of human rights and the protection of those rights is predicated on the idea that there are limits and obligations connected to a state's sovereign actions. Although human rights are considered "universal" in their modern sense, in many cases the protection of those rights requires action by the state or by the international community. In this reading, protection is not just about humanitarian impulses, but also a fundamental basis for the development of notions of human rights as well as the modern doctrine of the "Responsibility to Protect." The American and British transnational networks, especially those connected to the humanitarian, reform, and anti-imperial movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, provide a window into the historical understandings of the limits of sovereignty and the duties of sovereign responsibility.

---

[48] The term "regime" is used in international relations literature to refer to the principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures in an issue area that governs the actions of states. More encompassing than the related international organizations, regimes structure duties and obligations of states in the international system. See Robert Keohane, *After Hegemony* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), Chapter 4.
[49] Glanville, *Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect*; Glanville, *Sharing Responsibility*.

CHAPTER II: GOOD GOVERNANCE: THE ARMENIAN MASSACRES AND SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY

In November 1895, the *Century Illustrated* magazine, an American publication, invited James Bryce, a well-known British historian and then MP in the Liberal Party, to comment on events occurring in the Ottoman Empire.[50] Rumors of massacres against Armenians in the Anatolian region of the Empire had first appeared in the British press in August 1894. [51] By late 1895, the extent of the violence was clear and prompted the creation of a transnational mass movement in support of the Armenians. Bryce's article was one of the most influential because his ideas about sovereign responsibility and good governance helped shape the discourse used by the American response movement.

American newspaper and magazine articles regularly invoked the authoritative name of James Bryce during the mid-1890s. As a British M.P. and historian, he was well known in the U.S. for both his interest in the Armenian situation and American institutions. His 1888 book the *American Commonwealth* was tremendously popular, and the press often compared him to Alexis de Tocqueville. He became close friends with several American educators, and professors

---

[50] James Bryce, "The Armenian Question," *The Century Magazine* 50, no. 1 (November 1895): 151-154. HathiTrust.
[51] Figures vary widely as with any large-scale atrocities. An estimated 80,000 to 100,000 Armenians died through a series of attacks later called the Hamidian massacres after Sultan Hamid. These figures come from Davide Rodogno and are in line with other estimates and primary sources. Ottoman-Armenian relations are complex and involve several contested narratives. The Porte often pointed to the political violence employed by the Huntchak political party and other nationalist Armenian groups as justification for actions by the Ottoman Empire both during the massacres of the 1890s and later during the genocide. Rodogno notes that the Sultan drew a parallel between his use of military force against the Armenians and the British suppression of political insurgency within Egypt and India. The purpose of this chapter is not to engage that debate specifically, but to examine the response to events in the Ottoman Empire and the ways that Americans and British commentators interpreted those events. Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914: The Emergence of a European Concept and International Practice* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), 193; Michelle Tusan, *The British Empire and the Armenian Genocide: Humanitarianism and Imperial Politics from Gladstone to Churchill* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2017).

of government courses often assigned his work to their students. By mid-1895, American articles mentioned Bryce as a key figure in the fight to help the Armenians. Rev. Frank B. Vrooman, a leader of a pro-Armenian agitation group called Union of Practical Progress, described Bryce as "the leader of the Anglo-Armenian movement in the British Parliament."[52] With the publication of his article in the *Century* magazine, Bryce began to speak directly to Americans about the Armenian situation. Through this article, he hoped to rouse American popular opinion, pointing to its missionary presence as a justification for interest in the region. Because of its connections, the U.S. had a "special reason, over and above their quick responsiveness to sentiments of humanity" to take an interest in and assist the Armenians.[53]

Americans had become aware of troubles already, but the publication of this article, along with increasing reports of massacres, served to galvanize American interest in the affairs of the Armenians.[54] Bryce's article resonated with Americans because of its two theses. First, he asserted that the Islamic government of the Ottoman Empire was determined to destroy the Armenian people because of their Christian beliefs.[55] Second, he emphasized the role of an empire's responsibilities to the people within its borders, the standards of good governance, and the need for the Ottoman Empire's government to meet the standards of civilized nations. He maintained that while Europeans had welcomed the Turks into the fold of "civilized" nations, the Turkish government, "having no idea of responsibility to its subjects, and not recognizing any duty to promote their welfare" had abdicated its right to be called a civilized government.[56] This

---

[52] Frank Vrooman, "America's Responsibility in Armenia.," *Congregationalist* 80, no. 25 (June 20, 1895): 969. American Periodicals Series II.
[53] Bryce, "The Armenian Question."
[54] Oded Y. Steinberg, "The Confirmation of the Worst Fears: James Bryce, British Diplomacy and the Armenian Massacres of 1894-1896," *Études Arméniennes Contemporaines*, no. 11 (October 15, 2018): 15–39.
[55] Steinberg.
[56] Bryce, "The Armenian Question," 153.

second theme was echoed throughout discussions about the Armenian massacres and influenced several lines of debate around the ability of the Turkish government to govern well, the responsibility of the British to intervene in a poorly governed empire, and the role of the United States assisting the Armenians.

As a relief movement developed in the United States, concerns about protecting Christians were successful in generating widespread public sympathy. Yet, discussions about good governance and the responsibilities of the state were interwoven in that dominant narrative. This rhetoric had existed before the Armenian massacres; the abolitionist movement used similar arguments, for instance. The massacres of the mid-1890s, however, were situated at a key moment in American life on the cusp of America's rise as an international empire and the steady increase of the national government's domestic power. Moreover, this discussion was transnational with initial responses in the British press impacting American views of the massacre.[57] Examining American understandings of the idea of sovereign responsibility in response to the Armenian massacres and in dialogue with the British helps to illuminate

[57] The Armenian massacres have been examined extensively from the American and British perspectives. Fewer scholars have dissected the intertwined transnational discussion of American and British commentators. One of the first works to examine in-depth the American and British movements to support the Armenians was Peter Balakian, *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response* (New York, NY: Perennial, 2003). The American response has been examined by Merle Curti, *American Philanthropy Abroad: A History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1963); Gary Jonathan Bass, *Freedom's Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008); Ann Marie Wilson, "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity: The United States and the Armenian Massacres of the 1890s," *Le Mouvement Social* 227, no. 1 (May 29, 2009): 27–44; Karine V. Walther, *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015). The British responses have been examined by Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*; Michelle Tusan, "'Crimes against Humanity': Human Rights, the British Empire, and the Origins of the Response to the Armenian Genocide," *American Historical Review* 119, no. 1 (February 1, 2014): 47–77, https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/119.1.47; Tusan, *The British Empire and the Armenian Genocide*. More recent works have looked at transnational interactions, including Eric Weber, "National Crimes and Southern Horrors: Trans-Atlantic Conversations about Race, Empire, and Civilization, 1880-1900," 2011, https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/5037; Charlie Laderman, *Sharing the Burden: The Armenian Question, Humanitarian Intervention, and Anglo-American Visions of Global Order* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019).

American views of the role of the government in relation to later domestic and international events. This chapter examines those transnational discussions of ideas about state responsibility, its connection to good governance and intervention in another country's affairs, and the possibilities for reform in response to the Armenian massacres of the 1890s.

The Armenian Massacres

In September 1894, diplomatic reports began circulating that described the massacre of Armenian civilians in Sassun (or Sassoun) beginning in early August.[58] The initial reports said that the population in the area had risen in protest against efforts of the local authorities to impose taxes. By December, the papers published a different version based on foreign missionary accounts of the events, which stated that the massacres were instigated after a group of Kurds stole sheep from some Armenians in Sassun. The Armenians pursued the Kurds and a fight erupted leaving several Kurds dead. The local authorities then told the Porte, the official name of the Ottoman government, that the Sultan's troops had been killed. In response, the Sultan sent regular troops with orders to quell the rebellion.[59]

The Porte argued that nationalist agitators had instigated the rebellion. While some nationalist groups were active at the time, the British claimed that nationalist parties had not played a role in this specific incident based on local reports. In response, the Ottoman authorities refuted claims of a massacre and blamed Hussein Bey, a Kurdish leader, and the Kurds for excesses. Bey was arrested and exiled but later rehabilitated and given the rank of general. By November 2, 1894, Ambassador Philip Currie presented the Ottoman government with a memorandum that named specific government and military officials responsible for the

---

[58] Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*, 191.
[59] "The Armenian Massacres," *New York Observer and Chronicle*, December 13, 1894, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

massacres.[60] In addition, Currie asked for an independent British investigation, which the Porte refused.

Although the British authorities suppressed initial media reports, by late November 1894 letters from American missionaries about the massacre began to appear in British and American newspapers. Some American papers, such as the *Independent* and the *Washington Post*, cautioned against jumping to conclusions and perpetuating exaggerated rumors, but by early December 1894 most acknowledged that the evidence was clear and that a massacre had occurred. Moreover, the Sultan's reactions shaped arguments that the Turkish government directly instigated the massacres. In Britain, the Anglo-Armenian Association, founded in 1879 by James Bryce, began organizing meetings to galvanize public opinion, many of which were held in December 1894.[61] At this time, the former British Prime Minister, William Gladstone, emerged from retirement to make public statements about the events in Turkey. While he urged caution until the facts of the case could be ascertained, he asserted that he assumed the stories were true based on the past history of the Turks. Moreover, he argued that if those reports were true then "there was no lesson, however severe, that could teach certain people the necessity of observing in some degree the laws of decency, of humanity, and of justice."[62] American papers maintained that although the Ottoman Empire was not in the American sphere of influence, the U.S. needed to act "consistent with our foreign policy in behalf of religious liberty and personal rights."[63] Others echoed a similar point, arguing that while England was responsible for the safety of the Armenians, the U.S. had a moral obligation to speak out based on principles of

---

[60] Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*, 192.
[61] Wilson, "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity," 35.
[62] "The Armenian Outrages," *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, December 31, 1894, Gale British Library Newspapers.
[63] "The Armenian Massacre," *New York Observer and Chronicle*, December 27, 1894, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

humanity. The *New York Observer and Chronicle* noted that, "the principle of non-interference in European affairs, to which this government is irrevocably committed, will thus not be violated; while expression will be given to the interest in and desire of the nation to advance the cause of justice and humanity everywhere."[64] Throughout 1895, these calls for America's moral duty to the Armenians spread through the nation's press and shaped a public call for redress.

American and British reactions to the reports of massacres were based on historical interactions with the Armenians, the Eastern Question, and the Ottoman Empire. In addition, domestic issues and concerns shaped the ways that British and American commentators evaluated the source of the problems and the possibilities for change, with many using the language of sovereign responsibilities and good governance. Understanding British and American interests in the region requires an overview of the historical relationships between these nations and the Armenians. Moreover, domestic concerns of the 1890s shaped American and British interpretations of the events in the Ottoman Empire.

British and American Connections to the Ottoman Empire

In 1876 James Bryce, then Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, traveled through the Russian Empire and down to Mount Ararat in the Armenian areas of the Ottoman Empire where he claimed to have ascended to the mountain's peak. He wrote a travelogue documenting the trip titled *Transcaucasia and Ararat: Being Notes of a Vacation Tour in the Autumn of 1876.* The book was published at an opportune moment for his career because in April 1876, Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire started an insurrection against Turkish rule. After the Turks used severe force to stop the rebellion, the British paper the *Daily News* began publishing reports on the

[64] "The Armenian Inquiry," *New York Observer and Chronicle*, December 20, 1894, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

resulting massacres. In response, many leading Liberal Party members began to speak out on behalf of the Bulgarians, including Bryce. The British had been active in the Ottoman Empire prior to these massacres, but these events set the tone for British activism at the end of the century.

The British response to the Armenian massacres was part of a decades-long campaign for Christian minorities in the Ottoman Empire often referred to as "The Eastern Question." Historian Michelle Tusan argues that the Crimean War in the early 1850s first spurred the British public's interest in the Empire and the protection of its Christian minorities.[65] Awareness of these communities and a feeling of common affinity along with strategic trade and diplomatic connections shaped support for the Ottoman Empire's minorities, especially its Armenians. Moreover, from the late 1830s to 1876 the Ottoman Empire enacted a period of reform and modernization known as the Tanzimat with the goals of modernizing the state, stopping the Empire's economic and military decline, and stemming the rise of nationalism among non-Muslim ethnic groups.[66] Davide Rodogno argues that the European powers failed to realize the extent of the Ottoman reforms in establishing "good government" and attempting to modernize the state along European lines. The decrees of the 1830s and 1850s tried to accomplish this through secularization and increasing equality between religious groups in the region.[67]

The Bulgarian uprising and atrocities in Batak, Bulgaria tested those reforms and subsequently helped to instigate the Russo-Turkish War. The Treaties of San Stefano and Berlin in 1878, therefore, included provisions for the protection of other minorities in the empire, specifically the Armenians. Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin stated that "The Sublime Porte

---

[65] Tusan, *The British Empire and the Armenian Genocide*.
[66] Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 9.
[67] Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*, 26.

undertakes to carry out, without further delay, the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds."[68] The Treaty charged the European great powers, primarily Great Britain, Russia, and France, to serve as the protectors and guarantors of those reforms in the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the 1878 Anglo-Turkish Convention (also called the Cyprus Convention) provided vague instructions for reforms in the Armenian regions of the Empire.[69] According to these agreements, the European great powers had the right to demand reform, and Turkey would become "responsible to the Powers for the proper government of Armenia."[70] However, Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin did not provide an explicit enforcement mechanism for managing violations.

At the time of the Bulgarian massacres as Bryce was returning from Turkey, a campaign began that encouraged British leaders to side with the Sultan because of fear that Russia would ally with the Bulgarians and declare war on the Turks. Many in Britain at the time considered Russian interest in the Bulgarians to be a pretext for gaining a pathway to India and a challenge to British authority.[71] Bryce, concerned about the direction of the campaign, created the National Conference on the Eastern Question in December 1876 and then co-founded the Eastern Question Association. For the next fifteen years, commentators and British leaders worked to focus public attention on the Eastern Question with varying levels of success. Although the Eastern Question Association was nonpartisan, many members were leading figures in the Liberal party. William Gladstone, the former Prime Minister who was then in the Opposition,

---

[68] "Treaty between Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia, and Turkey for the Settlement of Affairs in the East: Signed at Berlin, July 13, 1878," *The American Journal of International Law* 2 (October 1908): 401–24.
[69] Steinberg, "The Confirmation of the Worst Fears"; Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 11.
[70] "All Round the Horizon.," *New York Evangelist*, June 20, 1895, ProQuest American Periodicals.
[71] John T. Seaman, *A Citizen of the World: The Life of James Bryce* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006), 75.

took a strong interest in the Ottoman Empire. He wrote several pamphlets on the issue, most famously *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East.*[72] In these works, Gladstone promoted a "moral foreign policy" based on kinship with the eastern Christians.[73] In addition to giving speeches in the House of Commons and at various town halls and associational meetings, Gladstone and others published editorials in political periodicals and newspapers. Furthermore, several journalists provided frequent updates on the empire, especially Emil J. Dillon with the *Daily Telegraph* and F. I. Scudamore with the *Daily News.*[74] Michelle Tusan quantified the coverage of the Eastern Question using major periodicals and found a 200% increase in the number of articles published from the period 1856-1875 to 1876-1885. Moreover, those numbers held steady through the turn of the century.[75] By the time of the massacres in the mid-1890s, the British public was familiar with the situation of minorities in the Ottoman Empire, especially the Armenians. Moreover, Rodogno notes that reporting by the *Daily News* and various Parliamentary inquiries helped to amplify the idea of British responsibility to the Christian minorities in the Empire.

The Berlin Treaty and the Cyprus Convention codified the role of the British as "protectors" of the Armenians without specific enforcement details. In contrast, American involvement was based on two primary connections—American missionaries and Armenian American expatriates.[76] In an article for the *Missionary Herald*, Rev. H. O. Dwight maintained

---

[72] William Gladstone, *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (London: John Murray, 1876), Gale Nineteenth Century Collections Online.
[73] Michelle Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide, and the Birth of the Middle East* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012), 29.
[74] Rodogno, *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*.
[75] Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes*, 17.
[76] The British, French, and Russians also had missionary connections, but the missions were neither as well-connected nor widespread as the American missions. Tusan, *The British Empire and the Armenian Genocide*; Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 18.

that in the 1820s a translated tract on the scriptures created by an American minister in Syria became popular with Armenians who subsequently became adherents to evangelical Christianity. If true, American influence in the region predated the arrival of the Congregationalist and Presbyterian American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) in the 1830s.[77] The ecclesiastic Armenian Church initially resisted these efforts and asked the Porte to stop the spread of the Protestant faith, but the missions continued to gain adherents partly because American Protestants assumed a natural religious affinity with the Armenians who were seen as the "first Christian nation."[78]

American Protestant missions grew quickly and established educational institutions and medical facilities in the capital and the Armenian areas. The most well-known was Roberts College in Constantinople, established by Cyrus Hamlin in the 1860s. In addition, many American missionaries were situated in remote Armenian areas, such as missionary Grace Kimball. By the 1890s around 200 American missionaries were in the Ottoman Empire with 177 ABCFM representatives.[79] These missionaries had strong ties back home and sent constant streams of letters to their congregations describing their activities in the empire. In the earlier periods, Americans tried to remain independent of the American diplomatic presence in Turkey, but as official U.S. representation in the rural areas was limited, they often had the most current information.[80] As a result, the Ottoman authorities increasingly saw them as informants and by the time of the massacres in the 1890s, the missionaries began looking to the U.S. government

---

[77] H. O. Dwight, "A Chapter of Mission History in Turkey.," *The Missionary Herald*, September 1894, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[78] Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 32.
[79] Wilson estimates over 150 missionaries operating 112 churches, 15 mission stations, 268 outstations, and estimated congregation of 47000. Wilson, "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity."
[80] Wilson, 32; Walther, *Sacred Interests*, 244; Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 20.

for protection. During the massacres, ABFCM representatives sent updates on the evolving situation to U.S. officials and in some ways served the functions of a consulate in the remote regions.

In addition to the missionary connection, the presence of naturalized Armenian Americans in the United States shaped awareness of the plight of the Armenians. Although a small community with around 10,000 people congregated in larger cities, many retained strong ties with the empire. Some Armenians emigrated to the United States, became naturalized Americans, and then returned to Turkey to visit loved ones, resume business contacts, or, in some cases, to participate in the Armenian nationalist movement.[81] The Porte assumed that many expatriates were agitators who were working with the emerging nationalist parties of which some were participants. Nevertheless, in the early 1890s, well before the massacres, a debate began in the United States about the place of Armenian Americans and whether Americans could support Armenians without supporting nationalist movements.

With President Grover Cleveland's annual address to Congress on December 4, 1893, this debate became a national one. In this speech, he outlined abuses against American missionaries in the Empire, including damage to property at Anatolia College. In response, the U.S. demanded protection of American nationals and indemnity for property loss. President Cleveland noted that the Turks had agreed and instituted measures. He then presented the Turkish view that Armenians were gaining American citizenship intending to return to the empire and engage in sedition. Because of these actions, the Turkish government planned to expel any Armenians naturalized in America after 1868. President Cleveland conceded that there were elements of nationalist movements in the U.S. and that the right "to exclude any or all

---

[81] Wilson, "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity," 30.

classes of aliens is an attribute of sovereignty." At the same time, Turkey had the duty to protect Americans from "unnecessary harshness of treatment" even if they were Armenian Americans.[82] This speech initiated a public debate over the role of Armenian Americans, the intentions of Armenian nationalist movements, American missionary support of the Armenians, and finally the duty of the U.S. to protect its citizens abroad.

An article in the *Independent* in response to the President's speech argued that the Armenian nationalists had a pattern of killing Turks and Kurds as a way to instigate the Porte's retaliation against Armenian citizens, which then encouraged Russia to respond in protection of the Armenians.[83] As a result, many newspapers, such as the Protestant *Congregationalist* and the secular *Independent*, expressed a need for cautious policy towards the Armenians. The editor of the *Independent* noted that American missionaries were in a bind; they could not denounce the Armenians without seeming to support Turkish actions. Nevertheless, they lived in Turkey under the country's rule and were required to abide by its laws. The editorial argued that the missionaries did not believe that "good government" could come through nationalist agitation, "but that it might be secured by legal methods and by the slower processes of education and pressures to which even the Turkish Government is amenable."[84]

Furthermore, the debate attracted letters and editorials on both sides in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. Most focused on the Turkish detainment of naturalized Armenian Americans upon entrance into Turkey. Those supporting the Armenians argued that no American should be assumed guilty of sedition, detained, and have their possessions taken away

---

[82] Grover Cleveland, "December 4, 1893: First Annual Message (Second Term)," December 4, 1893, Miller Center, https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-4-1893-first-annual-message-second-term.
[83] "Armenian Revolutionists," *The Independent*, January 4, 1894, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[84] William Hayes Ward, "The Armenian Propaganda.," *The Independent*, February 22, 1894, American Periodicals Series II.

without a chance for a fair hearing. One Armenian American in response to a harsh editorial in the *New York Times* argued that "our claims are in perfect harmony with the Monroe doctrine: foreign interference is justifiable for protection of life and property."[85] This echoed an argument that the U.S. had the duty to "champion the cause of the down-trodden and oppressed humanity."[86] Moreover, this debate shaped public understanding of the Turkish government's ability to govern and its inability to safeguard the rights of Americans and Armenians in the Empire. While this debate faded from view by the summer of 1894, the Armenians entered public consciousness again in late November, at that time in response to reports of atrocities.

Domestic Debates in Britain and the U.S.

In addition to the international context, domestic debates in the U.S. and Great Britain are essential for understanding responses to the Armenian massacres and rhetoric used in the broader campaign. Commentators in both countries asked questions about the role of a government to protect its citizens or subjects leading to a discussion about the meaning of "good government" within the Ottoman Empire. In addition to the use of civilizational and religious discourses, British and American commentators asked questions about the possibility of government reform. If reform could not happen, then Europe had the responsibility and duty to protect.

In Britain, the Liberal Party fell from power in the 1870s but returned following the success of Gladstone's 1880 Midlothian campaign, which focused on reform liberalism and the role of Britain in the world.[87] On the one hand, he argued that the Liberal Party should concentrate on domestic reforms like the expansion of the vote and Home Rule for Ireland. On

---

[85] "The Armenian Question," *New York Times*, March 11, 1894, ProQuest New York Times.
[86] "A Disgrace to Humanity.," *Los Angeles Times*, February 17, 1894, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[87] The Midlothian Campaign was a series of speeches on national and foreign policy given in the Midlothian region near Edinburgh that set the stage for Gladstone's comeback as a leader. Tusan, "'Crimes against Humanity,'" 32.

the other hand, the British as an empire could not avoid international affairs. Extending domestic reform arguments to the international realm, many liberals argued that the projection of foreign influence needed to be moral, leading to calls for imperialism with responsibility or moral imperialism.[88] These debates became especially critical during the mid-1890s when the Liberal Party again fell from power and split into multiple factions.[89]

The Liberal Forwards was one of those factions that criticized the Liberal Party's move toward an imperial policy. This group emerged in response to the British campaign to support the Armenians in 1896 and became active critics of British imperial policy through to the South African War. George Russell, a journalist and Liberal leader, and P.W. Clayden, the editor of the *Daily News* and a British host for the American anti-lynching campaigner Ida B. Wells, created the group after attending a rally against the Armenian massacres. Although Russell was a latecomer to the pro-Armenian agitation, he was well-known in Liberal politics at the time. Russell had been the Member of Parliament (MP) for Aylesbury from 1880 to 1885, and Gladstone later appointed him as Under-Secretary of State for India from 1892 to 1894. By profession he was a writer and a journalist, known primarily for biographies of Gladstone and Matthew Arnold. He was also an ardent supporter of Gladstone's policies on the "Eastern Question" and became an outspoken critic of Prime Minister Salisbury and his foreign policy.

Peter William Clayden was the Secretary of the Liberal Forwards. Though primarily a journalist, he ran for Parliament three times as a Liberal candidate, but never won a seat.[90]

---

[88] As Michelle Tusan notes, moral imperialism could inspire subject peoples in other empires to rise up and defend their own freedoms. Of course, in their view, the defense of freedoms should not include the British Empire's own subject populations. Tusan, "'Crimes against Humanity.'"
[89] David Dutton, *A History of the Liberal Party Since 1900* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7.
[90] G. S. Woods and H. C. G. Matthew, "Clayden, Peter William (1827–1902)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32439.

Though little has been written about Clayden in the literature, his name appears frequently in the press during this period as the primary spokesperson for the Liberal Forwards. In addition to writing longer pieces for the more liberal-leaning newspapers like the *Progressive Review*, he sent frequent editorial letters to the *Times* to correct their portrayals of the group and to present the Liberal Forward view of Salisbury's foreign policy on Armenia. In addition, he was an active member of the National Liberal Federation (NLF) as the President of the South St. Pancras Liberal Association and served as a member of the NLF's Executive Committee during the mid to late 1890s.[91]

In January 1897, in response to calls to clarify the purpose of his committee, Russell wrote a manifesto published in the *Contemporary Review*, a theologically focused but Liberal-leaning magazine.[92] He proclaimed the current agitation efforts for the Armenians a failure and called on the Liberal party to renew its efforts to assist the Armenians. He proclaimed that "the word of command in every enterprise for the right is: 'Speak unto the children of Israel, *that they go forward.*'"[93] In addition to calling for a new campaign led by the Liberal party, he maintained that the Armenian situation was the result of decades of questionable Conservative policies. After the publication of the manifesto, the Forward Movement, eventually called the Liberal Forwards, became a faction within the Liberal Party that tried to keep public and Parliamentary attention on the Ottoman Empire's minority issue long after public and Liberal party interest had waned.

Another Liberal figure who spoke out about the imperial turn of the government and the

---

[91] National Liberal Federation, "Proceedings in Connection with the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the National Liberal Federation" (Proceedings, Norwich, England, March 1897), Google Books.
[92] G. W. E. Russell, "Armenia and the Forward Movement," *The Contemporary Review*, January 1, 1897, ProQuest British Periodicals.
[93] Russell, 21.

lack of action to help Armenians was the fiery Reverend Charles Aked.[94] In August 1896 during a tour of the U.S., he gave a speech at Chautauqua, NY that the *New York Times* labeled the most sensational lecture of the season. The speech, titled "England Now in Disgrace," remarked on the state of the Liberal Party and reactions against progress in the country. He closed with comments on Armenia, saying that "the anguish of Armenia is England's deadly shame, as we are bound by a triple obligation" to come to their aid. He noted that Britain cared more about their "Indian Empire" and commercial relations with Turkey than it did about the loss of Armenian life.[95] These figures, the Liberal Forwards and Charles Aked, would remain outspoken critics of the direction of imperialism in Great Britain well into the 20th century.

In addition, members of the Liberal Party engaged with the national movements of the period and struggles for minority self-determination. James Bryce's biographer John Seaman argues that Bryce was heavily influenced by the idea of "the moral value of self-determination."[96] Bryce used the language of minority protection against the power of the imperial state even in relation to British actions. His views of the Armenian question were squarely within a lens of self-determination for an oppressed nationality, and he often made comparisons with Irish Home Rule. At the same time, Bryce's racial and civilizational ordering of the world shaped his ideas. Armenians were uniquely placed to become a stronger civilization than the Turks because they shared some Anglo-Saxon characteristics, a view that would permeate Bryce's views in later events as well. As demonstrated in later chapters, Bryce used his civilizational and racial hierarchy to evaluate which peoples were capable and deserving of self-

---

[94] Aked also assisted Ida B. Wells during her British anti-lynching trip. Clayden and Aked were both members of the London Anti-Lynching Committee. "An Anti-Lynching Committee," *Fraternity: The Official Organ of the Society for the Recognition of the Brotherhood*, October 1894, Empire Online - Adam Matthew Digital.
[95] "England Now in Disgrace," *New York Times*, August 9, 1896, Newspapers.com.
[96] Seaman, *A Citizen of the World*, 92.

government.

In the U.S., the movement for Armenian relief ran parallel to several domestic debates. Ideas about good governance and discussions about the state's duty to its citizens can be seen in various areas of American life at the time. One of the prominent areas was the right of freedmen to vote and the protection of people from mob violence especially after Ida B. Well's anti-lynching campaign in Great Britain in the mid-1890s. Comparison of the Armenian response to the anti-lynching efforts also became a point of contention. Some writers lamented the focus on Armenians when Southern mobs were targeting black men. This critique became a consistent refrain in later campaigns and suffused the writings of many figures, especially Moorfield Storey and W.E.B. Du Bois as will be discussed in Chapter 5.

The municipal reform movement was also a key component of American interpretations of state actions. As mentioned, the 1890s was a prime decade for "good government" reform efforts. For example, the National Conference for Good Government held in February 1894 garnered attention for being "a new era in the development of American citizenship" because it brought together a variety of groups engaged in the question of municipal reform.[97] Rather than being only applicable to municipal concerns, this movement shaped ideas about the functioning of effective governments at any level, from the local municipality to the nation and to the empire. Municipal reform writers translated their ideas to the international arena, evaluating the ability of the Porte to govern effectively. The inability of the Ottomans to reform and govern well was a key theme in American responses to the Armenian massacres.

Many assumed that the Ottoman Empire was not able to function as a coherent state and

---

[97] Charles Richardson, "The National Conference for Good City Government.," *The Independent*, February 8, 1894, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.

therefore could not protect the rights of the peoples within its borders. Some newspaper articles questioned the possibilities for reform. Three themes in particular emerged. First, writers compared the need for Ottoman reform to domestic problems of governing, such as municipal reform in U.S. and Irish Home Rule in Great Britain. Second, they debated the form of government the Ottoman Empire should adopt in relation to the Armenians. Finally, many hypothesized about the impact of the Turkish state's dissolution both on minorities and on wider international relations. Undeniably, these arguments about good government were also intimately connected with ideas about civilization and race. Although many articles argued for the possibilities of reform, underlying stereotypes of the Turkish people shaped many of their assumptions.

The language of good government directly or indirectly pervaded articles written on the Armenian massacres. For example, the *Independent* maintained that the European Powers "under the Treaty of Berlin secured the right of seeing that good government was maintained throughout the Turkish empire."[98] The *Interior* criticized Armenian nationalist efforts to assassinate figures by maintaining that, "not by the assassin's dagger is the cause of liberty and good government promoted."[99] The usage of the language is clearer in these instances; other articles engaged with the definition of good government by providing examples of possible Turkish reforms. An insightful article from the *Independent* in May 1894 examined the challenges for reform in the Ottoman Empire.[100] The article maintained that there were hopeful signs, but that Turkey had competing interests, including the Sultan's regime, the Sublime

---

[98] "Is the Eastern Question to Be Revived?," *The Independent*, January 31, 1895, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[99] "Armenia Still Disturbed," *The Interior* 26, no. 1285 (January 10, 1895): 33–35.
[100] "Reform in Turkey," *The Independent*, May 3, 1894, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.

Porte's influence on the Sultan, and the autonomy of provincial leaders caused by the weakness of the central state. Furthermore, the empire combined a diverse population, including some that were "stationary", such as the Turks and Christians, and some "nomads," including the Kurds. The article noted that Turks and Christians had friendly relations, but the Kurds were often the instigators of tensions between groups. The Porte, however, needed the Kurds as a "semi-official guerilla reserve" to protect against Russian incursions at the far-flung borders. Ultimately, the Ottoman Empire needed stronger institutions to control these diverse interests. According to the article, that strength could not come from within and needed support from a great power, specifically Great Britain. American actions were limited except "to exert a powerful influence in favor of good order and peace." A final example directly compared the Armenian situation to the need for municipal reform in the U.S. by invoking the corruption of Tammany Hall. E. L. Godkin, the editor of the *Nation,* in January 1895 argued that the U.S. could take diplomatic action, such as breaking off relations with the Porte. He maintained that the Europeans were only looking out for their own interests, ending his article with the remonstrance that "every power in Europe seems to be approaching the Armenian horror with the Tammany question, 'What is there in this for me?'"[101]

The U.S. press was not alone in using the language of good government. At a meeting of the British Women's National Liberal Association in January 1895, Marion Bryce, James Bryce's wife, gave a speech on Armenia arguing that England "took direct responsibility for the better government of Armenia under the Berlin treaty." Women in particular played a role because they needed to "stir up the public opinion and conscience of the people to arm the

[101] E.L. Godkin, "The Armenian Trouble," *The Nation*, January 1895, American Antiquarian Society (AAS) Historical Periodicals Collection - Series 5 Publications.

Government and strengthen its hand in seeing that the poor Armenian people were placed under a safe and peaceable system of Government."[102] While Marion Bryce focused on women in Great Britain, her husband turned to persuade the people of the United States. His writings and speeches helped spur public opinion and support for the Armenians and shaped much of the discourse used in the American movement.

Responses to the Massacres

Bryce's 1895 article in the *Century* was a decisive call for Americans to respond to the atrocities occurring in the Ottoman Empire. Using language that pointed to principles of good governance and sovereign responsibility, the article justified American involvement in the region and shaped the discourses used by the wider movement, especially the petitions sent to Congress. While he believed that reform within the Ottoman Empire might be successful, Bryce's main focus was on American action. He maintained that the U.S. had done well in separating itself from the affairs of Europe, but that Americans were in a special position to aid the Armenians as an impartial party. Although the presence of American missionaries in the region belied this idea of impartiality, appealing to an American sense of disinterest provided room for Americans to see themselves acting in a morally superior way in comparison to the old, failing powers of Europe. American attention was not the result of geopolitical concerns but emerged from an idea of common identity in Christianity, and for some, a common humanity. This idea of America as the harbinger of moral behavior and good governance resonated with many Americans in the mid-1890s.

In addition, Bryce's article called for a recognition that the Turkish state had abandoned

---

[102] "Women's National Liberal Association," *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, January 4, 1895, Gale British Library Newspapers.

its "responsibility to its subjects" in its drive to consolidate power against the nationalist movements and its unwillingness to protect the Armenians against the Kurds. Although the Treaty of Berlin was put in place to protect them, the six great European powers had not helped. Moreover, the growing religious fanaticism of the Muslim population, as described by Bryce, along with the Armenian nationalist movements, created an environment that was becoming untenable. The Turkish government was increasingly unable to fulfill its obligations to protect its subjects. He argued that:

> In every government more depends upon the men who administer than upon the system; but in a despotic government men are everything. In Turkey the men and the system are equally corrupt; and to try to reform the Turkish monarchy is like trying to repair a ship with rotten timbers.[103]

In his opinion, the only thing keeping the Ottoman Empire alive was the interference of the great powers to bolster a failed state. This combined with "Islamic fanaticism" and modern weaponry created an empire that continued to exist despite people wanting to be free from its control. He supported European intervention to replace the Sultan with a puppet and to break off administrative control over the Christian portions of the empire.

Bryce's article roused American interest, leading to a widespread pledge drive and relief movement that had begun in 1894 but exploded in late November and early December 1895 after the publication of the article. Although organizations were formed before the massacres, these groups grew in prominence after the news began to spread. In spring of 1894, the United Friends of Armenia (UFA), an agitation organization, was formed out of two existing organizations: the Boston Philarmenic Association and the Friends of Armenia. Several prominent Bostonians and former abolitionists became officers, including William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., Julia Ward Howe,

---

[103] Bryce, "The Armenian Question."

and Alice Stone Blackwell. At a meeting of the UFA, William Lloyd Garrison, Jr. spoke in emphatic terms about his concerns for the Armenians. As quoted in the *Boston Globe: "*The cry from the people was for justice. Brutal governments had trembled before awakened peoples, and the Armenians were demanding a cessation of the horrible treatment they were subjected to by the Mahometans."[104]

During the 54th Congress throughout 1896, church congregations and civil groups across the United States sent hundreds of petitions to their representatives and Senators.[105] These groups drew on the writings of Bryce and others for the language they used in their subsequent campaigns. Whether his influence was direct or not, the framework for public debate over American responses to the massacres reflected the imperatives that Bryce had outlined in his article. A close analysis of the petitions illustrates how the language of "good government" and sovereign responsibilities resonated for Americans who rallied in support of the Armenians. These petitions provide a window into the diverse discourses used to evaluate the fitness of the Ottoman Empire.

Petitioning was a common tool for supporters to engage with debates and to voice their concerns about the massacres. Signing petitions did not require a high level of commitment, but petition writing was a common practice in the political culture, following in the footsteps of the abolitionist movement, and gave citizens an outlet for commenting on international affairs, a

---

[104] At the time it was common for Europeans and Americans to use the term "Mahometans" to refer to followers of Mohammed. It is an offensive term, but at the time it did not necessarily signify anti-Islam sentiments. "Friends of Armenia," *Boston Daily Globe*, March 22, 1894, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

[105] This time period was chosen because major massacres occurred in fall 1895 and this group documented the immediate responses to those events. See petitions in Record Group 233, Box 169, Folder HR54A-H11.1, Record Group 233, Box 170, Folder HR54A-H11.1, Folder HR54A, Folder HR54A-F11.1, and Record Group 233, Box 171, Folder HR54A-F11.1 and Folder HR54A-H11.1, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), U.S.A.

field reserved for the Senate and the President.[106] Although the majority of the petitions came from Northeastern and Midwestern states, citizens, churches, and associations in Western and Southern states also voiced their concerns. One-third of the petitions came from Christian congregations, especially Congregational, Methodist Episcopalian, and Presbyterian churches, while two-thirds were written by individuals, leaders of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and other organizations, or during mass meetings of citizens held in churches, opera houses, and at universities.

Many early mass meetings were held under the auspices of the National Armenian Relief Committee, which provided instructions for organizing and created boilerplate petitions. The national committee recommended that affiliates keep their meetings focused on the relief effort and avoid turning "the meeting into one of mere protest rather than for relief."[107] Local affiliates organized a few mass meetings, but only a handful of those petitions mentioned the larger organizations. Instead, the influence of the wider movement can be seen in the common language across petitions. Many boilerplate petitions included rephrased statements to highlight specific points, and around a third of the petitions were unique and did not use boilerplate language. The immediate audience for these petitions were congressional representatives and senators, but several petitioners sent their resolutions to local papers or copies to the national committee. To understand the focus of these petitions, however, requires awareness of the wider circumstances in which petitioners from thirty-three states, D.C., and Indian Territory would take the time to write resolutions to their congressional representatives.

---

[106] I examined the petitions to the House of Representatives only as many petitioners sent the same petitions to both the House and the Senate members. Although the Senate has primary purview over foreign affairs, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was also active during the massacre period.
[107] Curti, *American Philanthropy Abroad: A History*, 123.

Across all of the petitions, the national and international contexts heavily influenced the language petitioners used. Historian Ann Marie Wilson argues that most of the petitions concentrated on American missions and indemnity for the destruction of property.[108] For example, the Evangelical Union wrote one of the earliest petitions in December 1894 after a meeting at Chickering Hall in New York. They sent this petition to the Secretary of State, arguing that the U.S. government needed to act to protect the interests of Americans in the empire.[109] Nevertheless, many of the early petitions in late 1894 and early 1895 also highlighted the need for a relief drive for the victims and criticized the actions the Ottomans had taken against *naturalized* Armenian Americans. Most of the early petitions requested government support for Clara Barton's proposed relief mission through the American Red Cross Society with some calling for a convoy of gunships to protect relief work. In addition to information from the National Armenian Relief Committee, Americans reacted to the ABCFM's informational campaign that included missionary presentations and articles in popular magazines. Reverend Cyrus Hamlin's article in the weekly magazine the *Outlook* in December 1895 is one example.[110] Hamlin argued that Sultan Hamid's consolidation of personal control over the empire caused the attacks against the Armenians. He dismissed claims that an Armenian rebellion justified the government's response and argued that only American power could stop the atrocities.

Furthermore, international context is key. Historian Merle Curti's landmark study of American philanthropy notes that the Armenian massacres occurred two years after the Russian famine garnered American attention.[111] He argues that Americans were primed to respond to

---

[108] Wilson, "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity."
[109] "A Protest to Humanity," *New York Times*, December 19, 1894, ProQuest New York Times.
[110] Cyrus Hamlin, "The Armenian Massacres," *The Outlook*, December 7, 1895, ProQuest American Periodical Series III.
[111] Curti, *American Philanthropy Abroad: A History*, 119.

international incidents when news of the massacres first arrived. For example, a petition from the United Congregations of the Reformed, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in Boontown, New Jersey noted, "America generously remembered the poor famine-stricken ones in Ireland, the needy peasants of Russia and the starving millions of China a few years ago, shall she not to day remember the perishing thousands of Armenia?"[112] Americans did not respond to all crises with the same degree of fervor, but the Armenian massacres were nested within that larger international humanitarian history.

Moreover, the petitions reflect an awareness of European great power politics. Historian Karine Walther provides a broad context, arguing that the Armenian massacres occurred as a result of a "complex convergence" of events, including Sultan Hamid's lack of control over the state, Great Power interference in the empire, and Armenian nationalist revolt.[113] While it is undeniable that the causes of the massacres were complex, from the American perspective in the petitions, the Sultan allowed them to happen repeatedly without interference. Although steeped in civilizational and racial discourses, Americans responded to accounts that were in many cases true, horrific, and on a scale that seemed unimaginable.

A close reading and comparison of the petitions provides a nuanced understanding of the discourses used to comprehend the events in the Ottoman Empire. In thinking about the role of government, many petitioners, especially the later ones, made a distinction between Islam as a religion and the government's misrule. As a result of that misrule, the petitions called for repercussions against the government of Turkey. However, as Walther has shown it is difficult to

---

[112] "Memorial of the United Congregations of the Reformed, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches of Boontown, New Jersey," January 7, 1896, Record Group 233, Box 169, Folder HR 54A-H11.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[113] Walther, *Sacred Interests*, 246.

separate the government from its Islamic identity, especially as it was a theocracy.[114] In the nineteenth century, intervention was justified through the discourse of spreading civilization, but this civilizational rhetoric was suffused in an understanding of the Islamic empire as a separate race defined by its religion.

Although civilizational discourse, especially one tinged with ideas of America's role as a civilized nation, runs throughout these petitions, a discourse about the right of a government to continue governing if it is unable to protect its people is also common. In the petitions, it is possible to see the antecedents of the idea that "sovereign authority entails responsibilities for the protection of subjects, responsibilities that may be rightfully enforced by the society of states."[115] These petitions recognized that outside powers had imposed reforms to protect minority populations in the Ottoman empire, and that the Turkish government had not followed through with those reforms. For example, the Mayor of Minneapolis issued the following statement at one mass meeting:

> when a nation perpetually disregards the laws of humanity, as Turkey does, when with a bigotry that belongs to ages long gone by, it continues to persecute its own subjects, to slaughter the innocent and the helpless, and to violate all the laws which God has planted in the human heart, that nation so offending ceases to have any right to exist and ought not only to be driven from Europe where it is merely an offence to the other nations, but ought as a power to be wiped off the face of the earth.[116]

The citizens of Minneapolis called for the violation of Turkey's sovereignty using the discourse of Christianity, but they were also making an argument about a state's responsibilities to protect

---

[114] Walther notes that the American response to the Armenian massacres "contributed to an emerging discourse of humanitarian intervention that demanded European and American intercessions into sovereign Islamic territories." Walther, 7.
[115] Ralph E Luker, *The Social Gospel in Black and White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 130.
[116] "Petition from the People of the City of Minneapolis," January 28, 1896, Record Group 233, Box 170, Folder HR 54A-H11.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

its citizens. Similarly, some petitions affirmed that the Turkish government had lost its right to rule because of its actions. Citizens of Plain Grove, Pennsylvania maintained that "The Sultan has practically abdicated government in Armenia by declaring the Armenians out of his jurisdiction and waging war with them."[117] Americans interpreted the events in the Ottoman Empire from the perspective of good government and sovereign responsibilities that were steeped in the civilizational discourses of the time.

Furthermore, embedded in many petitions, as noted in Minneapolis, was the expectation that states were answerable to a higher law. In most cases, this was a Christian God but, in many petitions, this was the law of humanity. Wilson argues that this humanity equated with Christianity, but some of the petitions indicate more complex ideas. A mass meeting in West Bay City, Michigan made the argument most clearly:

> While the policy and traditions of our people to consult diplomacy rather than humanity is apparent, our right to interfere becomes a solemn and binding duty. We are in favor of our Government interfering by moral suasion, by the provisions of International Law. It would seem our right and duty to interfere where the general interest of humanity are infringed by the excesses of a barbarous and despotic government.[118]

Undoubtedly, a double standard existed for "civilized" states, but even Europe was not free from condemnation in the petitions. In the later period, many petitioners criticized European countries, especially Britain, for not upholding international law and for acting in their own self-interest. As much as this discourse may have been shaped by an understanding of who belonged in the civilized world, the call for protection was based in a burgeoning understanding of the role of

---

[117] "Petition from a Meeting Held at Plain Grove, PA," January 10, 1896, Record Group 233, Box 169, Folder HR 54A-H11.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

[118] "Resolved by Citizens of West Bay City, MI," February 10, 1896, Record Group 233, Box 170, Folder HR 54A-H11.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

international law and the need for international law to govern the actions of states. Petitioners argued that countries and empires needed to be held accountable to the standards of good government and civilization and, if unable to do so, then they needed to face the consequences. During the mid-1890s many expected the European great powers to govern accountability, but others realized that there needed to be a higher standard, such as the force of international law.

Intervention and State Responsibility

By 1896, the relief effort had begun with Clara Barton's arrival in Turkey along with other American Red Cross Society relief workers. In January 1896 Congress vigorously debated the options for an American response. Senator Wilkinson Call from Florida introduced a joint resolution calling for intervention either by negotiation or force of arms. In his speech he referred to the need to protect American citizens in the Empire, but also claimed that "the Armenian people should have the protection of this Government, not because they are citizens of the United States, but because the people of the United States have a duty to civilization, have a duty to the progress of mankind, to perform."[119] Instead of his more forceful resolution, the Senate passed one introduced by the Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Shelby Cullom of Illinois that encouraged the European powers to pressure Turkey to protect its minorities. Criticized for a weak response, Cullom rejoined in his speech, maintaining that the duty to act rested squarely in the hands of the Europeans, specifically Britain.[120] Although President Cleveland ultimately ignored the resolution, historian Merle Curti argues that it still served a purpose. He asserts that it was the first time that Congress called for political action rather than a relief effort in response to a humanitarian crisis.[121] While Peter Balakian maintains that this set

---

[119] *Congressional Record*, 54th Congress, 1st Session, 1896, vol. 28, pt. 1, 963.
[120] *Congressional Record*, 54th Congress, 1st Session, 1896, vol. 28, pt. 1, 960.
[121] Curti, *American Philanthropy Abroad: A History*, 133.

the foundation for later human rights legislation, it also set the stage for later American interventions, such as the intervention in Cuba during the Spanish-American war.[122]

In Europe, the grim reality of potential solutions to the Armenian situation in the Ottoman Empire was becoming evident. In June 1895, Lord Rosebery resigned as British Prime Minister, and an August general election brought Lord Salisbury and his Conservative party into power. Supporters of the Armenians were hopeful early in Salisbury's leadership that he would take action to protect and even to propose a possible British intervention. Salisbury eventually made it known that he would not act unilaterally. In February 1896, he gave a speech circumscribing British actions in which he declared that "the Armenian Question was to be addressed equally by all the European powers, and Britain was not obligated to do more on the issue than any other power would."[123] After a flare up of tensions resulting from an Armenian nationalist attack on the Ottoman Bank in Constantinople in August 1896, the Europeans called a conference to implement reforms.[124] Little came from the conference and by November, Salisbury closed the matter in a public speech saying that there was not "a general body of public opinion in England favourable to isolated action" and that he had "never pledged the British Government" to intervention.[125] The reform conference ended in 1897 but with the start of the first Greco-Turkish War, the Europeans decided that reforms could not be enforced during an international crisis.[126] Charles Eliot, the President of Harvard, wrote to James Bryce in June 1897

---

[122] Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 73.
[123] A. Dzh. Kirakosian, *The Armenian Massacres, 1894-1896: U.S. Media Testimony* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004).
[124] Constantinople's name was changed to Istanbul in 1930.
[125] "Lord Salisbury on Foreign Affairs," *The Argus*, December 15, 1896, Trove.
[126] In 1896 Britain intervened on behalf of the Ottoman Empire in a conflict that included a local insurgency on Crete and Greece's attempt to annex the island. In this instance, Britain along with the other Concert members—in particular, France, Russia, and Austria—attempted to assist in the pacification of Crete at the invitation of the Ottoman Empire.

commiserating over Salisbury's inaction. He remarked that "it must be very repulsive and disheartening," but that Bryce had done what he could "to make England's influence in the East count for civilization and not for barbarism."[127] By then, Bryce had other concerns as tensions between Britain and the South African Boers were escalating, especially after the failed Jameson Raid in 1895 and Bryce's association with a new group called the "Pro-Boers".

In the United States, calls for humanitarian action in Cuba and the beginning of tensions with Spain dominated public agendas. As such, the Armenian question faded from immediate public view. At the same time, a new commentator on international entanglements emerged. A former President of the American Bar Association and a well-known Bostonian lawyer, Moorfield Storey, took on a case to defend the rights of Armenian refugees to remain in the United States.[128] Educated and mentored by members of the abolitionist movement, steeped in municipal reform, and labeled a "mugwump" for his individualistic stance on party politics, Storey was at the time a major figure in debates about good government and municipal reform. His writings and speeches reflect the interplay between domestic concerns and international events hinted at during the Armenian massacres. He used the language of good governance to grapple with the question of a country's responsibilities to its people. Only this time, that lens would be used to criticize the United States.

The Armenian massacres brought the United States into wider debates about the practice of intervention as scholars have shown.[129] Prior to this period, the Monroe Doctrine established a norm of noninterference in the affairs of other states, especially in Europe. The Armenian

---

[127] Charles Eliot to James Bryce, June 18, 1897, USA 1, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
[128] "Working for Armenians," *Boston Daily Globe*, October 23, 1896, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[129] Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 13.

massacres helped to energize those debates, especially as the state in question was one that many Americans saw as outside of the bounds of civilization. The debate over the massacres and the language used created an environment for discussions about the responsibility of a state to its citizens or subjects. Sovereignty did not mean the absolute power of a state to commit atrocities against its people. At the same time, with the rise of America's international empire, that idea intertwined with civilizational, religious, and racial beliefs that structured calls for intervention against those perceived to be weaker. These discussions about the responsibility of the state would occur simultaneously at the domestic and the international level as the United States moved to declare war.

CHAPTER III: THE ANTI-IMPERIALISTS: THE AMERICAN EMPIRE AND SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY

On June 15, 1898, Gamaliel Bradford, a well-known Bostonian banker and son of the former abolitionist with the same name, convened several reform groups for a protest in Faneuil Hall to address the imperial turn in the United States. The U.S. had taken a disturbing path to those gathered. With the start of the Spanish-American war in April and the launch of U.S. actions in the Philippines in May as well as debates in Congress over annexing Hawaii that June, they were troubled by the U.S.'s turn to international exploits. In their views, the institutions of the United States were based on the principle of self-government, which was inherently antithetical to imperialism. Moreover, they expressed concern that efforts to aid Cuban revolutionaries in the fight against Spain would turn "into a war of conquest." Finally, the United States should concentrate on its own domestic issues, noting that only "when we have shown that we can protect the rights of men within our own borders like the colored race at the south and the Indians in the west" should we consider acquiring territories and populations.[130]

The Faneuil Hall meeting led to the creation of the Anti-Imperialist League (AIL), an organization whose membership spread through the country and involved a variety of participants and beliefs within its fold. Moorfield Storey, the Bostonian lawyer with roots in the abolitionist and reform movements, contributed to one of the organization's main arguments: the U.S. actions in the Philippines violated the "consent of the governed" principle that was central to American identity. At the June meeting, Storey proclaimed, "we are here to insist that a war

[130] "Anti-Imperialism. Speeches at the Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston," June 15, 1898, accessed May 20, 2018, https://web.archive.org/web/20140227011841/http://www.antiimperialist.com/.

begun in the cause of humanity shall not be turned into a war for empire, that an attempt to win for Cubans the right to govern themselves shall not be made an excuse for extending our sway over alien people without their consent."[131] In his speeches and letters, Storey emphasized the necessity for good government, or the idea that the power of a government rested in its ability to understand and represent its people and should work for the common good.

This discourse, however, shifted with developments in the Philippines. As news of atrocities committed by American soldiers drifted home, a divide emerged in the Anti-Imperialist League. Some members focused solely on Philippine independence with less criticism of the U.S. Members like Storey insisted that a strong state such as the U.S. needed to act in a just manner. Within this wing, the "consent of the governed" shifted from a passive, backward looking phrase to one that was active. The U.S., if it wanted to be a moral leader, had to act in a just manner towards all, especially weaker nations. Through the AIL debates about American imperialism, it is possible to see the interplay of domestic ideas about reform and good governance intermingled with burgeoning perspectives on international events, thereby shaping notions of sovereign responsibility.

Much has been written about the anti-imperialists and the emerging international American empire in the late 19th century.[132] Most of that writing has focused on the political

---

[131] Anti-Imperialist League, *The Chicago Liberty Meeting*, Library Tracts 1 (Chicago: Central Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), accessed May 20, 2018, https://web.archive.org/web/20071009174631/http://www.antiimperialist.com/.

[132] Maria C. Lanzar-Carpio, *The Anti-Imperialist League,* University of Michigan, 1928, accessed February 28, 2023, https://web.archive.org/web/20120507214342/http://www.antiimperialist.com/webroot/AILdocuments/; Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900"; Beisner, *Twelve against Empire; the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*; Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*; Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*; Thomas G. Paterson, *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism* (New York: Crowell, 1973); James A. Zimmerman, "Who Were the Anti-Imperialists and the Expansionists of 1898 and 1899? A Chicago Perspective," *Pacific Historical Review* 46, no. 4 (November 1, 1977): 589–601; Welch, *Response to Imperialism*; Ernest R May, *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay* (Chicago: Imprint Publications, 1991); Zwick, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921"; Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*; Murphy, "Women's Anti-Imperialism, 'The White Man's Burden,' and the Philippine-American War: Theorizing Masculinist Ambivalence in Protest"; Cullinane,

efforts of the AIL and its failure to influence American foreign policy. Instead, this chapter examines the diverse anti-imperial intellectual network that developed during this period, primarily in Boston, and that became key in later events and issues. Moreover, the network was not purely American; its members interacted regularly with counterparts overseas, especially James Bryce. Although Bryce concentrated on his own country's war in South Africa, he corresponded with his American friends about the state of the Philippine war and wrote articles on the challenges facing an American empire. His writings along with the AIL's campaign fed into new understandings and debates over sovereign responsibility as the United States became an empire overseas.

The Spanish-American War and American Responses

The 1896 petitions to Congress about the Armenian massacres included many references in support of Cubans fighting against the Spanish empire. The petitioners compared the struggle of the Armenians against the Turks to the Cubans fighting the tyranny of Spain and the abusive tactics of the empire's representatives on the island. For example, a petition in January 1896 from the Pastor's Union of the Evangelical Churches in Washington demanded that "this Government extend to Cubans, struggling for liberty, the rights of belligerency, and recognition at the earliest moment when their achievements shall show that they are entitled to it."[133] Similar to the Armenia petitions, these petitioners framed the Cuban insurgence in terms of Spanish misgovernment, its inability to govern and its persecution of suspected Cuban nationalists. According to this view, the U.S. needed to intervene to protect the Cubans against the corruption

---

"Transatlantic Dimensions of the American Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1899-1909"; Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*; Stephen Kinzer, *The True Flag: Theodore Roosevelt, Mark Twain, and the Birth of American Empire* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 2017); Murphy, *No Middle Ground*.

[133] "Memorial of the Pastor's Union of Snohomish, WA," January 17, 1896, Record Group 233, Box 169, Folder HR 54A-H11.1, National Archive & Records Administration.

of the Spanish empire.

By spring of 1898 it was evident that the U.S. and Spain were headed to war. Many proponents of intervention in Cuba argued that the U.S. needed to support people suffering under imperial oppression, contrasting American action with European inaction in Armenia.[134] After the destruction of the *Maine* on March 28, the U.S. established a blockade of Cuba, and Spain declared war, officially starting the Spanish-American war with battles in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines.[135] In response to McKinley's war message, Republican Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado introduced the Teller Amendment, placing a condition that the U.S. would not establish permanent control over Cuba after the cessation of hostilities. By May, the U.S. and Spain engaged in the Philippines with the Battle of Manila Bay, and the U.S. began negotiations to return the Filipino leader, Emilio Aguinaldo, from exile. As the war continued with Aguinaldo's forces capturing most regions outside of the capital and his declaration of independence on June 12, many observers noted that the Philippines would become a key issue in the settlement of the war.[136] In August, Spain formally capitulated to the U.S. in a peace protocol that mandated formal treaty negotiations, culminating in the Treaty of Paris in December. Also in December, McKinley issued his "Benevolent Assimilation" policy in a memo to the U.S. Secretary of War, which articulated American control over the Philippines. The U.S. would deem which liberties the Filipinos would benefit from, but McKinley gave them "no legally binding promise to deliver the liberties contained in the Constitution."[137] After Treaty

---

[134] Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 31.
[135] As Kaplan notes, the term "Spanish-American war" is contested similarly with other imperial wars. Some use the term "Spanish-Cuban-American war" to denote the involvement of the Cuban War of Independence. In addition, the Philippine-American war, with which most of this chapter deals, did not start until February 1899. Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*, 215.
[136] Kinzer, *The True Flag*.
[137] Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*, 34.

negotiations, President McKinley established the Schurman Commission to explore American options in the governance of the Philippines. Unlike with Cuba, no protections were introduced to delimit American and Filipino interaction after the cessation of hostilities. Without these parameters, many anti-imperialists questioned the fate of the Philippines after the negotiations were concluded.

Opponents to American actions immediately began to respond. A dominant argument was that if the U.S. absorbed "alien peoples," then they needed to have citizenship rights. Giving these rights, however, would jeopardize white supremacy in a country already pressured by black citizenship and the influx of immigrants. On the other hand, if the U.S. treated them as subjects and did not give the Filipinos full rights of citizenship, then they would need to be governed by military rule as the U.S. had no other mechanism for ruling subject people. Military rule, however, was antithetical to the definition of a republic. A broad array of anti-imperialists used this anti-expansionist argument, from the Unitarian preacher Charles Gordon Ames to Southern Democrats like Benjamin Tillman. In contrast, other reformers argued that the U.S. violated the rights of a self-governing people by keeping the Philippines and that the Filipino people had proven themselves capable of those rights. Moorfield Storey was a key figure on this side of the debate. His anti-imperialist leanings and the creation of the Anti-Imperialist League sharpened this rhetoric about the responsibilities of a republican government and the harms of imperialism. Exploring the domestic and international influences on those debates will illuminate the development of those arguments.

Moorfield Storey and Good Governance

During a speech about his mentor, Senator Charles Sumner, in August 1897, Storey closed with the comment that "Mr. Sumner was not a man of one idea" and that he was "just in

his foreign policy, maintaining that the same law of justice should govern nations as between men." Moreover, Sumner "believed it was the duty of every true patriot to keep his country right."[138] While Sumner was a well-known abolitionist, he was also the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who often defended the independence and self-government of former colonies, such as Haiti. He engaged with both national and international issues and believed that the United States was subject to the standards of justice expected for all countries. The influence of this guiding principle is evident in Storey's reform efforts for good governance at home and his concern over the international spread of American imperialism.

Born into a prominent Bostonian family, Storey began working as Sumner's personal secretary in 1867, and by 1873 he began practicing law and was invited to participate in various civic organizations, such as the Commonwealth Club and the Massachusetts Reform Club. At these meetings, he met other "professional men" of the city, many of whom had been or were part of the liberal republican movement in the 1870s. Some of the older men, such as Sumner, were former Radical Republicans who later became active in the Liberal Republican Party organized in 1872 to protest corruption in President Ulysses S. Grant's administration and the continuation of Reconstruction.[139] Although the Liberal Republican Party was short-lived, many defected again from the Republican party during the 1884 election to support the Democratic candidate, Grover Cleveland. Labeled Mugwumps in the press, a term alluding to their sanctimonious tendencies, they switched parties because of corruption connected to the

---

[138] "Sounded Praise of Sumner," *Boston Daily Globe*, August 19, 1897, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[139] Historian Andrew Slap attempts to disambiguate the liberal republican movement from the Liberal Republican Party. The liberal republican movement was more focused on civil service reform and trade policies than the end to Reconstruction. He maintains that the election of 1872 led to a shift in the core principles of the movement toward the platform of the party, which was focused on attacking Grant and Reconstruction. Andrew L. Slap, *The Doom of Reconstruction: The Liberal Republicans in the Civil War Era* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2006).

Republican candidate, James G. Blaine.[140] Storey's association with these movements in his early career was central to the development of his ideas and established his contacts with major figures in the later anti-imperial movement, such as Carl Schurz, a Senator from Missouri and later Secretary of the Interior. At the same time, Storey's views, especially in his later writings, diverged greatly from the paternalistic and Darwinist perspectives of the Mugwumps.[141]

While serving as the Secretary of the Commonwealth Club, Storey's name became closely associated with good governance reforms, especially municipal civil service reform.[142] The ideas of good government infused his early writings; later in 1903, Storey articulated the specific elements of good government in a speech to the South Carolina Bar Association. He delineated four requirements: its power must be held for the good of the community; its focus should be elevating mankind rather than making money; its leaders must understand the community in order to lead effectively; and its leaders needed the checks of constitutional limitations and an engaged public.[143]

As indicated in his outline, his writings often focused on the importance of the professional class serving in a public capacity in the name of good governance. For example, his first article "Politics as a Duty and a Career" asserted that educated men had an obligation to participate in public life and to shape public opinion. These educated "professional men," as James Bryce described them, would work to overcome the corruption of politicians who used the

---

[140] Richard White, *The Republic for Which It Stands: The United States during Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).
[141] During the election, Moorfield Storey became known because he made incriminating documents against Blaine public. Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 22; Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 152.
[142] "A New Movement," *Lowell Daily Citizen and News*, November 21, 1874. Chronicling America, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov
[143] Moorfield Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies? The Annual Address before the Bar Association of South Carolina, Delivered in Columbia, January 16, 1903* (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis co., printers, 1903), HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001267347.

uneducated to gain and retain power. Storey argued that the educated classes needed to take an active role in their governments, and, if they did not, then any negative consequences were squarely their fault for shirking their civic duty. In his early writings, Storey maintained that public men had the burden of educating immigrants and the poor who were "the natural prey of the demagogue and the corrupt politician."[144] Storey's views toward immigrants later became more nuanced. At a meeting of the City Club in Hartford, Connecticut in 1894, he argued that "it was a mistake to attribute all trouble in municipal politics to the foreign population. They were not helped nor consulted by those who believe in better city government."[145] In that speech, Storey began to chart his own direction that would diverge from his later correspondent and friend, James Bryce.

In the 1880s, Storey worked on various civil service reform initiatives, and by the 1890s had become an active speaker in several clubs in Boston. His next major publication in *New England Magazine* reflected those interests. In "The Government of Cities," Storey criticized corrupt leadership and governance of America's large cities, pinpointing failures, and highlighting solutions. In this article, he stressed the importance of cities as the one constant in the lives of all individuals: "from birth to death, at home, at school, in the street, in the theatre, in church, eating, drinking, breathing, sleeping, walking," entire lives depended upon good governance of cities.[146] The same decade Storey became the President of the American Bar Association and remained active in many causes. During this period, the Massachusetts Reform Club also became a key forum for Storey's next stage in his public life. As with other clubs at the

---

[144] Moorfield Storey, *Politics as a Duty and as a Career.*, Questions of the Day, no. LVIII (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1889), HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/006514786.
[145] "Good City Government," *The Hartford Courant*, May 22, 1894, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[146] Moorfield Storey, "Government of Cities," *New England Magazine* 6 (June 1892): 433.

time, the Massachusetts Reform Club was an association for independent-minded Mugwumps to congregate and to discuss issues of the day, especially civil service reform. The group included many of the men who would become leaders in the anti-imperialist movement, including Edward Atkinson, Charles Eliot, and Carl Schurz, and would serve as a launching pad for the formal organization of the Anti-Imperialist League.[147]

In April 1898, the eve of the declaration of war, Storey gave a speech at the club criticizing American expansion and the desired annexation of Hawaii. This speech, called "Nothing to Excuse our Intervention," became one of his more famous pieces. In it, he maintained that "it is a serious thing for a people who can't govern themselves to attempt to govern others." Rather than annexing other peoples, the U.S. needed to give more attention to its cities and focus on governing them well.[148] In addition, he cautioned against the drumbeat to declare war on Spain, arguing that the general mood of the country was to cast the Spanish as villains while ignoring domestic issues. He noted "we who sit around this table have burned witches, have held four millions of people in slavery, have within a year or two shot down Indian women and children, have within a month murdered a negro postmaster."[149] These words were prescient, shaping his ideas, writings, speeches, and activities as the United States prepared to go to war with Spain.

Creation of the Anti-Imperialist League

The Anti-Imperialist League was founded in 1898, but the movement had antecedents.

---

[147] Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 10.
[148] "Hawaii Again," *Boston Daily Globe*, December 23, 1897, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[149] Storey's final words refer to the lynching of Frazier Baker, a postmaster in South Carolina, that would influence the creation of the NAACP discussed in chapter 5. Moorfield Storey, "Nothing to Excuse Our Intervention," *Advocate of Peace* 60, no. 5 (May 1898): 112–14.

Many figures, such as Gamaliel Bradford, were former abolitionists.[150] Others, such as Carl Schurz and E. L. Godkin, the editor of the *Nation,* were prominent in efforts to stop other expansionist endeavors after the Civil War, including the Grant administration's attempt to annex Santo Domingo.[151] Moreover, as many came from liberal republican or mugwump movements, they were leaders in domestic reform efforts. Most believed that the U.S. needed to prioritize domestic issues at home before interfering in the affairs of others abroad. This conceptualization of sovereign responsibility moved the focus from helping people in other countries, such as with the Armenians or the Cubans, to considering the needs of people within the borders of the U.S. In many cases, they gave racial reasons for anti-expansionist policy, arguing that the incorporation of non-white populations would be undesirable; others maintained that expansion and imperialism were antithetical to America's principles.

The roots of the Anti-Imperialist League were based in the good governance community in Boston, and the inaugural moment was at a place known well to many Boston-based humanitarian groups—Faneuil Hall. On June 2, 1898, the *Boston Transcript* published Gamaliel Bradford's letter called "A Cry for Help" in which Bradford rallied the men of Boston to hold a meeting to protest the war. He decried "the prospect of turning the great American Republic into a world-wide empire" as appealing only to "the thoughtless, the selfish, the speculative, and the ambitious."[152] Other figures also spoke out denouncing the U.S.'s direction, such as Professor Charles Eliot Norton who spoke to the Men's Club of the Prospect Street Congressional Church

---

[150] McPherson examines roots of abolitionist thought in later reform movements. Of the 42 individuals he studied who had roots in abolitionism, 10 supported American imperialism and 32 opposed it. James M. McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975), 325.
[151] Beisner, *Twelve against Empire; the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*, 22.
[152] Gamaliel Bradford, "A Cry for Help: Letter to the Editor," *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 2, 1898, Newspapers.com.

and condemned the "unrighteous war."[153]

At the previously mentioned meeting on June 15, 1898, at Faneuil Hall, reformers across Boston came together for the first official protest. In addition to speeches by Bradford, Storey, and others, those gathered voted on several resolutions.[154] Through these resolutions, it is possible to see connections with domestic issues as well as ideas about sovereign responsibility. The third and the fourth clauses are especially relevant. The third clause affirmed that,

> Resolved, That the mission of the United States is to help the world by an example of successful self-government, and that to abandon the principles and the policy under which we have prospered and embrace the doctrines and practices now called imperial, is to enter the path which with other great republics has ended in the downfall of free institutions.

This statement encompassed the principle of self-government, which was incompatible with the aims of imperialism. Moreover, the fourth clause continued with a comparison:

> Resolved, That our first duty is to cure the evils in our own country, the corrupt government, of which New York and Philadelphia afford only conspicuous examples, … and when we have shown that we can protect the rights of men within our own borders like the colored race at the south and the Indians in the west, … it will be time to consider whether we can wisely invite distant populations of alien race and language and of traditions unlike our own to become subjects and accept our rule, or our fellow-citizens and take part in governing us.

Civilizational and racial rhetoric suffused the fourth clause, and that line of argumentation was reflected in some speeches at the meeting. Nevertheless, a key argument was that the U.S. also had an obligation to its current citizens first and that examples of failure to protect those citizens were rife in the country.

The speeches mirrored these concerns. Charles Gordon Ames made the distinction between people as citizens and people as subjects within an empire. He argued that if the U.S.

---

[153] "An Unrighteous War," *Boston Daily Globe*, June 8, 1898, Newspapers.com. Kinzer calls Norton's speech "the first major speech in the history of American anti-imperialism." Kinzer, *The True Flag*, 48.
[154] "Anti-Imperialism. Speeches at the Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston," 2.

attempted to rule with consent by making everyone citizens, that would require the addition of seven million "Maylays, Negriots, and Chinamen," an outcome which he deemed undesirable. If the U.S. were to rule without consent, then the U.S. would govern them as subjects in a military occupation, which was both the Spanish method and incompatible with American principles.[155] Storey's speech took his ideas further, arguing that the U.S. had already committed to freeing the Cubans, allowing them to create their own government and to enjoy their independence. Therefore, the Philippines and the other islands should enjoy the same freedom. Harking back to domestic issues, he posited that "when we undertake to govern subject peoples separated from us by half the world, let us remember how we despoiled the Indians at our doors and how impossible it has been to keep that service pure."[156] Through his writings it is possible to see the merging of anti-imperial critiques with theories on good governance and an attempt to define the content of sovereign responsibility.

The meeting resulted in the creation of a small Committee of Correspondence tasked to build interest, and the formal movement and recruiting efforts began in the fall of 1898. In November, members of the Massachusetts Reform Club met with members of the Committee of Correspondence and voted to create the Anti-Imperialist League.[157] The primary outcome of the meeting was an "Address to the People of the United States," a proclamation serving as a plan for the development of the AIL. The address contended that sympathizers had waited for the administration to change its policies, but President McKinley refused to renounce the acquisition of territory. As such, they created a formal organization to protect the principles of the U.S. and

---

[155] "Anti-Imperialism. Speeches at the Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston," 15.
[156] Storey, "Nothing to Excuse Our Intervention."
[157] "Anti-Imperialist Meeting," *The Washington Post*, November 16, 1898, ProQuest Washington Post; "Anti-Imperialist League," *The Sun*, November 21, 1898, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

the Constitution. The Address called for the creation of more committees of correspondence around the country and offered a mass petition for circulation. This petition protested the "extension of sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, or other foreign territory, without the free consent of the people thereof."[158] The Anti-Imperialist League claimed to have petitions streaming into the office from every state and over five thousand signatures.[159]

The ascendancy of the League came in January and February of 1899 with the debate over the Senate ratification of the Treaty of Paris, which ended the war with Spain and solidified American control over the Philippines. Stephen Kinzer argues that the anti-imperialist movement had gained significant momentum by the time of the Treaty of Paris debate, and credits part of the loss of momentum to William J. Bryan's switch from opposing to supporting the treaty and encouraging his allies in the Senate to vote for its ratification.[160] Despite losing the fight, the movement spread through the efforts of several Committees of Correspondence in major urban areas around the country. In addition to the original Boston-based league, later known as the New England Anti-Imperialist League, these men and women created groups in New York City, Philadelphia, Washington, DC, Northampton, Mass., Cincinnati, Portland, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Chicago. The most significant Anti-Imperialist League groups were in Boston, D.C., New York, and Chicago, but the leagues in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Northampton tended to be more radical in comparison.[161] On April 30, 1899, the meeting of the Central Anti-Imperialist League in Chicago declared that imperialism was inherently wrong and represented a

---

[158] Anti-Imperialist League, "Address to the People of the United States" (Boston, November 19, 1898), https://web.archive.org/web/20071009174631/http://www.antiimperialist.com/webroot/1647.html.
[159] "Congratulating the Federation," *The Washington Post*, December 21, 1898, ProQuest Washington Post.
[160] Kinzer, *The True Flag*, 110.
[161] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*.

form of slavery.[162] By October, the headquarters of the AIL were centralized in Chicago and the group officially became known as the American Anti-Imperialist League.[163]

Debating America's Sovereign Responsibility and the AIL

The concept of sovereign responsibility undergirded many debates during both the Spanish-American war and the later conflict in the Philippines. During the Cuban insurgency, Americans borrowed language from the Armenian massacres to talk about the abuses inflicted by the Spanish empire on Cubans. After the Filipino resistance to American rule began in February 1899, many argued that the U.S. had the obligation to restore order to the islands and to "protect" the Filipinos from themselves. For example, an editorial in the *New York Times* noted that the revolt against the U.S. was a "revolt against our authority, an authority established in law and right." Furthermore, the U.S. was "compelled by law and duty and obligation, as well as by a sense of National self-respect, to overcome these mad people and restore order in the islands."[164] The mainstream press and many Christian papers echoed this perspective on American obligations. The Methodist weekly *Zion's Herald* asserted that Methodists were imperialists and that the Filipinos "are not capable of self-government," as such it was the obligation of Americans "to protect them, and to direct and teach them to be self-governing."[165] The *Open Court* magazine argued for "expansionism, but not imperialism" as a guiding principle and supported eventual Filipino sovereignty. Before that could be granted, however, they needed to be taught, expressing this idea in parental terms: "As the education of children exercises an educational influence on the parents themselves, so the United States may derive unexpected

[162] Anti-Imperialist League, *The Chicago Liberty Meeting*.
[163] Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*, 57.
[164] "Aguinaldo's Allies in Boston.," *New York Times*, February 12, 1899, ProQuest New York Times.
[165] "Methodists Are Imperialists," *Zion's Herald*, February 1, 1899, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

blessings from a faithful discharge of their duties toward their new wards."[166] Within this perspective, the U.S. had the duty to restore order as protection, even if the Filipinos desired independence.

Many members of the AIL supported humanitarian justifications at the time of the Cuban intervention. For example, Mark Twain argued for American action in solidarity with the Cubans.[167] Their views shifted, however, in response to U.S. actions after the end of the Spanish-American war. At the Chicago Liberty Meeting of the AIL, Bishop James Lancaster Spalding, a Catholic leader from Peoria, Illinois, emphasized that the U.S. "did not enter into this war for the purpose of becoming an empire, but for the purpose of helping others to throw off the yoke of a tyrannical imperialism."[168] Furthermore, he argued that "we have sympathized with all oppressed peoples—with Ireland, Greece, Armenia, Cuba." Despite these noble beginnings, by 1899 the U.S. had become an oppressive overseas empire trying to control the lives of peoples who wished to govern themselves.

Anti-imperialists used the language of sovereign responsibility, but with several varieties developing over time. In response to the paternalistic argument for American control, anti-imperialists, especially those based in New England, dismissed assumptions that the Filipinos could not govern themselves. In a speech at Tremont Hall, Albert E. Pillsbury, the former Attorney General of Massachusetts and later a figure in the NAACP, asserted that the assumption that the Filipinos could not govern themselves was based on the idea that only white

---

[166] "Expansion, but Not Imperialism," *The Open Court*, February 1900, American Periodicals Series III.
[167] Kinzer, *The True Flag*.
[168] Anti-Imperialist League, *The Chicago Liberty Meeting*, 40–41; Zimmerman, "Who Were the Anti-Imperialists and the Expansionists of 1898 and 1899?," 599.

men had the capacity to govern.[169] Moreover, a common refrain was the duty of the U.S. to its own people. At the Chicago Liberty Meeting, reformer Jane Addams maintained that a spirit of war would pervade society and shift focus away from domestic concerns.[170] Others used the language of American responsibilities under international law to maintain that the U.S. should let the Philippines be free. At a meeting held at the beginning of the Philippine-American war, the League argued that the U.S. had the duty to allow the Philippines to be "an independent and equal state among nations."[171]

Historians of American anti-imperialism have tended to focus on leaders and members with national standing, especially men like Mark Twain, Grover Cleveland, and Andrew Carnegie. Scholars have used these figures to characterize the broader movement, calling American anti-imperialism backwards-looking, fundamentally conservative, and many times racist.[172] Though there is an element of conservative and racist thought in the anti-imperial discourse, this was not the only framework used. As later scholars have noted, members reflected the multiplicity of anti-expansionist and anti-imperial thought at the time, from isolationist, anti-immigration stances to direct critiques of the larger American imperial project. This chapter highlights some of the less prominent AILs whose writings provide more nuance to the picture of the movement.

For example, while Moorfield Storey is often mentioned, he rarely appears as a central

---

[169] Anti-Imperialist League, "In the Name of Liberty: Anti-Imperialist Meeting, Tremont Temple, April 4, 1899: Protest against the Philippine Policy." (Boston, April 4, 1899), 7, https://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupid?key=ha100190119.
[170] Anti-Imperialist League, *The Chicago Liberty Meeting*.
[171] "The Peace Treaty Signed," *New-York Tribune*, February 11, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[172] McPherson argues that the thesis of anti-imperial racism is partly correct but exaggerated and generalized to the entire movement. Those individuals like Storey from abolitionist backgrounds tended to use equal right language. He points to Wendell Garrison and others. McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, 326.

figure in the general literature on the AILs.[173] Nevertheless, he was a key person for the continuity of his thought into the new century and across issues. Storey's speeches were notable for both reiterating the "consent of the governed" idea used by many anti-imperialists, and for his central emphasis on the connections between international entanglements and domestic concerns. In a speech in August 1899, Storey compared Spanish actions in Cuba and the Philippines to American treatment of native and Black Americans. He highlighted American outrage over Spain's treatment of Cuba by pointing out that Americans ignored their own country's treatment of Filipinos. He asserted: "How do the cases differ? What made it wrong for Spain to kill and makes it right for us?" He continued,

> The self-complacent American replies, 'We are more civilized than the Spaniard, our purposes are benevolent, our Government in the long run will be better for these Malays than any they can devise.' Are you sure? As evidence from our benevolence, we call them 'niggers' or 'Indians' and always 'rebels,' words redolent of kindness and respect, and in the same breath we promise them in general phrase good government. Were you Filipinos would you believe the promise, or would you recall the fate of 'niggers' and 'Indians' and the government which they enjoy today? Do you in your hearts believe these promises yourselves?[174]

The most common refrain, however, and the one most discussed in the press, was the League's appeal to the principle of "the consent of the governed" as embodied in the founding documents of the United States. This appeal had several strains but became a catchphrase for the AIL throughout 1899 and 1900. Moorfield Storey's speech entitled "Is it Right?" at the League convention in Philadelphia embodied the idea.[175] He argued that key American principles, such

---

[173] Storey is lost in this story because of the timeline many authors use. Many mark the beginning of the end of the AIL with the loss of the treaty debate and the death knell with the 1900 election. Storey did not become president of the AIL until 1905. The difficulty of this view, as demonstrated by Zwick, Cullinane, and Murphy, is that the AIL continued on for many years. While it was unsuccessful in its political goals, the ideas of the movement shaped ways of thinking about other issues.

[174] "A George III Policy," *The Sun*, August 18, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

[175] Moorfield Storey, *Is It Right?*, Liberty Tracts 8 (Chicago, Ill.: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900), https://hdl.handle.net/2027/yale.39002023956742.

as "men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" applied to the current conflict. Storey took this argument further. He maintained that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." For Storey, this was not an empty catchphrase; he believed that a "self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people." In other words, as discussed previously, the United States as a republic could not have unwilling citizens. If it absorbed people unwillingly, it could only do so as a military occupation. This led to the final idea that the subjugation of people was aggression and antithetical to the principles of America, and therefore would lead to the downfall of the republic. He ended with a quote from Lord Russell, an Irish lawyer and statesman:

> What indeed is true civilization? … Civilization is not a veneer. It must penetrate to the very heart and core of societies of men. Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for women, the frank recognition of human brotherhood, irrespective of race or color or nation or religion, the narrowing of the domain of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice.[176]

Storey chose these words as a rebuke to the pro-expansionist arguments that the United States needed to spread civilization to the world. Instead, he argued that with civilization came duties. If the U.S. could not meet these obligations, then it was not living up to its own self-proclaimed standards.

Storey's writings became more numerous after 1900 and with his rise to prominence within the AIL. His 1901 response to Alfred Thayer Mahan's article in the *Harvard Law Review* reveals his ideas about sovereign responsibility. In his article, Thayer argued that the U.S. had precedents for its actions in the Philippines. Storey countered, saying that "precedents may make

[176] Storey, 12.

law, but not morals" and that past U.S. actions were "to be regretted, not repeated."[177] Although the U.S. had not followed the principle to govern by consent in its dealing with sovereign Native American nations, the past did not set a historical precedent for future dealings with other peoples. Moreover, he remarked on the notion of the limits of sovereignty, maintaining that,

> As against other nations, the federal government is sovereign. None of them can question its absolute power. As against its own citizens and subjects, its powers are limited. … The government of the United States cannot deprive its meanest subject of liberty or property without due process of law, nor can its officers enter the humblest cottage without the warrant of a court.

The question at hand for Storey was the obligation of the sovereign to the people it governed. In this realm, the rights of sovereignty, especially internal sovereignty, had limitations.[178]

Although emphasis has been placed on the New England wing of the AIL, more radical and outspoken anti-imperialists were in other regions, especially the Midwest. Edwin Burritt Smith was a member of the Central Anti-Imperialist League and a well-known lawyer in Chicago.[179] Smith was involved in a variety of domestic reform movements. For example, he was part of a campaign to maintain school desegregation in Chicago along with the journalist Ida B. Wells and Reverend Jenken Lloyd Jones, another active member of the Central AIL.[180] In addition, he protested Chinese exclusion. His comments on the exclusion issue reflected ideas of sovereign responsibility both internationally in the U.S.'s treaty obligations to China and domestically in terms of the treatment of individuals on American soil. He admitted that he "held extreme views in favor of the protection of every man who dwells within the limits of the United

---

[177] Moorfield Storey, *Our New Departure* (Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1901), 4, Internet Archive, http://archive.org/details/ournewdeparture00storgoog.
[178] Storey, 8.
[179] "E. Burritt Smith Is Dead," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 9, 1906, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[180] Ida B. Wells-Barnett, *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020), 235.

States in the full enjoyment of the rights of American citizenship."[181] While the Chinese were not citizens, they enjoyed protections under the treaties with China to which the U.S. had agreed.

With the founding of the AIL, Smith became an active member in the Chicago branch, serving as chairman for an October 1899 meeting in which he proclaimed, "Mr. McKinley thus transformed a war for humanity into a war of inhumanity in the East."[182] He later gave a speech at the AIL's Philadelphia Conference titled "Republic or Empire" that would become a popular AIL Liberty Tract. He noted that the McKinley administration's "Benevolent Assimilation" of the Filipinos was a dual system that would create "a republic at home and an empire abroad" and would be "half representative and half despotic in character."[183] His primary concern was the undermining of the Constitution if the U.S. restricted its authority to the states and did not extend its rights to those considered "subjects" or "colonies," predicting the issues later taken up by the Supreme Court in the "Insular Cases". Smith in the closing of his speech noted that the Supreme Court would not stand for a dual system, even though the Court held up this exact approach in *Downes v. Bidwell* in 1901.[184] Although scholars have not discussed Smith's life as much as other AILs, he was a key figure in the Central League who argued that the Constitution's protections did not end at national borders. Under the Constitution, the U.S. had an obligation to extend those rights to any people, even if considered "subjects".

---

[181] Edwin Burritt Smith, *The Chinese of the United States* (Chicago, 1887), HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100734032.
[182] "Anti-Progressives," *Los Angeles Times*, October 18, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[183] Edwin Burritt Smith, *Republic or Empire, with Glimpses of "Criminal Aggression,"* Liberty Tracts 9 (Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900), 22, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009475690.
[184] Although the case was on its face about import duties on products from Puerto Rico, the opinions shaped U.S.'s relations with its possessions. The assenting opinion's words articulated the reality of a dual system: "while in an international sense Porto Rico was not a foreign country, since it was subject to the sovereignty of and was owned by the United States, it was foreign to the United States in a domestic sense, because the island had not been incorporated into the United States but was merely appurtenant thereto as a possession." For further interpretation of this case, see Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*, 2.

Moreover, some African American leaders engaged with the AIL movement.[185] Jerome Riley, one of the founders of the Freedman's Hospital in D.C., and Clifford H. Plummer, a prominent Boston-based lawyer, created the first Black anti-imperialist affiliate, initially called the Boston Colored Auxiliary of the National Anti-Imperialist League.[186] The first meeting of the group included Riley and William Lloyd Garrison, Jr. as speakers, and concluded with resolutions condemning both the past actions of the Democrats and the imperialism of the Republicans. One resolution noted that,

> While the rights of colored citizens in the South, sacredly guaranteed them by the amendment of the Constitution, are shamelessly disregarded, and while the frequent lynchings of negroes, who are denied a civilized trial, are a reproach to republican government, the duty of President and country is to reform these crying domestic wrongs and not attempt the civilization of alien peoples by powder and shot.[187]

Erving Winslow, the Secretary of the AIL, in a letter to the *Sun*, disavowed Riley's comments and the comparison between lynching at home and imperialism abroad, maintaining that there was no connection between the two topics.[188] Despite this disavowal, the AIL under Moorfield Storey's presidency would use the argument to bring attention to the hypocrisy of American actions.

Although the historian Michael Cullinane argues that this group had little lasting impact, leading newspapers took notice of it at the time, with the *Sun* positing that "an uprising of the

---

[185] Discussions of Black AIL activity are limited because of the paucity of sources, but some authors have attempted to uncover their stories. See Willard B. Gatewood, "Black Americans and the Quest for Empire, 1898-1903," *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 4 (1972): 545–66, https://doi.org/10.2307/2206149; Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*; Murphy, *No Middle Ground*.

[186] This auxiliary would later become the National Negro Anti-Expansion, Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Trust, Anti--Lynching League. While Plummer is more well known, few sources are available on Jerome Riley beyond a tribute to him at the Buxton National Historic Site and Museum in Ontario. He grew up in the Elgin Settlement in Buxton, one of the sites of settlement for former enslaved peoples in Canada. Buxton Historical Society, "Jerome R. Riley," 2022, https://buxtonmuseum.com/history/PEOPLE/riley-jerome.html.

[187] "Negroes in a League New Boston Movement Is Put in Practical Operation," *The Sun*, July 18, 1899, America's Historical Newspapers; "Almost a Riot," *Indiana State Journal*, July 19, 1899, Gale Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers.

[188] "The Colored Man and the Administration," *The Sun*, July 24, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

negro race against the Administration" had begun.[189] The same article goes on to say that three Black politicians denounced the AIL's efforts to recruit Black people. Nevertheless, the *Sun* admitted that those Black men who were not employed by the government were more willing to speak in support of the AIL. One of those men was Kelly Miller, a mathematics professor at Howard University and later a leading figure in the African American rights movement.[190] Miller had forceful words for the newspaper, saying that, while he did not think the AIL's recruitment would amount to much, he doubted "whether there is a single intelligent Afro-American in the country who has the heart to condemn Aguinaldo and the cause he represents." Moreover, he proclaimed, "I don't think there is a single colored man out of office and out of the insane asylum who favors the so-called expansion policy."[191] The view of the Black movement as less significant is based partly on a lack of sources, but also based in a myopic reading of their long-term significance. Storey adopted many of their arguments, both in relation to the Philippine-American war and in his later opinions about lynching. Moreover, these arguments are reflected in the speeches of peace advocates who connected with the anti-imperial movement.

Edwin and Lucia Mead were prominent Bostonian peace advocates who were also involved in the Anti-Imperialist League. In 1889 Edwin Mead became the associate editor of the *New England Magazine* and remained until 1901 when he resigned to work in the peace community. Lucia was a Bostonian piano teacher who was herself a prolific writer. By the time she gained prominence as a peace advocate, she was a published author, including a semi-

[189] "To Organize Negroes," *The Sun*, July 17, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[190] Miller would become more prominent in the 20th century for his efforts to create the Negro Sanhedrin movement, his involvement with the NAACP, and his work at Howard University.
[191] "To Organize Negroes."

autobiographical novel called *Memoirs of a Millionaire*.[192] As the couple's activism grew, their lives became intertwined, working and traveling together in support of their efforts. The events of the Philippine-American war helped to solidify their anti-imperialist beliefs, and their subsequent writings and speeches served to establish their credentials.

Edwin Mead's editorials for *New England Magazine* conveyed a growing sense of frustration with American policy in the Philippines. Before the war began, he, like others, expressed a sincere hope that the U.S. would act nobly in the war. He pointed to Britain's attempts to help the Armenians as "humane and generous impulses" and that those same concerns shaped American support for the Cuban revolt. After May 1898, it was clear that the U.S. was headed in a different direction, and he called on true patriots to speak out when the government acted unjustly.[193] With the start of the Philippine-American war, he bemoaned the hypocrisy of American actions. Despite claims to help the Filipinos achieve independence, Mead noted that,

> We have ruthlessly mowed down and broken the prestige and the power of that body of the people which alone had vitality and capacity to develop self-government, which had long and heroic resistance to the Spanish oppression, and had demonstrated organizing talent of an order which commanded the respect and confidence of every democratic man.[194]

Edwin often cautioned against providing "assistance" that resulted in more harm. The U.S. could and should aid those in need, but that assistance should not result in the destruction of their ability to govern themselves.[195]

---

[192] James T Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 68.
[193] Edwin D. Mead, "Editor's Table - The Peace Movement in Boston," *New England Magazine* 20, no. 2 (April 1899): 253–59. HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000548075.
[194] Mead, 256.
[195] Edwin D. Mead, *The Present Crisis*, Anti-Imperialist Leaflet 17 (Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1899).

In October 1900, Edwin addressed both the Spanish-American war and the South African war in an editorial entitled "The Two Englands and their Lessons for America."[196] He recalled the words of a British preacher visiting a church in Salem, Massachusetts who said in reference to England's actions in South Africa: "power and dignity have their responsibilities, and empire its moral obligations." Edwin was particularly impressed with this statement, using it to compare British actions to the U.S.'s efforts to subjugate the Philippines. He remarked that even if the Filipinos were less "advanced" than the U.S., a claim he doubted, "our duty, as a great democracy, would still have been clear: 'to lead upward a free people, instead of forcibly driving a subject race.'" In Edwin's view, there were two Englands—the England of democratic principles and the England of subjugation. He felt optimistic that the U.S. would eventually follow the path of the first England. When Mark Twain later echoed this language to describe "Two Americas" in his influential and popular essay, "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," his tone was much less hopeful.[197]

These are only a few examples of the rich discourses that can be uncovered when examining individuals within the AIL and their involvement with each other and across issues. Doing so is useful because it helps to uncover ideas about sovereign responsibility, or the notion that a state or an empire has limitations on its sovereignty. Foremost, it has the obligation to protect people within its borders from harm. The speeches and writings of AIL members reflect

---

[196] Edwin D. Mead, "The Two Englands and Their Lessons for America," *New England Magazine*, October 1899, Box DG 021 Edwin D. Mead and Lucia Ames Mead 2 (microfilm reel 78.1), Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, PA.

[197] Twain's line is "The Person Sitting in Darkness is almost sure to say: 'There is something curious about this--curious and unaccountable. There must be two Americas: one that sets the captive free, and one that takes a once-captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on, then kills him to get his land.'" It is unclear if Edwin Mead and Twain knew each other but Twain was probably familiar with *New England Magazine* especially as he returned to the U.S. from Europe in October 1900, the same month as Mead's editorial. Mark Twain, "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," *The North American Review*, February 1901, 170, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

this question frequently but they do so in dialogue with others both within the U.S. and abroad. James Zwick argues that scholars did not view the anti-imperialists as a social movement because of its elite leadership; he maintains that having this narrow view ignores the fact that the AIL's influence spread far beyond Boston.[198] Moreover, the AIL movement was not solely developed within the U.S. The anti-imperialists at home were in dialogue with their counterparts and reform-minded intellectuals abroad, especially in Great Britain.

The British Connection

In contrast to the many studies of the American anti-imperial movement, fewer authors have examined transnational connections between American anti-imperialists and their British counterparts. A common theme in Anti-Imperialist League literature was the appropriateness of colonial policy for the United States. In the U.S., the AIL President George Boutwell and other anti-imperialists argued that the country should not become like Britain, and in Britain, James Bryce detailed why the U.S. did not have the appropriate governance structures for an imperial system. This section will briefly discuss the perceived relationship between the U.S. and Great Britain during the imperial period, demonstrating the transnational contexts for their ideas.

Comparisons between the U.S. and Great Britain were common in the buildup to both wars. In some cases, anti-imperialists viewed the U.S. becoming like Great Britain with trepidation. At an April 1899 meeting, George Boutwell accused President McKinley of entering "systematically upon a colonial policy in imitation of the colonial policy of Great Britain."[199] In addition, he argued that nothing in the constitution prevented the U.S. from taking territory, but he opposed the scheme as bad policy. He posited that "our form of government in each and every

---

[198] Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*.
[199] Anti-Imperialist League, "In the Name of Liberty: Anti-Imperialist Meeting, Tremont Temple, April 4, 1899: Protest against the Philippine Policy."

of its attributes proceeds upon the idea that the people, acting in communities, are to govern themselves."[200] Later in November he directly compared the actions of the U.S. to Great Britain playing off the Anglophobic tendencies in the U.S. by saying, "England is engaged in suppressing the aspirations of infant republics in Africa, and we are crushing a young republic in Asia."[201] Boutwell was not alone in making these comparisons, especially as the South African war began.

Despite tense relations between the U.S. and Great Britain caused by the 1896 Venezuelan crisis, many leading figures worked to mend that relationship. In July 1898, the London-based Anglo-American League was formed to advance the interests of the two countries as well as to promote arbitration on international disputes.[202] Members of this organization included both imperialists such as preacher Lyman Abbott and anti-imperialists such as Carl Schurz.[203] James Bryce was selected as Chairman and gave the opening speech on July 4 at the American Society in London. He proclaimed that "England and America now understand one another far better than they ever did before." Furthermore, the two nations were successfully "imposing their languages and their types of civilization upon the world" and therefore were being drawn together through common interests.[204] While these words obscure Bryce's support for self-determination for smaller nations, a point that will become clear in the next chapter, his ideas of progress were entrenched in a civilizational hierarchy in which the U.S. and Great Britain were ascendant.

---

[200] Anti-Imperialist League, 10.
[201] Anti-Imperialist League, "First Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Now the New England Anti-Imperialist League" (Annual Report, Boston, November 25, 1899).
[202] S. G. Smith, "The Anglo-American League in England," *Congregationalist*, December 8, 1898, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[203] "Anglo-American Relations," *The Cyclopedic Review of Current History* 8, no. 3 (July 1, 1898): 563–81. ProQuest American Periodicals.
[204] "Anglo-American Relations," 568.

In addition to his Anglo-American League speeches, Bryce wrote several articles in 1898 on relations between the U.S. and Great Britain and compared the colonial experience in the two countries. The first, "The Essential Unity of Britain and America," argued that the U.S. and Great Britain had similar thoughts and sentiments, pointing to the shared response to the Armenian massacres. He noted that the American and British publics spoke out because "they believed that it is justice, humanity and freedom that ought to guide the policy of nations."[205] Again, in this article, the commonality was not based solely on interests. The U.S. and Great Britain had a more fundamental connection: "the community of blood, the similarity of institutions, and that capacity for understanding and appreciating one another which is given by a common tongue and by habits of thought and feeling essentially the same."[206]

While Bryce continued to support this commonality based on civilizational and racial hierarchy, he also cautioned the U.S. against any attempt to be an empire like Great Britain. He maintained in an article for *Harper's Magazine* that the U.S. did not have the appropriate governing mechanisms for colonies in the Caribbean and the Pacific. Despite having neither a colonial office nor what he deemed "desirable races" in the colonies, he argued that the primary issue was that the "American government is built upon the principles of popular sovereignty and complete self-government, both local and national. … In the United States everybody who is a subject is (or may make himself) also a citizen, and a citizen in the fullest sense of the word." Annexation of these areas created a body of subjects because they were incapable of being citizens. This approach, however, simply did not fit with the existing American structure.[207] As

---

[205] James Bryce, "The Essential Unity of Great Britain and America," *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1898, 27, HathiTrust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/chi.23222420.
[206] Bryce, 28.
[207] James Bryce, "Some Thoughts on the Policy of the United States," *Harper's Magazine*, September 1898, 616, HathiTrust, https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015056082657.

such, in his next article for the *Century* magazine, Bryce counseled the U.S. to proceed with caution in its acquisition of territories and maintained that if he were an American, he would oppose the annexation.[208] Bryce's arguments against American imperialism focused on the lack of government structures to accommodate the realities of empire. He was against American imperialism because of the inability of the U.S. to govern subject peoples appropriately within its democratic structures. Similar to some anti-imperialists, he could not reconcile his belief in Anglo-American supremacy with the possibility of the incorporation of "inferior peoples."

In their letters to Bryce, some members of the AIL reflected the first concern about the rising American empire. Henry Villard, an American financier and journalist, said he left the country in April 1898 because of his disgust with the trajectory of American policy.[209] He wrote that he agreed with Bryce that acquisition of the Antilles and Philippines as colonies of the United States was "even greater folly than the wicked war." In another letter he responded in depth to Bryce's request for his views on the imperial movement. Villard connected the rise of imperialism in the U.S. directly to apathy about the treatment of American black citizens, especially in the South. He noted that McKinley "interwove everywhere advocacy of annexation with eulogies of the ex-Confederates, but never had a word of censure or even simple admonition with references to the present persecutions of the blacks in these same States." In the end he connected this rise of imperial thinking and jingoism to the Anglo-Saxon spirit.[210] Moreover, Wendell Phillips Garrison, the literary editor of the *Nation*, in a letter to Bryce pointed to the

---

[208] James Bryce, "British Experience in the Government of Colonies," *The Century Magazine*, March 1899, HathiTrust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/coo.31924079630350.
[209] His nephew, Oswald Garrison Villard, was a founding member of the NAACP and will be discussed more in Chapter 5.
[210] Henry Villard to James Bryce, September 3, 1898, USA 10, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.

treatment of the Filipinos and traced it to Southern race views, saying "you must remember that Southern privates and officers were among the number sent to the East, with all their color prejudice and lynching habits in full strength." Furthermore, news of atrocities committed by American soldiers had reached the U.S. by the time of the letter. While Garrison admitted he had no hard evidence that the perpetrators of atrocities were Southerners, he felt that "this spirit of cruelty certainly invades the islands with our Southern contingent, and must have manifested itself on occasion."[211] This divergence in racial thinking also exemplifies the key difference between James Bryce and Moorfield Storey. Where Storey highlighted the injustice of governing subject peoples in a democratic system, Bryce focused on the impossibility of trying to rule "inferior peoples" within the American system. Storey became more active and vociferous in his condemnation of the injustices, especially with the loss of the 1900 election and the emerging news of atrocities committed by American soldiers.

The Election

After failing to influence the Treaty of Paris debate, AIL members turned their attention to the presidential election of 1900. While many believed that the Democratic Party would be the best option for an anti-imperialist movement, they were not enamored with William Jennings Bryan as the nominee. Others found themselves bound to the Republican Party with both its Civil War heritage and its emphasis on monetary principles. Historians often point to the election of 1900 as the defining moment for the AIL. It was at the apex of its power and the precipice of its downfall according to this account.[212] More recent historians have extended the framework

---

[211] Wendell Garrison to James Bryce, February 14, 1902, USA 4, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
[212] Schirmer influenced many later works that argued that League effectively died in 1904. Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 227. Kinzer argues that the assassination of President McKinley and the ascendancy of Theodore Roosevelt, an imperialist, took away all AIL hope that they could influence American policy. Kinzer, *The True Flag*, 213.

for analyzing the AIL, however, allowing the possibility of a continuation of ideas across time and issues.[213] Moreover, after the 1900 election those members concerned with justice as a guiding principle gained prominence.

The June Republican convention set the tone with a strong affirmation of the administration's imperialist policies. During the summer, Carl Schurz and Storey wrote each other letters regularly about the proceedings. Schurz hoped that a third ticket "headed by some old Republicans" would rally the AILs together.[214] With the Democratic convention in July and William Jennings Bryan's speech on anti-imperialism, the Democrats became the default party of anti-imperialism.[215] Many leading AILs came out for Bryan. For example, Bourke Cochran, a representative from New York, supported Bryan because it would split the Republican Party and imperialism would fail, arguing that, "the politicians of every shape and description will be eager to do justice, and when the desire for justice is sincere the way to justice is soon discovered."[216] Schurz wrote to Storey again in August, calling Bryan's anti-imperialism speech excellent, but expressed concern that Bryan was "not unlikely to do a great deal of mischief" when it came to monetary policy.[217] Despite these hopes, Bryan's insistence on including a free silver plank in the Democratic platform created a rift in the party.[218] Some, such as Senator George Hoar from Massachusetts, simply could not side with the party because of its record on racial issues. In a

---

[213] Zwick, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921"; Zwick, *Confronting Imperialism*; Cullinane, "Transatlantic Dimensions of the American Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1899-1909"; Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*; Murphy, "Women's Anti-Imperialism, 'The White Man's Burden,' and the Philippine-American War: Theorizing Masculinist Ambivalence in Protest"; Murphy, *No Middle Ground*.
[214] Carl Schurz to Moorfield Storey, July 22, 1900, Box 2, Folder Jan-July 1900, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[215] "William Jennings Bryan -- 'Against Imperialism,'" American Rhetoric, accessed November 24, 2020, https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wjbryanimperialism.htm.
[216] "Will Support Bryan," *New-York Tribune*, August 16, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[217] Carl Schurz to Moorfield Storey, August 11, 1900, Box 2, Folder Jan-July 1900, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[218] Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900," 227.

collection of essays about the election in the *North American Review*, Senator Hoar wrote that electing Bryan would mean that the U.S. would proclaim self-government in the world while putting a heel "on ten million at home."[219] Nevertheless, many AILs were placated by Bryan's strong stance against expansion.

In August, the AIL convened the Liberty Congress in Indianapolis to debate their future endorsement. The Congress demonstrated the diversity of opinions within the AIL at that time and in some ways foreshadowed later divisions in the movement. A group of attendees briefly flirted with the idea of a third party with Storey as a potential candidate. He wrote a long letter to Schurz describing the encounter, saying that he was underwhelmed by the interest in the possibility, and that even though he was offered the candidacy, he declined because he believed that they needed a Republican and not an Independent.[220] The attendees by the meeting's close endorsed Bryan.

In addition, the issue of race relations pervaded Congress. AIL President George Boutwell began with an appeal to Black voters for the sake of the Filipinos.[221] W. S. Holden, a member from Chicago, proposed the following resolution, which was added to the platform:

> Resolved, that in declaring that the principles of the Declaration of Independence apply to all men, this Congress means to include the negro race in America as well as the Filipinos. We deprecate all efforts, whether in the South or in the North, to deprive the negro of his rights as a citizen under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.[222]

While the African American community stayed predominantly in the Republican camp, black

---

[219] Adlai E. Stevenson et al., "Bryan or McKinley? The Present Duty of American Citizens," *The North American Review* 171, no. 527 (1900): 480.
[220] Carl Schurz to Moorfield Storey, August 18, 1900, Box 2, Folder Jan-July 1900, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[221] "Anti-Imperialist Convention Meets," *New York Times*, August 16, 1900, ProQuest New York Times.
[222] "Bryan Ratification," *The Hartford Courant*, August 17, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

members of the AIL were active throughout the campaign. In September, Kelly Miller wrote an article for the *Springfield Republican* called "The Effect of Imperialism Upon the Negro Race," which was re-published as an Anti-Imperialist Broadside.[223] In the article, he lamented the fact that Black men remained committed to the Republican Party even though the party had abandoned them. He noted that for the past four years, "the race has suffered severer onslaughts on its political rights, a more cruel carnival of lynching and murder, and sharper proscription of civil privilege than at any time since emancipation." But the Republican Party had done nothing. Moreover, he maintained that Black Americans needed to support the Filipinos because,

> Acquiescence on the part of the negro in the political rape upon the Filipino would give ground of justification to the assaults upon his rights at home. The Filipino is at least his equal in capacity for self-government. The negro would show himself unworthy of the rights which he claims should he deny the same to a struggling people under another sky.

As with many of the independent republicans in the white League, he argued that the issue of rights was overarching even if supporting those rights required foregoing support for the Republican Party. After a meeting at Faneuil Hall in October with Plummer and Garrison as speakers again, several prominent black Bostonians came out for Bryan including the lawyer and former American Consul to the Dominican Republic, Archibald Grimké.[224]

Despite pressure from the third-party movement and under pressure from the press, Storey finally endorsed Bryan in September saying that, "the only issue in this campaign is the issue of imperialism."[225] The divide in the ranks of the leading AILs was stark with Charles Francis Adams, Jr., Andrew Carnegie, and Edward Atkinson endorsing McKinley, and Schurz, Cochran, and Storey supporting the Democrats as the party of anti-imperialism. The *Weekly*

---

[223] Kelly Miller, *The Effect of Imperialism upon the Negro Race. Ably Set out by a Colored Man.*, Anti-Imperialist Broadside 11 (Boston, Mass: Anti-Imperialist League, 1900), https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.07900600/.
[224] Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 215.
[225] "Will Vote for Bryan," *The Sun*, August 13, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Republican called the three delusional, saying that "this 'imperialism' disease affects the minds of its victims."[226]

The election was a defining moment in the immediate context; the approval of the imperialist policy by McKinley's reelection limited the ability of the AILs to influence national policy. It did not, however, stop the spread of ideas and continuation of discourse about sovereign responsibility. Rather, it was the beginning of a redefinition of that discourse from one of consent of the governed to one of justice. Warren Winslow at the first AIL meeting after the assassination of McKinley in 1901 suggested that the AIL should disband, and Dr. Francis Abbot, a philosopher, spoke up rejecting the proposal. His words reverberated with the new direction that many in the AIL would take, saying "I am sick of this talk of an inferior race. We are all inferior enough, God knows. I am ready to follow William Lloyd Garrison or any other leader under the banner of emancipation."[227] Those ideas, that the U.S. should act in a just manner as a great power and that justice should be the focus, influenced the directions that Storey, Edwin and Lucia Mead, and others would take in their writings. Although Storey drew on the language of the hypocrisy of an unjust America to address news of atrocities in the Philippines, this language would be used as a point of comparison and critique long after the election of 1900.

American Atrocities and AIL Responses

After the election that winter, the U.S. began to increase its pressure against Aguinaldo's forces with one commander telling his officers to begin using "European methods", such as the concentration of civilians.[228] Around the same time, rumors of American soldiers committing

---

[226] "They Are Daft.," *Weekly Republican*, October 4, 1900, Readex: America's Historical Magazines.
[227] "Warren's Bomb," *Boston Daily Globe*, October 17, 1901, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[228] Kinzer, *The True Flag*, 194.

atrocities against Filipino soldiers and civilians began to arrive in the U.S. According to historian Richard Welch, if atrocities are defined as "the murder of civilians and prisoners, torture of captives, systematic burning of civilian quarters, and rape," there were 57 verifiable instances during the American occupation, including the most infamous form of torture, the water "cure."[229] American soldiers held down victims as another person forced open their mouths and poured large volumes of water down their throats, and potentially into their lungs. Before the victim would pass out, a soldier would punch them in the stomach forcing out the water. Soldiers found increasingly brutal ways to force out the water, including one case in which a soldier was documented jumping on the stomach of their victim. Although the water cure was not the most widely used form of torture, it was the most publicized and often discussed in the correspondence between Storey and other AIL members.

Many Americans found out about these atrocities as soldiers' letters returned home and the AILs publicized them. The McKinley administration also began to give approval to these practices as official policy, especially after the declaration of martial law on December 20, 1900. General Arthur MacArthur declared that because guerrilla war was contrary to the customs of war, the Filipino insurgents were not entitled to the privileges of prisoners of war. Moving into 1901, American actions became more systematic and brutal. After the killing of American soldiers in the town of Balangiga on the island of Samar in September 1901, General Jacob Smith ordered his troops "to kill and burn" and to make the island of Samar "a howling wilderness." [230] Major Littleton Waller gained particular notoriety because of his order to execute

[229] Richard E. Welch, "American Atrocities in the Philippines: The Indictment and the Response," *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 2 (1974): 234, https://doi.org/10.2307/3637551.
[230] Welch, 237.

eleven native guides for withholding food from Americans during a march through Samar.[231] In summer and fall 1901, the AIL began receiving reports of concentration camps on the island of Samar and other areas of the Philippines.[232] In December 1901, General J. Franklin Bell issued a concentration order in Batangas, an area further north in the Philippines, calling for the movement of civilians into camps in accordance with General Orders Rules No. 100, or the Lieber Code, which provided instructions on the treatment of noncombatants during war.[233] In circulars issued to his station commanders, he urged them to target wealthy Filipinos especially, saying that they needed to adopt a policy "that will as soon as possible make the people want peace, and want it badly."[234] This activity was particularly galling to the AILs because many in the U.S. had protested against the Spanish *reconcentrado* policy in Cuba, or the concentration of civilians into camps, using those actions as justification for starting the war with Spain. By March 1903, an estimated 65,000 Filipinos died in the concentration camps from a combination of the lack of adequate supplies and a spreading cholera epidemic.[235]

Despite the setbacks of the previous fall's elections engendering a lull in anti-imperialist

---

[231] Welch, 238.
[232] Aidan Forth claims that these were not *camps* but rather the concentration of individuals into specific areas. While concentration zones were the method, primary sources indicate that *ad hoc* housing was developed in some cases. In "Root's Record", Storey and Codman point out that people were confined in large bodies "whether in *stockades*, which General Smith is said to have used, or in what General Bell calls "*protected zones."* The undeniable reality of American concentration orders, however, is that they were less organized than the British, thereby shaping the inability of the administration to provide exact numbers of those concentrated and a mortality rate. Aidan Forth, *Barbed-Wire Imperialism: Britain's Empire of Camps, 1876-1903* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2017); Moorfield Storey, *Secretary Root's Record: "Marked Severities" in Philippine Warfare* (Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1902), 89, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=philamer;idno=AKL0070.0001.001.
[233] General Bell was responding to orders issued by the Military Governor-General Adna Chaffee. He was following the approach of his immediate predecessor General Arthur MacArthur who emphasized aggressive punishment of rebels and tactics that bordered on illegality. Jonathan Hyslop, "The Invention of the Concentration Camp: Cuba, Southern Africa and the Philippines, 1896–1907," *South African Historical Journal* 63, no. 2 (June 2011): 260, https://doi.org/10.1080/02582473.2011.567359.
[234] Storey, *Marked Severities*.
[235] Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism," 307.

activity, the increasing awareness of these atrocities reinvigorated the AIL and refocused the movement. Historians Cullinane and Murphy note this shift from a narrower anti-expansionist discourse to a broader interest in humanitarian causes and an increasing emphasis on rights and protection of those oppressed both at home and abroad. Part of this shift was due to the beginning of a divide in the national AIL. On one side were conservative members who shifted their attention away from atrocities and the war to focus on the goal of eventual independence for the Philippines. The other side continued to highlight American atrocities both in the Philippines and at home. This moment in the early years of the new century was a critical turning point. While the AIL itself became a weaker organization because of the divide, the radical leadership developed a new understanding of America's role in the world and at home. Unlike many of their colleagues whose racial thinking overtook their anti-imperialist tendencies, several AIL members, such as Moorfield Storey, Herbert Welsh, and Edwin and Lucia Mead, protested the hypocrisy of American actions in various ways. The 1901-1902 campaign against atrocities may have been the last national Anti-Imperialist League campaign "of any magnitude," but it was a key moment in shaping the arguments they would use in response to other issues.[236]

Initially the press was slow to respond to the letters and reports of torture, but stories began to gain coverage in the winter and spring of 1902.[237] A series of revelations including Bell's order to establish camps in Batangas, and the courts-martial of Major Waller and General Smith brought national press coverage and wider public interest. Many Americans saw these incidents as shameful but isolated byproducts of war with racism and views of Filipinos as black

[236] Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 227.
[237] Welch, "American Atrocities in the Philippines," 247–48.

shaping that lack of interest.[238] Others disagreed with this assessment. In December 1901, Herbert Welsh, the editor of *City and State*, a Philadelphia-based weekly focused on good government, wrote to Moorfield Storey about a report of "a water-cure torture." He argued that even those who did not support the political rights of the Filipinos should be against these actions, saying that the U.S. "should not slip back into the practice of Medieval barbarities." In the letter he committed himself to the fight to publicize these tortures and called on Storey to contribute his voice "to bring the question sharply before the Boston public and force from them some kind of answer."[239] In January 1902, Storey and Welsh began lobbying members of Congress to investigate the reports. In a letter to Welsh, Representative Samuel McCall from Massachusetts, thanked him for bringing the issue to his attention and noted that the reports of "the 'water-cure' method" were corroborated. He asserted that he would raise the issue with his colleagues but was concerned that he would have backlash from supporters of the American military.[240]

Responding to gathering reports, Senator George Hoar of Massachusetts introduced a resolution in January 1902 calling for the Committee on the Philippines to investigate the claims or for the appointment of a separate investigatory committee. The Senate Committee on the Philippines, also known as the Lodge Committee after its chairman, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, had been established in December 1899 to oversee the administration of the Philippines. Hoar also asked that Governor-General William Howard Taft, the administrator of

---

[238] The reality of the racial aspect of this will become clear when South Africa is discussed in chapter 4. These atrocities were being reported at the same time as the reports of concentration camps in South Africa. While neither event elicited widespread public engagement, the hypocrisy of some who worked for the Boers but did not speak out about the Filipinos is evident.
[239] Herbert Welsh to Moorfield Storey, December 27, 1901, Box 1, Folder 1900-1901, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[240] Samuel W. McCall to Herbert Welsh, January 8, 1902, Box 1, Folder Jan 1-13, 1902, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.

the Philippines, be called home to report on conditions.[241] Senator Lodge in response maintained that the existing committee should conduct the investigations and on January 28, 1902, Lodge introduced a resolution to start the Senate Investigation on Affairs in the Philippines (SIAP). The resolution's wording was vague, calling for the committee to hear testimony from any persons "in connection with any investigation which they may deem proper relating to affairs in the Philippines Islands."[242] The same day Senator Hoar complained to Welsh that people were sending him reports of torture and reconcentration "in confidence" but he needed people who were willing to testify.[243]

With seven Republican imperialists in the majority and six Democrat and Republican anti-imperialists in the minority, the majority controlled the direction of witness testimony as much as possible. It was up to the opposition to bring attention to key issues. A component of the hearings was the examination of the Lieber Code in which soldiers were ordered to uphold the principles of civilization in dealing with noncombatants. Created during the Civil War, G.O. 100 gave the circumstances in which American soldiers could be released from their obligations to protect if noncombatants were acting in a disloyal manner. Those who were disloyal could be exposed to the burdens of war, if necessary, but cruelty was not allowed. The order was used to justify reconcentration because in a guerrilla war it was difficult to distinguish loyal from disloyal noncombatants. Therefore, if people were placed in camps, the US would have more

---

[241] Committee on the Philippines. U.S. Senate, *American Imperialism and the Philippine Insurrection; Testimony Taken from Hearings on Affairs in the Philippine Islands before the Senate Committee on the Philippines, 1902*, ed. Henry F. Graff (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1969), https://archive.org/details/americanimperial00henr/page/n3/mode/1up.
[242] *Affairs in the Philippine Islands. [Part 1]*, 57th Cong., 1902, 2, ProQuest Congressional.
[243] George Hoar to Herbert Welsh, January 28, 1902, Box 1, Folder Jan 14-31, 1902, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.

control over the population.[244] In addition, the Lodge Committee rationalized American actions against Filipinos because they were outside the bounds of civilization.[245] At the same time, they affirmed that American policies would have civilizing influences on the people of the Philippines.

Early in February, Senator Hoar introduced a petition written and organized by Welsh and Storey and signed by many leading figures, to force the committee to address torture claims. The petition cited the McKinley administration's proclamations against the Spanish use of concentration camps and gave evidence from various sources for the policy's use in the Philippines.[246] In addition, they noted a statistic that would become a consistent refrain for the anti-imperialists, especially Storey—that "the killed many times exceed the wounded."[247] This was seen as evidence that people were being targeted for killing because of the fact that in most wars, especially the Civil War, the number of wounded should have been higher than the number of killed. The fact that those numbers were reversed was evidence of a policy with the intent to kill. Moreover, the petition noted that no matter what people thought about Philippine independence: "There should be no room for difference among civilized men as to the use of torture and other inhuman methods of waging war." Welsh used the language of good government, writing that Americans wanted to believe that,

> The country's purposes are benevolent and that his fellow-countrymen mean to give the unhappy people of the Philippine Islands civilization and good government, but our present methods seem ill adapted to secure the only foundation on which any good government can rest—the contented acquiescence of the governed.[248]

---

[244] Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism," 305.
[245] Murphy, *No Middle Ground*, 110.
[246] George Mercer to Moorfield Storey, January 9, 1902, Box 1, Folder Jan 1-13, 1902, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC; George Hoar, *Petition for Suspension of Hostilities in Philippine Islands*, 57th Cong., 1902, ProQuest Congressional.
[247] Hoar, *Petition for Suspension of Hostilities in Philippine Islands*, 2.
[248] Hoar, 3.

The petition's resolutions called for an investigation into the practices of the army, the cessation of reconcentration and torture, negotiations with the representatives of the Filipinos, and orders to the army to treat the Filipinos in a more civilized manner.[249]

With the opening of the hearings, the anti-imperialists hoped that the public would see the truth of American actions, but many were doubtful. Welsh wrote that he was worried that Lodge would sidetrack the committee and urged Storey to write a public piece to encourage action. He noted that "what we need is to get hold of the people in such a way that their minds will see the truth convincingly, and that their hearts will be touched by the wickedness and the horror of this whole business."[250] After Taft in his testimony argued that Americans were bringing benefits to the Filipino people, such as educational institutions, Senator Hoar wrote to Storey, saying that "there are not yet half as many children enrolled in the schools as there have been parents slain by us in the unnecessary and indefensible war."[251] As Hoar repeated in several letters to Storey, the key was finding hard evidence rather than relying on rumors and hearsay.

In April 1902, several anti-imperialists led by Charles Francis Adams and Erving Winslow organized a committee that they called the Philippine Investigating Committee, or the Adam-Schurz Committee. Winslow noted in a letter to Storey that while Adams had been against the effort earlier, he had changed his mind considering the lack of action on the Lodge Committee.[252] All of the leading anti-imperialists were members, including Adams, Schurz, Smith, Carnegie, and Welsh, with Storey and Julian Codman serving as legal counsel. After

---

[249] Hoar, 4.
[250] Herbert Welsh to Moorfield Storey, January 31, 1902, Box 1, Folder Jan 14-32, 1902, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[251] George Hoar to Moorfield Storey, March 12, 1902, Box 1, Folder Feb-Mar 1902, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[252] Erving Winslon to Moorfield Storey, April 18, 1902, Box 1, Folder 1902 Apr-Sept, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.

Senator Lodge adjourned his committee in June 1902 and refused to reconvene, the anti-imperialists issued an open letter to President Roosevelt lodging specific charges against the military and called for resumption of the investigations.[253]

Storey and Codman submitted a brief to the committee in September 1902 called "Root's Record". This document outlined the cases of atrocities in the Philippines and the Secretary of War Elihu Root's lack of action to stop the events. They countered claims that American actions were in line with the Lieber Code and repeated statistics about the proportion of wounded to killed. Throughout the brief they compared U.S. actions in the Philippines to Spain in Cuba and contemporaneous actions of England in South Africa against the Boers. Of note for them was Secretary Root's description of the war as humane. In response to a comment from General Miles, Secretary Root denied "that the warfare in the Philippines has been conducted with marked severity." Instead, he argued that "the warfare has been conducted with marked humanity and magnanimity on the part of the United States."[254] Missing from Storey and Codman's discussion was the civilizational discourse that suffused so much of the hearings and provided justifications for American conduct in the Philippines. In the brief, they repositioned the Filipinos as worthy of rights and protections under American rules of warfare. The brief even highlighted the racist descriptions of Filipinos that American soldiers were sending to their families at home.[255] The ultimate responsibility however was with the administration, and Storey and Codman described incident after incident that should have elicited a response from Washington.[256] They even compared General Smith's orders in Samar to Turkish atrocities

---

[253] Charles Francis Adams et al., "Specific Charges," *Boston Daily Globe*, July 28, 1902, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[254] Storey, *Marked Severities*.
[255] Storey, 26.
[256] Storey, 32.

against Armenians.[257]

Moving into 1903, anti-imperialists wrote to Storey urging him to call for the reconvening of SIAP in response to new instances of torture.[258] One incident was especially noteworthy—the kidnapping of a Filipino priest named Father Augustine and his subsequent death by water cure. In February, Welsh asked the Adams-Schurz Committee to circulate a petition calling for new SIAP hearings. He invoked influential Bostonian peace advocates, such as Edwin and Lucia Mead as well as several other female reformers.[259] But the anti-imperialists' focus on atrocities began to lose ground with key supporters. On February 10, 1903, Welsh wrote to Storey about Andrew Carnegie, saying that "I feel that his heart is really not in this work."[260] This was especially serious because Carnegie had been giving money to the committee to support publishing. By March, Adams refused to allow Welsh to submit his petition calling for the reconvening of the Lodge Committee.[261] Moreover, Erving Winslow cautioned against demonstrations and worked with Fiske Warren, a businessman who had first-hand knowledge of the Philippines, to create a group separate from the AIL called the Philippine Information Society that would focus solely on achieving Philippine independence rather than the conduct of the war.[262] Although many of these leaders continued to work together for the next decade, after the collapse of the Chicago organization in 1904, the Anti-Imperialist League retreated into its

---

[257] Storey, 38.
[258] Matthew K. Sniffen to Moorfield Storey, May 31, 1902, Box 1, Folder 1902 Apr-Sept, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[259] Herbert Welsh to Moorfield Storey, February 3, 1903, Box 2, Folder Feb 1903, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[260] Herbert Welsh to Moorfield Storey, February 10, 1903, Box 2, Feb 1903, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[261] Edwin Burritt Smith to Erving Winslow, March 17, 1903, Box 1, Folder 1903, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC; Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 246.
[262] Schirmer refers to this group as the Philippine Independence League, while Zwick calls it the Philippine Information Society. Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 248; Zwick, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921," 176–77.

Boston base and, according to scholars, effectively ended as a *national* organization.[263]

After the death of George Boutwell, the League's President, in February 1905, the AIL elected Moorfield Storey as his replacement. While the organization had lost its national scope, it did not die. The AIL remained an organization until 1920, and its mandate shifted from focusing solely on the Philippines to considering other issues around the world. In Storey's acceptance speech, he called for the AIL to give more matters their attention, including "the Panama Canal deal and others."[264] He also hinted at an additional concern, attempts in the United States to nullify the 15th amendment that prohibited the abridgement of a citizen's right to vote no matter their "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." As the AIL headed into the new century, these concerns would become the focus for Moorfield Storey and the anti-imperialists.

American Imperialism and Sovereign Responsibilities

In January 1903, Storey gave a speech to the South Carolina Bar Association that was a clear articulation of his worldview and America's actions. He argued that there were two theories at play in dealing with the U.S.'s dependencies. The first theory was the administration's view that the U.S. was superior and would guide the dependencies as inferiors. The second theory was that the consent of the governed applied to all. He maintained that the first view was based on a 'might makes right' ideology, whereas the second view was one of justice, which was "the only secure foundation for any human institution."[265] In this speech he directly addressed the issue of America's racism, saying that "no sooner had our soldiers landed than the Anglo-Saxon contempt for men of a race and a color different from our own, intensified in the American by

[263] Zwick provides the most comprehensive discussion of the splinter organizations and their agendas. Zwick, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921."
[264] "Storey Honored," *Boston Daily Globe*, May 16, 1905, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[265] Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies?*, 5.

the long-established relation of master and slave with the negro and of conqueror with the Indian, began to manifest itself."[266] Most importantly, the inability to understand subject nations would ensure continued failure for any government, whether ruling foreign subjects or its own people.[267] In order to gain its moral standing the U.S. needed to recognize these realities and give the Philippines its independence.

The American public became aware of soldiers torturing Filipinos soon after news emerged about the use of concentration camps during the South African War. Comparisons between the two wars multiplied as both involved a large empire interacting with a smaller nation fighting for its freedom. Many anti-imperialists ignored or minimized the plight of the Filipinos while expressing concerns for the white Boers in South Africa. Others such as Moorfield Storey and Edwin and Lucia Mead maintained that the actions of the U.S. and the British were synonymous, with both acting as immoral strong states against weaker ones. As historian Daniel Schirmer writes, they rejected nationalism and shifted to supporting internationalist views of the world and to advocating against injustices in other regions. These individuals drew direct parallels between the Filipino fight for independence and the Boer efforts to remain free. In addition, they used these arguments to criticize domestic events as they were the first members of the Anti-Imperialist League to point to "a connection between the struggle against imperialist foreign policy and the fight for black rights at home." [268]

The Anti-Imperialist League did not have an immediate impact on the policies of the United States at the time of the 1900 election. Nevertheless, American disillusionment with

---

[266] Storey, 25.
[267] Storey, 30.
[268] Schirmer, *Republic or Empire*, 259.

imperialism grew as the nation entered the new century.[269] In addition, the efforts of the AIL shaped understandings of America's own sovereign responsibility. From a focus on the consent of the governed based on American principles to a broader call for justice, the AIL's activities solidified ideas about American obligations to anyone under its protection, including subjects in a dependency far away. Accusations of Americans torturing their fellow humans were viewed in the wider context of Turkish actions in Armenia, Spanish actions in Cuba, and British actions in South Africa. The United States claimed a moral superiority but was failing to live up to its own standards in the Philippines.

[269] Kinzer, *The True Flag*.

CHAPTER IV: SELF-DETERMINATION: THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY

In the summer of 1901, Edwin and Lucia Mead traveled to Great Britain to see friends, attend a peace conference, and visit sites for Lucia's book *Milton's England.* While there, the couple met some individuals whom the press had called the "Pro-Boers", the catch-all name for those who criticized Britain's role in the South African War. According to her diary, Lucia was curious about British perspectives on the war and documented their views in articles written for the American press. At the time of the trip, the Meads were already well-known international peace advocates. They were influenced, however, by the currents of internationalist thought that preceded their trip, especially the anti-imperialist and pro-Boer movements. Moreover, their writings provide a window into the influence of the British Pro-Boers, particularly Pro-Boer interpretations of events in South Africa, and their implications for the U.S.'s rise as an imperial state and the duties of great nations in an increasingly internationalized world.

The South African war (or Anglo-Boer War) entered American awareness in fall 1899 alongside ongoing discussions about the U.S.'s conflict in the Philippines. As with the Meads, many American writers and advocates had direct personal ties with British pro-Boers and corresponded frequently. Through these discussions, American protest groups and individuals borrowed ideas from the British response to the South African war to craft their own challenges to the emerging American empire, highlighting questions about the proper role and responsibilities of governments both to their own citizens and subjects and within the larger international arena. They borrowed their lines of argumentation from diverse sources, including James Bryce, Edwin and Lucia Mead, and as well as the American Anti-Imperialist League, to

develop a complex discourse about self-government, imperialism, race, and the duties of the state.

Similar to the American anti-imperialists, an extensive literature exists on the Pro-Boers and their responses to the South African War. Scholars, however, have tended to examine them in isolation from other events and from their transatlantic counterparts.[270] As discussed in Chapter 3, examinations of American anti-imperialist responses to the South African war focus on familiar individuals such as Mark Twain and Jane Addams. They were influential, but other figures also shaped discourses about the role of the United States and the responsibilities of an empire as a great power. This chapter reverses the network's direction, focusing first on the development of the British pro-Boer movement and then how that movement molded the discourse of the American anti-imperialist. Events in both the U.S. and the British Empire influenced the writings and speeches of the Meads, the activity of many AILs in the American pro-Boer movement, and the campaign to petition Congress to intercede, especially after news of concentration camps in South Africa. Their new thinking about the world and America's role on

---

[270] John S. Galbraith, "The Pamphlet Campaign on the Boer War," *The Journal of Modern History* 24, no. 2 (1952): 111–26; I. Sellers, "The Pro-Boer Movement in Liverpool," *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* 12, no. 1 (January 1959): 69–84; Stephen Koss, *The Anatomy of an Anti-War Movement: The Pro-Boers* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973); John W. Auld, "The Liberal Pro-Boers," *Journal of British Studies* 14, no. 2 (1975): 78–101; Arthur Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1978); Claire Hirshfield, "Blacks, Boers, and Britons: The Antiwar Movement in England and the 'Native Issue,' 1899-1902," *Peace & Change* 8, no. 4 (October 1982): 21–34, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0130.1982.tb00472.x; Claire Hirshfield, "Liberal Women's Organizations and the War against the Boers, 1899-1902," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 14, no. 1 (1982): 27–49, https://doi.org/10.2307/4048484; Jodie Noelle Mader, "Patriotic Dissent: The Pro-Boer/Anti-War Movement in the South African War, 1899–1902" (Ph.D., Kentucky, University of Kentucky, 2008), ProQuest Dissertations. Strauss and Bhroiméil examine Irish American perspectives on the South African War: Charles T. Strauss, "God Save the Boer: Irish American Catholics and the South African War, 1899-1902," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 26, no. 4 (2008): 1–26. Üna Ní Bhroiméil, "The South African War, Empire and the Irish World, 1899-1902," in *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire, c.1857-1921*, ed. Simon James Potter (Dublin: Four Courts, 2004). Sutton provides a framework for analyzing American pro-Boer discourse through the lens of several national issues of the day such as the role of social reform and the place of African Americans, non-Anglo-American immigrants, and women. Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism."

the cusp of the turn of the century molded how they thought about the entrance of the world's largest empire into a war against two small republics.

The South African War

Tensions between Great Britain and the Boer republics arose during events much earlier in the century. Britain's acquisition of the Cape of Good Hope in 1815 and the later formal abolition of slavery precipitated the 1830s migrations of Dutch-speaking Boer settlers (later known as Afrikaners) from the colony to the areas that eventually would become the Orange Free State (OFS) and the South African Republic (Transvaal).[271] Although in the 1850s Britain recognized the independence of the republics, the British later annexed the Transvaal. In 1880, the First Boer War began after the Transvaal declared formal independence.[272] Once the hostilities ended, the British government negotiated the Pretoria Convention of 1881, which allowed Boer self-government in the Transvaal under British suzerainty. This gave the republic domestic control while the British retained jurisdiction over foreign relations. The claim of suzerainty would become a major point of debate when the British tried to force domestic reform within the republic.[273] In 1884, the term suzerainty was dropped from the Anglo-Boer London Convention, thereby generating uncertainty in the relationship between Britain and the Boers; this became a point of contention in the 1890s.

---

[271] "Boer" is the historically accurate term used by the people of European and Dutch ancestry who participated in the treks, especially the Great Trek (*Voortrekkers*) and who lived outside of the British colony. Those who lived in the Western Cape were called Cape Dutch. Not until the 20th century were these two groups referred to as Afrikaners. Although the term is currently avoided, it is historically accurate and was the term used to describe the specific people in the republics rebelling against the British Empire. It was also a term they themselves used.
[272] Alongside the emergence of a movement to bring attention to the Bulgarian massacres, a pressure group was created to advocate for the Boers at that time. Many of the individuals who would later be called pro-Boers were initially part of the Transvaal Independence Committee, a pressure group formed in early 1881 with many of the same tactics as the Bulgarian movement. See Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*.
[273] Richard B. Mulanax, *The Boer War in American Politics and Diplomacy* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994).

With the discovery of gold in the Transvaal in the 1880s, British citizens and others began to move into the region.[274] Called Uitlanders, or foreigners, by the surrounding Boers, the predominantly British community established roots in the republics, although the Transvaal denied them full citizenship and voting rights. In addition, British leaders associated with the Witwatersrand gold mining industry pressured the South African Republican President Paul Kruger to provide concessions, including the expansion of black labor and the provision of voting rights to the British.[275] When that pressure failed, the gold mining industry's leaders advocated more coercive means. In 1895, the Jameson Raid, a failed attempt to instigate an uprising of Uitlanders, exacerbated tensions between the British and the Boers. Some scholars have questioned the perception that the raid was a necessary cause of the war as the war did not start until four years later.[276] At the same time, it is undeniable that the Jameson Raid deteriorated the relationship. By 1897, tensions increased especially after the Transvaal established a military alliance with the OFS. In addition, Alfred Milner became the Governor of the Cape and the High Commissioner of South Africa and began emphasizing the Uitlander franchise issue with the republics.

On October 9, 1899, the South African Republic, allied with the Orange Free State, issued an ultimatum requiring that the British withdraw their troops from the Transvaal border within 48 hours. When the ultimatum expired on October 11, the South African War began.[277] The first phase of the war involved Boer successes from October through February 1900 with a

---

[274] Denis Judd and Keith Terrance Surridge, *The Boer War: A History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013).
[275] Judd and Surridge, 34.
[276] Donal Lowry, *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000).
[277] The name of this war has undergone some revision. Most scholars use the phrase "South African War," but Cuthbertson has argued for the "Anglo-Boer South African War" as a way to acknowledge both the imperial and the civil war dimensions. This chapter will use the phrase "South African War" with the recognition that the war impacted British, Boers, as well as the Black populations within the region.

shift to British victories through the spring and summer. By the fall of 1900, the British began burning farms and concentrating civilians in camps as methods for controlling the spread of guerrilla warfare. In May 1902, the war ended, and negotiations brought the Orange Free State and the South African Republic under the sovereignty of the British Crown.

As the possibility of war in South Africa increased, growing numbers of Britons called for caution, decrying an overemphasis on a military solution. The membership of the emerging pro-Boer organizations included many well-known leaders, thinkers, and in some cases, agitators for other reform campaigns. For example, W.T. Stead, the editor of the *Review of Reviews,* was the founder of the Stop-the-War Committee, the most radical pro-Boer organization. Other famous names associated with pro-Boer sentiment included James and Marion Bryce, the economist J. A. Hobson, and multiple Liberal party politicians. Despite some similarities with American anti-imperialists, the British pro-Boers were in most cases not opposed to empire. Rather, they questioned the empire's reach into previously unincorporated areas and the right of the empire to interfere with the self-government of the South African republics. Although not intentionally anti-imperialist, their efforts led to questions about the extent of the British empire, especially over those who they believed could govern themselves.[278] Pro-Boers argued that the republics had the right to self-government and that Britain should not have intervened even to protect the rights of British subjects. In many ways, they were arguing that sovereign responsibilities had limits at national borders. The British could not expect the Boer republics to provide political rights to non-citizens. Moreover, Britain did not have the right to intervene and violate sovereignty to protect those rights.[279] Many pro-Boers were concerned that British

---

[278] Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War: A History*, 246.

[279] The irony of this discourse is that during the Armenian massacres from 1895-1897, British humanitarians argued that the Ottoman Empire needed to protect the rights of foreign nationals within its empire, mainly British

actions were evidence of a growing and "insatiable imperial appetite."[280]

Moreover, a civilizational framework was present in their interpretations. Many Britons saw the Boers as a less advanced society in need of Anglo-Saxon guidance. At the same time, the Boers were white and therefore were considered more capable of self-government than black Africans. These beliefs in a common heritage based on skin color became a crucial point for Boer supporters in the United States because the shifting understanding of in-groups based on the color of skin would shape ideas about the state's obligations to its citizens. Before examining American responses, however, it is necessary to consider first the organizations and ideas of the British pro-Boers.

Pro-Boer Organizations and Ideas

The pro-Boers formed several organizations differing in tactics and rhetoric therefore representing the amalgam of viewpoints. One of the earliest groups to protest British actions in South Africa was the Transvaal Committee, emerging from George Russell's Liberal Forwards introduced in Chapter 2. The Transvaal Committee is often discussed in isolation from those earlier efforts in relation to other conflicts. In so doing, scholars miss their ongoing critiques of British actions, protesting both the Empire's destruction of the national aspirations of small states and its refusal to intervene to assist the Armenians. Viewing the Transvaal Committee from this longer view provides a more complete picture of that critique. The group's goal was not only the support of Boer national aspirations; they were critiquing empire more broadly. As such, according to British historian Arthur Davey, the Liberal Forwards and the Transvaal Committee

---

missionaries. The main difference however is that with the Ottoman Empire, the British were not advocating political rights of foreign nationals, but for the protection of property and religious rights.

[280] Hirshfield, "Blacks, Boers, and Britons," 21.

became identified with a more extremist wing of the Liberal party.[281]

Russell had been active in issues related to South Africa since the 1880s when he became a member of the Transvaal Independence Committee created in response to the First Boer War. In June 1899, the Executive Committee of the Liberal Forwards passed a resolution creating the Transvaal Committee, a new organization. The purpose of this committee was "to watch the proceedings of the Colonial Office and to rouse public opinion to prevent a war between the British Empire and the Transvaal."[282] At another meeting of the Executive Committee on October 12, 1899, the day after the declaration of war, the Liberal Forwards passed a resolution arguing that the present war occurred because of belligerent actions towards the Transvaal. They proclaimed that the peace movement should remain vocal, and that the committee would continue to spread information to stop the "passion of revenge" and to appeal "to the sense of justice and humanity among the British people."[283] In addition, the group called for the Liberal party to focus its attention on domestic issues instead of exacerbating tensions abroad.

In late 1899, George Russell wrote his most direct condemnation of British actions for the *Speaker*. In his article titled "An Unchristian Christmas" he first decried the government's claim that it was acting for a humanitarian cause by writing, "but we claim our right—and it is not an excessive claim—to ask for what we are fighting? Away with sanctimonious hypocrisy which pretends that the ill-treatment of native races is the cause or the justification of the campaign!"[284] Moreover, he directly contrasted the events in South Africa to the Armenian massacre, arguing that the Turks:

---

[281] Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*, 74.
[282] Koss, *The Anatomy of an Anti-War Movement: The Pro-Boers*; Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*, 43.
[283] "Transvaal Refugees' Fund," *Daily News*, October 13, 1899, Nineteenth Century British Library Newspapers.
[284] George Russell, "An UnChristian Christmas," *The Speaker: The Liberal Review*, December 23, 1899, 313, Gale Nineteenth Century Collections Online Archive.

> sacrificed, amid circumstances of equal horror, one hundred thousand Armenian lives. But we were told by the strongest Government of modern times, and by those who, theoretically in Opposition, backed the Government to the utmost of their power, that we could not stir a finger to stay the carnage. England dared not attempt it. The military and political risks were too great. The blood of a hundred thousand Armenians was not worth the life of one English soldier.[285]

In closing, he gave his most critical indictment of British actions: "To-day perhaps some of them [Armenians] are thinking that, if England had then displayed an ounce of courage in a righteous cause, she would not now be sacrificing her best-beloved for territorial aggrandisement and the lust of gold."[286] The Transvaal Committee through Russell began to question the nature of late imperialism and Great Britain's role in the world.

The next organization provided a moderate counterpoint in its approach to agitation. Liberal party members with Leonard Courtney as President formed the South African Conciliation Committee (SACC) in November 1899. Courtney was a member of Parliament who emerged in British politics in the 1870s and became a member of Gladstone's administration in the 1880s. His views on the South African war eventually required his retirement from party politics. He later became an ardent supporter of the women's movement in Britain. Founded by Catherine Courtney, Leonard Courtney's wife, the South African Conciliation Committee (SACC) primarily argued that war should not be waged beyond the need to protect subjects of the empire.[287] Because of its moderate leanings, the SACC was the most prominent pro-Boer organization with over 1000 members and 30 branches. Furthermore, as explained in Chapter 5, several of the key figures in the SACC, especially Charles Aked, were prominent leaders in reform, civil rights, and women's suffrage movements.[288] The SACC also had a large following

---

[285] Russell, 314.
[286] Russell, 314.
[287] Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*, 78.
[288] Sellers, "The Pro-Boer Movement in Liverpool," 77.

among women with over 20 women's groups in London. The most famous member was Emily Hobhouse, a journalist who exposed the existence of Boer concentration camps. However, Hobhouse was not the only high-profile female. The list of SACC members published in March 1900 included 155 women along with Marion Bryce, James Bryce's wife.[289] James Bryce also expressed support for the SACC and advised the group on its messaging, particularly ways to respond to Uitlander grievances. He did not become a member, however, because of his Liberal party leadership position. The primary scholar on the pro-Boers, Arthur Davey, considers SACC as the most effective organization out of all of the pro-Boer groups.[290]

As evident in the SACC membership lists, women played a large role in the pro-Boer movement on both sides of the Atlantic. Eliza Riedi calls the pro-Boer campaign "the first demonstration of organized female anti-war activism in a major conflict in Britain."[291] The Women's Liberal Federation (WLF), a counterpart to the National Liberal Federation (NLF), provided an early critique of the war, proclaiming that "the contemplated attempt to enforce the demands of England by force of arms is not only an error but a crime."[292] The WLF began as a rubber stamp for NLF measures until a turnover in leadership brought Rosalind Howard, Countess of Carlisle, onto the Executive Committee.[293] The Countess was a staunch suffrage advocate and pushed for the WLF to support only Liberal party candidates who defended suffrage. Some member organizations were unhappy with this disloyalty to the Liberal party and broke off to form the Women's National Liberal Association (WNLA), which became closely

[289] Eliza Riedi, "The Women Pro-Boers: Gender, Peace and the Critique of Empire in the South African War," *Historical Research* 86, no. 231 (February 2013): 99, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2281.2012.00612.x.
[290] Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*, 78–79.
[291] Riedi, "The Women Pro-Boers," 93.
[292] Hirshfield, "Liberal Women's Organizations and the War against the Boers, 1899-1902," 28.
[293] Hirshfield, 31.

allied with the Party. While the groups had their ideological differences, and the WLF was seen as extremist, both groups supported pro-Boer agitation. For example, Marion Bryce kept the Boer cause at the forefront of the WNLA, especially after Hobhouse returned with her findings about the concentration camps.[294] At each of the annual conferences for 1900 and 1901, concerns about the war were main topics on the agenda.

The final major organization was the Stop-the-War Committee (STWC) created by the editor and journalist W.T. Stead, famous for his muckraking journalism at the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Review of Reviews*. Contemporaries, and scholars, considered the Stop-the-War Committee the most radical of the groups in both ideas and tactics. The STWC was Stead's brainchild as a result of his disillusionment with the Liberal Imperialists, especially after the Jameson Raid.[295] The controversy surrounding Stead's South African war coverage as well as his articles earlier in his career helped to shape his reputation. As such, most of his ventures came with the taint of controversy. His actions as the founder were no different than before, using more inflamed rhetoric than the other groups, and thereby alienating many would-be supporters. Like Bryce, though, Stead was well-known in the United States, especially after his trip to the 1893 Chicago Exposition and the publication of his exposé of Chicago corruption called *If Christ Came to Chicago.*[296] Along with Bryce, Stead was a source that shaped American interpretations of the war.

Historians Denis Judd and Keith Surridge describe pro-Boer critiques of the war as varied and nuanced. Some critiques focused on the imperial question, and a small number were outright

---

[294] Hirshfield, 45.
[295] Davey, *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*, 83.
[296] W. T. Stead, *If Christ Came to Chicago: A Plea for the Union of All Who Love in the Service of All Who Suffer* (Chicago: Laird & Lee, 1894).

anti-imperialist. Many were outraged by the perceived economic motives of the Empire in response to the Jameson Raid. Most pro-Boers admired the Boers' fighting spirit and romanticized notions about the Boers and their pastoral existence. Others advocated for the possibility of a negotiated peace through arbitration.[297] Considering the multiplicity of discourses, it is difficult to narrow down the focus of these groups and individuals to one argument or idea. Yet these themes provide a window into their understandings of sovereign responsibilities within the framework of the British empire. Through them we have a more complete picture of the contradictory sentiments and discourses surrounding race, civilization, empire, and sovereignty; these discourses also shaped American perceptions.

As can be seen in George Russell's "lust of gold" line from his "An Unchristian Christmas," many pro-Boers pointed to capitalist greed as a motivator for the actions that led to the Jameson raid and ultimately the war. James Keir Hardie, a founder of the Labour Party, and the economist J.A. Hobson both highlighted capitalist exploitation as the main driver for the war.[298] They noted the disruptive impact of the gold rush and the entrance of mining companies into South Africa, including those supported by Cecil Rhodes, one of the architects of the Jameson Raid. This argument emphasized the greed of the capitalists and mine owners in South Africa, often cast as Jewish financiers, and the corruption of those in the Colonial Office, primarily the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain.[299]

Furthermore, when considering the role of race, most saw the South African war as a

---

[297] Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War: A History*, 238.
[298] Kenneth O. Morgan, "Lloyd George, Keir Hardie and the Importance of the 'Pro-Boers,'" *South African Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (November 1, 1999): 299, https://doi.org/10.1080/02582479908671895.
[299] J. A. Hobson, the well-known author on imperialism who later influenced Vladimir Lenin, wrote about the war in his book *War in South Africa* and promoted the view that South Africa had been taken over by Jewish capitalists. Keir Hardie and others borrowed from Hobson's assertions. The focus on Jewish influence was less direct in American discourse. For discussion of Chamberlain's role, see Mader, "Patriotic Dissent," 125–26.

conflict between white nations and ignored the existence of Black Africans. While the British claimed to be concerned with rights of Black South Africans, both the British and the Boers were committed to retaining white supremacy.[300] The pro-Boers dismissed claims that the British were protecting Black South Africans as a hypocritical effort to shift attention away from the real aims of the war, which was capitalist greed and imperial expansion.[301] This argument resulted in support for the Boers coming from perplexing quarters. For instance, members of the Aborigines Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society, such as Leonard Courtney, supported the Boers regardless of their dismal record in protecting native rights, and did so even though these two societies had protested Britain's treatment of Afghans and Egyptians in previous conflicts.[302] In this imperial conflict, the rights of the white Boers overruled the rights of the Black Africans.

Nevertheless, racial categories used at the time were more complex than a white-black juxtaposition. Civilizational progress, as described by James Bryce in his essays "Impressions of South Africa" and "The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa," was a key framework.[303] In his worldview, Anglo-Saxon culture shared by Great Britain and the U.S. was the pinnacle of civilizational hierarchy. Other European or European-based cultures, such as the Boers and the Armenians, needed civilizational uplift and guidance in order to advance. At the same time skin color played a role. In "Impressions in South Africa," Bryce detailed the history of the region and the various groups of native Africans and Europeans. The conflict with native

---

[300] Hirshfield, "Blacks, Boers, and Britons"; Peter Warwick, *Black People and the South African War 1899–1902*, African Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511523908; Mader, "Patriotic Dissent"; Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War: A History*.
[301] Hirshfield, "Blacks, Boers, and Britons," 21.
[302] Hirshfield, 25.
[303] James Bryce, "Impressions of South Africa, Part 1," *The Century Magazine*, May 1896, HathiTrust; James Bryce, "Impressions of South Africa, Part 2," *The Century Magazine*, June 1896, HathiTrust; James Bryce, "Impressions of South Africa, Part 3," *The Century Magazine*, July 1896, HathiTrust; James Bryce, "The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa.," *The North American Review*, December 1899, ProQuest American Periodicals.

Africans had become almost insurmountable, and Bryce argued that Black Africans were viewed from a perspective of racial inferiority by all Europeans. He maintained that "the educated and the savage, the Christian and the heathen, the African and the Indian" were all "treated by the whites as divided from themselves by a wide and impassable gulf."[304] For Bryce, although the Boers were not as low in the hierarchy as people with dark skin, they were a lesser civilization and a distinct people. Aidan Forth notes this transformation of the Boers from a "white and respectable European diaspora" to "an untrustworthy and conniving colonial race," especially as the war progressed and moved into its guerrilla phase.[305] Both sides of the debate transformed the Boers as a group, with imperial supporters stressing Boer degeneracy and pro-Boers emphasizing their rough homespun existence. Bryce echoed these ideas, maintaining that the lack of abstraction in their language "has helped to keep them ignorant and curiously conservative in their social and religious ideas."[306] For example, in an article for an American audience, he called the Boers "an ignorant and rude people," a statement that was picked up by the American press.[307]

This theme of civilizational differences despite the Boer's whiteness became central for both pro-Boers in Great Britain as well as supporters in the United States. The American press carried the idea of the uneducated Boer into debates over which side the U.S. should support.[308] Many Anglophiles argued for Anglo-American commonalities as justification for supporting Britain, while others argued that the Boers had more in common with Americans because of their

---

[304] Bryce, "Impressions of South Africa, Part 3," 445.
[305] Forth, *Barbed-Wire Imperialism*, 137.
[306] Bryce, "Impressions of South Africa, Part 3," 448.
[307] Bryce, "The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa."
[308] For example, Johannes Hrolf Wisby, "The South African War of Races.," *The Arena*, May 1900, ProQuest American Periodical Series III.

pastoral existence and independent spirit. The essential point in these arguments was not the "truth" of their civilizational level as much as a reflection of how Americans or Britons saw themselves and their own societies.

In addition to racial and civilizational discourses, British pro-Boers argued that the Boer republics had the right to govern themselves. The self-government discourse was challenging to proffer because the pro-Boers realized that the Republics, especially the Transvaal, were not well-run states. In fact, the Transvaal was bankrupt at the beginning of the first war in the 1880s and by the late 1890s, corruption was rampant, leading one American to describe the Transvaal in a letter to the *New York Times* as "A Pretorian Tammany".[309] James Bryce agreed that the Boers were unable to administer a modern state.[310] Even if the Jameson raid had not happened, the Transvaal would have fallen, and the Boers would have turned to the British for support even without the raid. He concluded that the British forced a war that was not inevitable. In light of this corruption and in combination with the poor treatment of Black South Africans, the historian John Auld notes that the situation in South Africa "revealed the limitation of the pro-Boers' attachment to the ideal of self-government; self-government might in certain cases—and this was one of them—conflict with good government."[311] Despite these contradictions, Americans latched onto this discourse, especially the members of the Anti-Imperialist League, who saw commonalities with their own arguments about the consent of the governed.

Finally, some British pro-Boers questioned the imperial motives underlying the war. As noted previously, most pro-Boers were not anti-imperialist. In some cases, they supported the empire, and in others they even advocated for the empire's benefits, using the examples of the

---

[309] J.B.C, "A 'Pretorian Tammany,'" *New York Times*, March 19, 1900, ProQuest New York Times.
[310] Bryce, "The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa."
[311] Auld, "The Liberal Pro-Boers," 94.

crown jewel of India and the settler colonies in Canada and Australia. Nevertheless, many pro-Boers questioned whether Britain was justified in expanding into the republics. Moreover, Judd and Surridge argue that this was the key defining factor for the pro-Boers, maintaining that "the persistent pro-Boer campaign did gnaw away at public perceptions and perhaps sowed seeds of doubt about Britain's moral right to govern other peoples."[312]

In the end the pro-Boers were neither successful at stopping the war nor changing government policy. Similar to the American Anti-Imperialist League, many saw their actions as futile. After the British victories in 1900 initially increased public support, the continuation of the war and the shift in tactics to include concentration camps caused enthusiasm to wane as the British public began questioning its necessity. British discourses on race, civilization, self-government, sovereignty, and the role of empire would also become major themes in the American responses to British actions.

Americans and the South African War

The relationship between the United States and Great Britain had been in flux since the Venezuelan crisis in the mid-1890s. With the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, many Americans considered the British a model of a world-spanning empire, while others viewed the British as a cautionary tale. On the one hand, the U.S. government had strategic reasons for supporting the British. The McKinley administration had interest in the war because of the possible disruption of relations with Great Britain, and a wider impact on American interests in other areas, such as Central America and the Near East.[313] Secretary of State John Hay was an Anglophile, not only because of common values or ancestry, but because "anything that

[312] Judd and Surridge, *The Boer War: A History*, 246.
[313] Mulanax, *The Boer War in American Politics and Diplomacy*, 40.

weakened the British Empire threatened the United States."[314] Keeping their relationship on good terms, required that the U.S. ignore pro-Boer calls for mediation or intervention in the conflict. While the McKinley administration had an official policy of neutrality, the President and members of his cabinet tacitly supported the British. Moreover, later during the Roosevelt administration, the U.S. provided some material support to Great Britain.

Another justification for supporting the British was their common Anglo-Saxon identity and therefore affinity between the two countries. Historian Stuart Anderson maintains that for Theodore Roosevelt and others like him "any extension of Anglo-Saxon rule was by definition a gain for humanity."[315] Secretary Hay was convinced that the fight in South Africa was a fight for "civilization and progress" and crafted American-British relations in support of that view. Common identity and the subsequent demand to side with Britain in the war was a consistent refrain in both editorials and letters to the newspapers. Many of these commentaries highlighted Anglo-American affinities by pointing out that immigrants were involved in the pro-Boer movement. For example, one letter to the *Washington Post* remarked that "it is the least assimilated foreign citizens, as a rule, who are most active in this movement … we owe our greatness to our intellectual and moral heritage from England and the love of justice and fair play, a race characteristic."[316] Supporters also borrowed from James Bryce's arguments that the Boers were less advanced compared to the British. Many columnists, editors, and letter writers appropriated his language to highlight the racial inferiority of the Boers. Even though Bryce argued the war was unjustified, American supporters of the British saw the war as a battle

---

[314] Mulanax, 83.
[315] Stuart Anderson, "Racial Anglo-Saxonism and the American Response to the Boer War," *Diplomatic History* 2, no. 3 (June 1978): 222.
[316] Paul Eaton, "Sympathy for the Boers," *The Washington Post*, April 23, 1900, ProQuest Washington Post.

between a civilized, and therefore humane, empire and a backward, corrupt, and prejudiced lesser race.

A small minority pointed to British support for the political rights of Uitlanders and Black Africans as justification for British actions in the war. The African American community used these arguments most frequently. For example, William H. Ferris presented resolutions at the Colored National League meeting in February 1900 calling on the U.S. to support the British. The resolution maintained that "the colored people of the world over should sympathize with England in this great struggle."[317] Others tempered their views, arguing that the war was a white man's conflict that ignored the interests of Black Africans. Nevertheless, Britain was the lesser of the two evils. They acknowledged that the Boers had taken oppressive actions against Black Africans, and held to the idea that the British, while not perfect, were more likely to protect their political rights.[318] Finally, some argued for disavowal of the conflict, noting that "neither the Boers nor the English are deserving of their sympathy."[319] An editorial in the *Boston Advance* argued that in a world free of race "the colored people would naturally lean toward the Boers in their struggle against a great and powerful nation seeking to deprive them of their rights and liberties." When race was factored in, "the more intelligent and deep thinking among our people … have no sympathy to bestow upon either side." The editorial called on the Colored National League to temper their resolution with the reality that neither side would protect the rights of Black Africans in a white man's war.

As there were few formal ties between the pro-Boer organizations in Great Britain and

---

[317] "The Anti-Boer Resolutions," *Boston Advance*, February 17, 1900, Readex: African American Newspapers.
[318] Willard B. Gatewood, "Black Americans and the Boer War, 1899-1902," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (Spring 1976): 226–44.
[319] "The Anti-Boer Resolutions."

Boer supporters in the United States, some scholars have concluded that there was not an active movement or that the movement in the U.S. was not influential.[320] However, the level of engagement in the popular media and in petitions sent to Congress demonstrates that Americans were following the events and debating the war. Moreover, many members of the AIL were central figures in those activities. While previous studies have focused on prominent members of the League who supported the Boers, such as Andrew Carnegie and Bourke Cockran, lesser-known figures were active participants in the Boer question, especially members in the Central League and other regional branches.[321] Immigrant communities through their fraternal organizations, such as the Ancient Order of the Hibernians and the American Turners, were also active. The efforts of these groups did not change British actions or policy, but they shaped the broader conversation about American relations with Great Britain and sovereign responsibilities in the face of empire. This section will discuss the reasons why many Americans decided to support the Boers and will highlight the influence of James Bryce and other AILs on the pro-Boer movement. It will then outline the organizational history of the movement and the development of its petition campaign.

Some American pro-Boers used outright anti-English rhetoric. At the AIL convention in August 1900, President George Boutwell declared: "Who doesn't see that the day of England's downfall is approaching? And we are asked to follow her example and tread in the imperial footsteps of Great Britain, knowing that those steps are leading the British Empire to destruction."[322] Boutwell was not alone in asserting the wider impact of the war on Great Britain

---

[320] Anderson, "Racial Anglo-Saxonism and the American Response to the Boer War."
[321] Charles Strauss calls Bourke Cockran "the national spokesperson for the pro-Boer movement in the United States." Strauss, "God Save the Boer," 2.
[322] "Anti-Imperialist Convention Meets."

and cautioning the U.S. in its emulation of the Empire. Anti-British rhetoric also resonated with some American immigrant communities. In the major cities, especially Boston, Chicago, and New York, Irish immigrants took a keen interest in the plight of the Boers, making comparisons with questions about Home Rule for Ireland. However, historian Üna Ní Bhroiméil demonstrates that the Irish weekly newspaper, *Irish World,* attempted to link the Boer cause with the struggles of all nations against empire.[323] Moreover, the paper connected the principles of American republicanism with the Boer cause, and presumably the Irish cause as well. Charles Strauss further contends that the Irish used the South African War to "assert themselves as genuine, liberty-loving Americans." Rather than only comparing their Irish experience, they crafted a political language that made the Irish community more patriotic.[324]

In an article written for an American audience, James Bryce argued that England had not managed the Boer situation well, fueling anti-British sentiment even from their earliest interactions. In the minds of the Boers, the English had abolished slavery in 1833 without adequate compensation, altered the courts system, reduced Dutch rights, and insisted on the use of the English language.[325] He argued that the difficulties might have dissipated if not for the discovery of gold in the Transvaal. The Boers saw the limitation of political rights for Uitlanders as "an obvious form of self-preservation" because of the rapidly increasing number of immigrants arriving in South Africa in response to the gold rush.[326] The Boers did not completely deny Uitlanders the right to vote, but rather they had a longer residence requirement for acquiring the right than the English considered necessary. Bryce argued that, considering the

---

[323] Bhroiméil, "The South African War, Empire and the Irish World, 1899-1902," 195.
[324] They could use the South African War to do this rather than the Philippine-American War because they would not risk opposing American policy and seeming therefore unpatriotic. Strauss, "God Save the Boer," 3.
[325] Bryce, "The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa.," 739.
[326] Bryce, 752.

numbers of new settlers into the region, if the residency requirement were reduced to the three years sought by the British, the Boers would lose political control over the country. Because of his role as an MP, Bryce refrained from fully siding with the Boers or the British, but his articles intimated that the British demands of the Boers were unjust.

Other commentators focused on the idyllic and pastoral aspects of Boer life as justification for supporting a hearty and rugged race. Webster Davis, who had been the mayor of Kansas City and the Secretary of the Interior from 1897 to 1898, was an outspoken advocate for the Boer cause and used this argument frequently. Davis visited South Africa in 1898 while Secretary of the Interior, and afterward became an opponent of British actions. As a result of this activity, he was forced to resign from his cabinet position. He later switched to the Democratic Party because of the refusal of the Republican Party to include a plank in support of the Boers during the 1900 election. His arguments romanticized the Boers, contending that they were a race to be emulated and one with a civilizing role in Africa.[327] Immigrant groups sharing common ties with the Boers often highlighted these elements in their rhetoric as well, especially the German, Dutch, and Nordic groups in the Midwestern cities.

The assertion of the right to self-government was a popular theme with the members of the Anti-Imperialist League. They recognized that the Boers should not be romanticized, but that the fight for self-determination was paramount. R. A. White, a minister and member of the Central League, gave a fiery sermon in which he noted that "the Boer has no doubt been stubborn and unprogressive. But if strong nations have a moral right to attack and subjugate such a people, then the United States has a right to war with Mexico and the South American

---

[327] "McKinley Not to Blame," *The Washington Post*, May 7, 1900, ProQuest Washington Post.

republics on a moment's notice."[328] Many commentators referenced an issue of the *North American Review* published in December 1899 that included articles by James Bryce and Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie's article maintained that the Uitlander franchise was not the real cause of the war. Instead, the cause was "whether the British or the Dutch were to control South Africa."[329] He contended that the war was a "racial dispute" between the Britons and Boers, and that in this fight, Britain was at fault, contending that "no nation has a right to attack and endeavor to suppress a people so capable of self-government as the Dutch and force its own supremacy."[330]

Moreover, many American supporters of the Boers tried to fit the South African War within their world view by ignoring or downplaying elements that did not conform. For example, they compared the plight of the Boers to the U.S. treatment of the Filipinos while ignoring racial questions in either scenario. Others made direct comparisons between the Filipino struggle and the Boer conflict. At a public meeting in January 1900, William E. Mason, Senator for Illinois and a Central AIL member, maintained that Americans "want the Boers to have the kind of liberty they want. We want them to have the kind of liberty that the Filipinos want."[331] Jacob Ingenthron, another AIL member, at a meeting of German Americans in Chicago, argued that "when Cuba's wrongs became too great we declared war for humanity's sake … why now this ominous silence? Imperialism has muzzled our administration. Our policy against the Filipinos has placed us in a glass house, and as residents of such a domicile we dare not throw stones."[332] At a lunch meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Moorfield Storey made this point directly. He

---

[328] "Praises the Boers Heroism," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 26, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[329] Andrew Carnegie, "The South African Question," *The North American Review* 169, no. 517 (1899): 798.
[330] Carnegie, 803.
[331] "Boer Cause Theirs," *The Washington Post*, January 22, 1900, ProQuest Washington Post.
[332] "Cheer for Kruger," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 9, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

argued that the American people were not paying enough attention to the situation in the Philippines, asserting that "we should like to sympathize with the Boers in South Africa for we feel that they are right", but that American conduct in the Philippines made that sympathy problematic. Storey was drawing attention to the hypocritical double standard of calls to support the Boers without the acknowledgment of the reality of American imperial and racial policy in the Philippines.[333]

James Bryce's correspondence with American friends echoed these thoughts. His correspondents included several prominent AIL members who reflected the diversity of interpretations of the war. One of his closest correspondents, Wendell Phillips Garrison, an editor for the *Nation* and son of the abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, was skeptical of support for the Boers, noting in February 1900, that "England's moral position is, I must say, much more defensible than ours with reference to the Philippines, or even Porto Rico, which we are trying to keep under military rule … in order to save our 'protection' policy."[334] He noted his feelings bluntly in a letter from May 1900, saying "but considering the relations of the Boers with the black nations, I do not think I would have felt much more tenderly for them than for the Confederates of the South."[335] Bryce also voiced his frustrations in private to his friends. In a December letter to Seth Low, at that time Mayor of New York City, Bryce complained that "this miserable and utterly unnecessary war seems interminable, and has lowered our credit before the world, made us hated throughout Europe, and involved us in a frightful expenditure."[336]

---

[333] "Boston's Anti-Imperialists," *The Des Moines Leader*, October 22, 1901, Newspapers.com.
[334] Wendell Garrison to James Bryce, February 14, 1900, USA 4, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
[335] Wendell Garrison to James Bryce, May 8, 1900, USA 4, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
[336] James Bryce to Seth Low, December 28, 1900, USA 22, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.

Compared to the anti-imperialist movement, the American pro-Boers were more dispersed across existing networks of anti-imperialist, humanitarian, and immigrant groups. A national organization eventually formed, but existing organizations such as the AIL and immigrant fraternal organizations were critical infrastructure for the pro-Boer movement. The League and its individual members issued statements condemning British aggression even before the start of the war. In September 1899, a month before the war, Bourke Cockran, a League member and a representative from New York, wrote an open letter to President McKinley calling on him to issue a statement in favor of mediation. Comparing U.S. actions in the Philippines, he proclaimed that if the U.S. was "justified in exerting military force to restore order at the other side of the globe, surely it should exert every moral force to preserve order at half the distance."[337] The AIL issued a resolution at the time denouncing "the evident purpose of Great Britain to overthrow the Transvaal republic and appropriate its territory as one of the most flagrant wrongs perpetrated by that power for the extension of its empire."[338] The immigrant communities organized public rallies with one of the first spearheaded by Holland City, a Dutch American organization at the start of the war in October 1899 in New York.[339]

The League was not the most prominent supporter of the Boers, but many of its individual members worked for organizations calling attention to the injustice of British actions. On January 22, 1900, a prominent public meeting was held in Washington, D.C. Speakers included several senators and representatives invited under the auspices of the United Irish societies in conjunction with some German groups.[340] The language used in the speeches

---

[337] "Cockran's Gibe," *The Globe*, September 14, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[338] "Boers Patted on the Back," *The Washington Post*, October 1, 1899, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[339] Strauss, "God Save the Boer," 20.
[340] "Boer Cause Theirs."

reflected much of the League's language about the Philippine-American War. William Sulzer, a representative from New York, who wanted to pass a congressional resolution supporting the Boers, asserted: "We sympathize with Poland, with Hungary, with Greece, with all the South American republics; with Armenia and with Cuba. Many we helped. Why, I ask in the name of all that is just and honorable, should we now refuse to lend our moral support and sympathetic aid to the patriots of South Africa?" Moreover, he argued that the defeat of the Boer republics would be a defeat for republican institutions. Champ Clark, a representative from Missouri, gave a particularly rousing speech, according to the news coverage. He maintained that, "the love of freedom is not confined to any latitude or longitude. Wherever people are struggling for liberty they should have the friendship of all Americans." Finally, J. J. Lentz, a representative from Ohio and a League member, argued that "America has a mission, and that mission is to promote liberty, not to stifle it … We are shooting down the first republic of Asia, and England is trying to destroy liberty in South Africa." Several other League members were present at the meeting including Senator William E. Mason of Illinois and member of the Central League and Patrick T. Moran and Patrick O'Ferrall, Vice-Presidents in the Washington League. The attendees issued resolutions expressing sympathy for the Boers as free republics. They asked for the U.S. to intervene as a mediator in the conflict, invoking American support for the Hague Convention of 1899. This call for mediation would be a common refrain both at the public meetings and in petitions to the U.S. Congress.

March 1900 saw the creation of organizations focused on Boer support, especially as Boer representatives from South Africa arrived for a tour of the U.S. On March 14, one group held a meeting at Cooper Union in New York City featuring Montagu White, a representative of the South African government. Judge George M. Van Hoesen, chairmen of the meeting,

introduced White as the person who could refute "the statement that the citizens of South Africa are uncivilized."[341] In descriptions of the events and editorials about later meetings, commentators emphasized White's respectability and bearing as proof that the Boers could not be uncivilized peoples. Throughout the spring months until May, when he was joined by three additional Boer representatives, Montagu White toured with Webster Davis and other American figures through various large cities and small towns, often visiting Dutch, German, and Irish groups. In June, a meeting at Faneuil Hall with these South African guests brought together several leading anti-imperialists to speak on the issue. Thomas Higginson, a founding member of the original Anti-Imperialist League, said that even though the U.S. shared traditions with England, Americans had the right to criticize British actions. Edwin Mead invoked international law, remarking that, although the Boers did not expect the U.S. to intervene, "they do expect and do ask that the people of this republic shall call attention with a mighty voice to the mighty law of nations, and to those great principles of right and justice which should and must be made to control nations."[342] Edwin and Lucia Mead repeated many of these ideas about international law and the principles of justice in their writings about the South African War, and as such will be explored in more detail.

As with the anti-imperialists, much of the literature tends to focus on the well-known figures who supported the Boers, but others played a role in shaping ideas about the South African war. It would be shortsighted to dismiss these efforts as ineffectual as their activities, writings, and connections to others shaped norms and understandings about the role of the

---

[341] John E. Milholland was also a speaker at this meeting. He was at that time the editor of the *New York Tribune* and an anti-expansionist. Later he organized the International Union Club, a London-based organization supporting the Boers, after his brief emigration there. Upon return to the U.S., he became the first Treasurer of the NAACP. "Pro-Boer Mass Meeting," *New York Times*, March 16, 1900, ProQuest New York Times.
[342] "Boers' Rights," *Boston Daily Globe*, June 1, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

government and its obligations both domestically and internationally over the long-term. Historian John Craig observes that the arbitration and peace movements, much like the anti-imperialists, represented a wide variety of heterogeneous viewpoints. He places Edwin and Lucia Mead within a group called "genuine dissenters" or those who opposed the American drive to expansion after the Spanish-American War.[343] Through their writings and speeches, the Meads became well-known as peace activists after the Hague Conference in 1899 and into the turn of the century. They were influenced, however, by the currents of internationalist thought that preceded their peace activity, especially the anti-imperialist movement and pro-Boer support.

In April 1899, Edwin's editorial in *New England Magazine* articulated his idea of American exceptionalism within a new internationalism. He discussed a group called the Good Citizenship Society and noted that this group declared "international duty to be a prime factor in all good citizenship to-day."[344] Citizens of the world had duties to all of humanity and not just their fellow nationals. Moreover, he proclaimed that "the methods of war do not fit the age" and that the United States had a "peculiar" obligation to lead the way in anti-militarism. In July 1899, Edwin Mead returned to these arguments with a passionate pamphlet for the Anti-Imperialist League decrying the subjugation of the Philippines and calling attention to America's special duty to help the world. He noted that "a century ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men—not simply all Americans—are created equal, are God's children and to be treated everywhere and always as God's children."[345] His pamphlet engaged directly with ideas about American superiority and

---

[343] John M. Craig, *Lucia Ames Mead (1856-1936) and the American Peace Movement*, (Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1990).
[344] Mead, "Editor's Table - The Peace Movement in Boston."
[345] Mead, *The Present Crisis*, 11.

provided evidence from Americans themselves that the Filipinos were worthy of self-government. These notions of duty surpassing the borders of a nation were integral to the Meads' worldview. Their new thinking about the world and America's role on the cusp of the turn of the century shaped how they thought and wrote about the British Empire's war in South Africa.

In January 1900, Edwin responded to an article in the *Boston Herald* that argued that both sides of the war were at fault.[346] Using language that mocked the rhetoric justifying both the South African and the Philippine-American wars, he noted,

> Of course, we know it, as we also know well that a 'superior' person and 'superior' nation are under superior obligations to act righteously, and that when they do not do it, ... they should suffer the greater punishment, and not have their 'superiority' cited as a very reason why they should thrive and 'have our sympathy' in their tyranny and sin.

He then echoed his two Englands comment from October saying "it is not a question whether we love England; it is the question, Which England do we love? It is the question, Shall Americans range themselves today with Joseph Chamberlain or with James Bryce?" In other words, did Americans support the English who spoke for the empire, or did they support the English who spoke for freedom? Mead closed this article lamenting the fact that the two great Anglo-Saxon nations would be engaged in war against weaker peoples.[347]

Through the summer of 1900, Edwin wrote a series of editorials that touched on the war, intertwining it with the larger theme of the role of great nations in an international world. He first drew attention to the recent work of J. A. Hobson, who had been a correspondent in the war. He

---

[346] Edwin D. Mead, "Boer Warriors Defended," *The Boston Herald*, January 13, 1900, Box DG 021 Edwin D. Mead and Lucia Ames Mead 2 (microfilm reel 78.1), Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, PA.
[347] Discourses of civilization shaped his world view, but importantly, unlike other peace advocates, he brought together the Boers and Filipinos as a weak people, based not on race but on lack of resources. Sutton argues that peace advocates saw the evolving international law after The Hague Conference as only applicable to Boers (not Filipinos) and therefore applicable only "to wars among white people." Edwin's statement however demonstrates that this was not universally the case. Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism," 125.

noted that Hobson, "of all Englishmen who have personally investigated the situation in South Africa, he is by far the most important, save Mr. Bryce alone."[348] He agreed with Hobson that the British overplayed excuses to force the war, especially claims of suffrage rights.[349] In a July article of *National Geographic Magazine,* he questioned the entirety of the British Empire noting that rather than strengthening the empire, control of India weakened it because "no people can be kept permanently in leading strings."[350] At the same time, he held to the idea that Great Britain and the United States as "the mother country and the daughter country" could stand together to be inspirations and "devoted to whatever makes for the peace and freedom of the world."[351] His fall editorial for *New England Magazine* compared the three wars fought at the century's close, the Spanish-American war, the Philippine-American war, and the South African war. He noted that while many, including him, believed that the Spanish-American war began with just principles—the freeing of the Cubans—later actions had been "unworthy and baneful."[352] He decried the senselessness of the wars observing all that was lost in South Africa:

> Five hundred millions in South Africa! — the ten thousand graves, the hundred thousand blasted homes, the two little nations with their possibilities and aspirations smitten down, the freedom-loving world aghast, the century looming up ahead for England big with its burden of resentment, turmoil and menace, vaster and more inveterate far than the long hate and threat of Ireland![353]

Throughout this period, Edwin wrestled with the place of the U.S. as an exceptional nation with

---

[348] Edwin D. Mead, "Editor's Table - War in South Africa," *New England Magazine* 22, no. 3 (May 1900): 369–80.
[349] He also agreed with Hobson's focus on Jewish financial and commercial concerns, pointing out that the critique was useful not because they were "enemies of Jews" but because of the nature of the oligarchy in South Africa. Hobson pushed the Jewish conspiracy angle in his writing, but it is interesting that Mead felt he must insert a claim that he was not anti-Semitic. Mead, 371.
[350] Edwin D. Mead, "The Expansion of England," *National Geographic Magazine*, July 1900, 261, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000397540.
[351] Mead, 263.
[352] Edwin D. Mead, "Editor's Table," *New England Magazine* 23, no. 3 (November 1900), 249, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000548075.
[353] Mead, 349.

a mission to do good and the duties that exceptionality placed on its shoulders.

By the summer of 1901, Lucia and Edwin were circulating among many notable reformers and peace activists during their trip to Europe.[354] In July 1901, they attended a small conference of pro-Boers at William Stead's invitation that included James Keir Hardie, David Lloyd George, whom she identifies as a "Welsh member", and Mrs. Bodde, "an Englishwoman from Pretoria" who had returned from a visit at the concentration camps in May 1901. The Meads also finally met J. A. Hobson.[355] A key point that Lucia took from Hobson was that Britain's imperial actions had delayed many needed domestic reforms. This situation paralleled the issues facing the United States and its imperial endeavors.[356]

Her diary closes with their attendance at the tenth annual Universal Peace Congress in Glasgow. Attracting European peace activists, many of the leaders recognized Lucia's growing prominence in the community. After W.T. Stead presented a damning resolution that "excommunicated of humanity" all nations who supported war, Lucia was asked to temper his language and later to give a speech. She "assented and said with privilege came responsibility." She upheld that governments had a responsibility to their citizens to avoid war at all costs and, moreover, the peace community needed to educate voters on why avoiding war was the best course. An educated citizenry would choose a government that would act more responsibly. In this sense, a government had a responsibility to choose peace, while they as peace activists had the duty to educate.

---

[354] Lucia Ames Mead, "Diary of Lucia Mead" (Diary, 1901), Lucia A. Mead Correspondence, 1903-1919, Box DG 021 Edwin D. and Lucia Ames Mead, microfilm reel 78.4, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, PA.
[355] When Lucia met Hobson, he was in the middle of writing his work, *Imperialism: A Study,* that would later influence Lenin. While this work was not as anti-Semitic as his accounts of the South African War, Hobson alluded to Jewish financial power as a driver for capitalist oligarchy which fueled imperialism.
[356] Craig, *Lucia Ames Mead (1856-1936) and the American Peace Movement*, 69.

In her diary, Lucia described her time spent writing for various outlets. One of her articles, published in the *Boston Evening Transcript* in August 1900, outlined some of her encounters during the trip.[357] She commented that the South African war was on the top of everyone's minds in Great Britain but only a small number openly opposed the war. She maintained that around five percent were with Stead and the Stop-the-War party and twenty percent saw the war as a crime but did not see the point in the Transvaal demanding independence. Around forty percent criticized the government and blamed the Jameson raid for aggravating the issue but saw the Boer ultimatum as a mistake. Finally, thirty-five percent saw the war as inevitable and called the first twenty-five percent traitors to the empire. In addition, she discussed her meetings with former inhabitants of the Boer concentration camps that would become more prominent over the next year. Although they were allowed to go to Europe for medical aid, the Boers described the destruction of homes and property in retaliation for family members taking up arms. Lucia noted that "if this statement be true…this, as even a child knows, goes beyond all the bounds of civilized warfare and deserves stern investigation."[358] By this time, Emily Hobhouse had already issued her report on the camps, but it is obvious from Lucia's diary that some realities of camp life were still coming to light.

Historian David S. Patterson points to the Spanish-American War as a catalyst for Edwin and Lucia Mead's involvement in the Anti-Imperialist League.[359] The European trip, however, was a turning point for both as they began to devote their attention and skills to writing in support of peace and justice, especially Lucia in her writings. She maintained that the only way

---

[357] Lucia Ames Mead, "The War Must Go On," *Boston Evening Transcript*, August 3, 1901, Newspapers.com.
[358] Mead.
[359] David S. Patterson, *Toward a Warless World: The Travail of the American Peace Movement, 1887-1914* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976), 67.

to change society would be to ensure justice "and through justice, reason instead of folly, and peace instead of war."[360] Moreover, her arguments focused on the duties of the state; not only citizens had an obligation to pursue justice, but governments did as well. These ideas of international law and the duties of the United States to the international community were also mirrored in the petitions sent to the U.S. Congress.

Alongside the speeches and writings of various figures, petitions in a large-scale campaign that started in late 1899 and ran until the end of the war in 1902 echoed these sentiments. From Oakland, California to Atlantic City, New Jersey, petitioners met in weekly social groups or in mass meetings to solicit hundreds of signatures on resolutions in support of the Boers.[361] Similar to the Armenian drive, some petitions were unique with specific demands and others were reprints or even handwritten copies of national petitions. Also, unlike the Armenian petitions, which had been concentrated on the east coast, the petitions to support the Boers came from all regions of the country. The signatures on the petitions represent a wide swath of American life and therefore provide some indication of public sentiment on the war. These documents demonstrate how the American public viewed the role of the British empire, the obligations of the empire to the Boers, and the obligations of the U.S. to intervene in an unjust war.

Citizens groups and German and Irish Leagues such as the Turners Societies and the Ancient Order of the Hibernians wrote many of the petitions up to 1902. The petitions became increasingly more formal especially after the founding of the American Transvaal League (ATL)

---

[360] Lucia Ames Mead, "Address of Miss Lucia T. Ames," in *Report of the Third Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.* (Mohonk Lake, N.Y.: Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1902), 63.
[361] National Archives & Records Administration. Records of the U.S. House of Representatives 56th. Box 86.

in December 1899. The first ATL meeting held in Grand Rapids, Michigan rallied a few ethnic groups, including the Ancient Order of the Hibernians, the German Turners, and Polish clubs, and was reported across the nation in the local press.[362] In September 1900, the ATL became a national organization based in Chicago with branches in New York, San Francisco, Grand Rapids, and various smaller towns. The mission of the ATL was the creation of "a more united and systematic effort for the Boers," and they developed "an endless chain" petition drive that would gain thousands of signatures from all over the country.[363]

The petitions present several key themes that shift over the course of two years and in response to the events of the war. The earliest petitions revealed a sense of Anglophobia stemming from various sources. First, many compared the Boer experience to the historical experience of the U.S. and the American Revolution. The City Council of Pella, Iowa made common cause with the Boers in one of the early petitions from January 1900, noting that like the Boers, the U.S. had "wrested the precious boon of self-government from the self same ruthless invader."[364] Similarly, a petition from St. Paul, Minnesota reminded the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain, that the Boers were repeating the struggle that the U.S. had made a century ago.[365] The idea of the British Empire as a common historical enemy was prevalent throughout many of the petitions. They also decried the British as greedy and an imperialistic absorber of smaller nations. Citizens of Keokuk, Iowa noted that "greedy England has from time immemorial maintained a land grabbing system in all quarters of

---

[362] "Boer Meeting in Grand Rapids," *The Kearney Daily Hub*, December 19, 1899, Newspapers.com; "Another Big Boer Meeting.," *Grand Rapids Herald*, December 28, 1900, Newspapers.com.
[363] "To Lend Aid to the Boers," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 16, 1900, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[364] "Petition from City of Pella, Iowa," January 2, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[365] "Petition from St. Paul Minnesota," January 6, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

the globe to the great oppression of the natives of the countries taken by her."[366] Moreover, a meeting in Oakland, California appealed for the U.S. to support the republics because "we emphatically and heartily condemn the Government of Great Britain, the hereditary foe of liberty and the oppressor of small nations."[367] Finally, a petition from a meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota pointed to a potent and familiar example, maintaining that "this meeting expresses its deep sympathy and good will for the Boers, and sends to them its encouragement and its best wishes for their success in their gallant struggle to prevent the establishment of another Ireland upon the ruins of their republics."[368] These petitions reflected the idea that Great Britain was rapacious in its acquisition of smaller nations to benefit the enlargement of its empire. Missing of course from most of these statements was the recognition that the Boers also stole land from Black Africans.

Following from the idea of a common history, petitioners argued that the U.S. and the Boers shared a common form of government—the republic. A meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Connecticut called on the U.S. to support republics all over the world, saying that "we consider it a duty to aid and assist sister republics in retaining their rights against despotic powers."[369] A mass meeting in Atlantic City made the point clearly: "Resolved that our Government, having helped the struggling Cubans to throw off Spanish oppression by forceful intervention, should at least extend a generous measure of sympathy to the South African

---

[366] "Resolutions That Talk: Petition from City of Keokuk, Iowa," January 4, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[367] "Resolutions: Petition from Oakland, CA," January 25, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[368] "Petition from Minneapolis, Minn.," February 9, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[369] "Petition from Norwich, Conn.," January 19, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

Republics, and encourage the maintenance of every republican form of Government."[370] Finally, a mass meeting in South Dakota claimed that Americans would support any republican government even if it were weak as long as the government was "of the people by the people and for the people."[371] Unlike the Armenian petitions that argued that the Ottomans needed to have not only the right to rule but the *ability* to govern themselves, some petitioners tacitly recognized that the Boers were not the model of good government. Nevertheless, they had the right to choose the *type* of government they wanted.

As such, many focused on the principles of self-government and consent of the governed. These petitions used similar language to the AILs regarding the Filipinos. Citizens of Waterbury, Connecticut declared that "all civilized governments shall rest only on the consent of the governed," and that the U.S. had historically supported liberty-loving nations, such as Greece, Hungary, Cuba, and the South American Republics. Therefore, the U.S. should support the Boers.[372] Finally, these petitions noted that self-government guaranteed some amount of sovereignty, echoing the refrain that the Anti-Imperialist League borrowed from Abraham Lincoln that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."[373]

By the spring of 1900, the discourse shifted to the need for American mediation or intervention in an unjust war. The Transvaal Committee of California used British history as a justification. Their petition noted that Great Britain had been allowed to intervene between belligerent parties in the past, a custom which "has been sanctioned by all the civilized nations of

---

[370] "Petition from Atlantic City, NJ," February 2, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[371] "Petition from South Dakota," February 14, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[372] "Resolutions Passed by Waterbury, CT," March 6, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[373] "Petition from St. Louis, MO.," January 28, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

the Earth, and accepted and approved by every recognized authority on international law." As such, the U.S. should intervene as an arbitrator in the conflict "in the interest of humanity and freedom."[374] Many groups invoked the recent Universal Peace Conference at the Hague to justify American mediation and in a few cases outright military intervention.

The peak of the first wave of petitions for the Boers ran from January to March 1900 with a few trickling in through May. The next and larger wave did not begin until December 1901. While themes from this first wave remained in the next wave of petitions, the dominant concern was no longer self-government or consent of the governed. Instead, the focus of the petitions shifted to the concentration camps and the staggering death rates that were finally coming to light. The next section provides a brief history of the concentration camps system and reviews responses in Great Britain and the U.S.

The Concentration Camp System

Although the British began winning battles in early 1900, they were increasingly facing guerrilla warfare. To prevent Boer communities from aiding their combatants, the British began destroying farms and property in the spring of 1900.[375] These "scorched earth" tactics led to the displacement of thousands of Boer and Black African communities, a development to which the British responded by creating camps for concentrating civilians. While the first camp may have been Mafeking in July 1900, the British created the larger system of concentration camps in the fall and early winter of 1900.[376] On December 21, Lord Herbert Kitchener, newly appointed

---

[374] "Petition from Transvaal Committee of California," March 23, 1900, Record Group 233, Box 86, Folder HR56A-H7.3, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[375] John Fisher, *That Miss Hobhouse.* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1971); S. B. Spies, *Methods of Barbarism? : Roberts and Kitchener and Civilians in the Boer Republics, January 1900-May 1902* (Cape Town: Human & Rousseau, 1977), 108; Elizabeth Van Heyningen, *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War* (Aukland Park, South Africa: Jacana Media, 2013); Forth, *Barbed-Wire Imperialism*, 139.
[376] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 144.

Commander of the British Forces in South Africa, issued Army Circular No. 29 which included implementation of civilian concentration orders.[377] The military was in charge of the administration of the camps during this first period, but in the spring, civilians began to take over control because of concerns that the military did not have the training and resources to provide adequate care.[378] By the summer of 1902, after the Treaty of Vereeniging ended the war**,** the British began to slowly empty the camps.

Historians have demonstrated that the concentration camps were not isolated or *ad hoc* instances. Instead, the British created what Emily Hobhouse called a "concentration system", which included the combination of their 'scorched earth' policy, camps, martial law, and bureaucrats.[379] The British claimed that they established the camps for the protection of surrendering Boers, giving the camps a humanitarian twist. Historians argue that the concentration of people was integral to British military strategy and therefore more appropriately considered concentration camps, meaning a camp created to concentrate the population to avoid giving aid to enemy forces.[380] Moreover, as Aidan Forth demonstrates, the creation, organization, and use of the camps fits within the Empire's longer history of controlling civilians.[381] Placing the camps in a genealogical line with plague and famine camps in other areas, Forth notes that "they embodied the repressive and humanitarian vagaries of the British Empire—the Jekyll and Hyde of Britain's fin-de-siècle imperial venture."[382] The British imperial

---

[377] A year later in December 1901, General Bell issued his orders for concentration in the Philippines.
[378] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 193.
[379] Liz Stanley, "'A Strange Thing Is Memory': Emily Hobhouse, Memory Work, Moral Life and the 'Concentration System,'" *South African Historical Journal* 52, no. 1 (January 2005): 191, https://doi.org/10.1080/02582470509464864.
[380] Iain R. Smith and Andreas Stucki, "The Colonial Development of Concentration Camps (1868–1902)," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 39, no. 3 (September 1, 2011): 426, https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2011.598746.
[381] Forth, *Barbed-Wire Imperialism*, 4.
[382] Forth, 131.

state drew on previous systems of welfare and social control both in the colonies as well as in the metropole.

No matter the reason for the creation of the camps, the results were undeniable. In the end, the British camps held over 116,000 Boers and a similar number of Africans. Around 28,000 civilians in total died from malnourishment or disease. Of those, 22,000 were children and 4,000 were women. Of the Africans, around 14,000 died in segregated camps.[383] According to S.V. Kessler, the military did not keep track of the number of deaths during their period of administration from September 1900 to February and March of 1901. As such, the numbers of deaths in the white and black camps may have been much higher. The causes of death differed by camps, but most civilians died from contagious diseases caused by a lack of adequate sanitation, food, and housing.[384]

In the initial phases of the system's creation, many British assumed that it was an orderly process and that the military was protecting the Boers. After Emily Hobhouse's visit in early 1901, however, it became clear that the official British version was not accurate, and she used the mortality rates and lack of adequate care of women and children to sway the British public. Emily Hobhouse came to prominence through her work as the honorary secretary of the women's branch of the British SACC starting in November 1899. She first made news in the *Guardian* in a June 12, 1900 story about a riot at a pro-Boer rally in which a Miss Hobhouse "was, fortunately, saved from injury."[385] At a protest meeting on June 14, presided over by Catherine Courtney and with Marion Bryce in attendance, Emily Hobhouse proposed a

---

[383] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 227; B. E. Mongalo and Pisani Kobus Du, "Victims of a White Man's War: Blacks in Concentration Camps during the South African War (1899-1902)," *Historia* 44, no. 1 (May 1999): 149, https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC37937; Lowry, *The South African War Reappraised*, 2.
[384] S. V. Kessler, "The Black Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War.," *Historia* 44, no. 1 (1999): 134, 137.
[385] "Our London Correspondence," *The Guardian*, June 12, 1900, Newspapers.com.

resolution in support of the women of the South African Republics and expressing regret with British government policy.[386] Although the wider focus was not on camps at this point, the public knew that civilians were being displaced and left destitute as a result of the war. In response, Hobhouse founded the Women's and Children's Distress Fund, which by December 1900 had raised enough money to send her to South Africa on a relief mission. She remained in South Africa from January to May 1901 visiting Bloemfontein and other camps and delivering food and clothing.

The farm burnings and "scorched earth policy" had gained public attention well before the concentration orders, prompting an impassioned plea from Leonard Courtney to cease in the *Times*.[387] Hobhouse's letters home in March and April 1901, however, encouraged members of Parliament to ask questions, especially of the Secretary of State for War William Broderick.[388] On June 17, 1901, Hobhouse delivered her report to Parliament, and on June 19, the *Manchester Guardian* published portions. The report included a series of letters with her observations on conditions in the camps, a set of recommendations, and an appendix with statements from women and children. Historian Elizabeth Van Heyningen argues that her report shocked the public and helped to bring wider attention to the camps.[389] W.T. Stead cited Hobhouse's work in his *Review of Reviews* comparing her efforts to American responses to the *reconcentrado* policies of Spain. He noted that "Miss Hobhouse has done for Europe what Senator Proctor did for his countrymen. She has turned the light of day upon a hell of suffering deliberately created

---

[386] "Summary of News. Domestic," *The Guardian*, June 14, 1900, Newspapers.com.
[387] Leonard Courtney, "Farm-Burning in The Transvaal And Orange River Colonies," *The Times*, November 28, 1900, Gale The Times Digital Archive.
[388] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 216; Heyningen, *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War*, 183.
[389] Elizabeth Van Heyningen, "The Concentration Camps of the South African (Anglo-Boer) War, 1900–1902," *History Compass* 7, no. 1 (2009): 183, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00562.x; Heyningen, *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War*.

for expediting a policy of conquest."[390] The report's publicity and Hobhouse's speaking tour generated wider interest in the plight of Boers.

In August 1901, the Fawcett Commission, led by a group of women doctors and reformers under the auspices of the British government, arrived in South Africa to conduct its own investigation. Led by Millicent Garrett Fawcett, whom Hobhouse accused of having a strong anti-Boer bias, the commission's report finally forced the administration to implement reforms.[391] The reforms helped slow the growth of the camps and thereby the mortality rate in the white camps, but the British continued to send Black Africans to camps through the end of the war. In her later book on the war, Hobhouse noted that she thought the Fawcett Commission was going to visit the black camps, but their report did not cover them.[392] She therefore wrote a letter to Fox Bourne of the Aborigines Protection Society, who sent a letter to Chamberlain about their concerns. Chamberlain on May 2, 1902, wrote back that the conditions had improved and therefore no investigation was needed. Hobhouse throughout her South Africa experience did not believe that the black camps were her purview.[393] Unfortunately, although one member of the Fawcett Commission, Dr. Jane Waterston, visited the black camps, the Commission's purview did not extend to them either.[394]

Hobhouse's report and her later book the *Brunt of War and Where it Fell* were influential in framing the issue for British and American audiences. This work evoked "civilian suffering" as a moral and political wrong, nesting her activity squarely within the wider networks of reform

---

[390] W. T. Stead, "A Chance for the Small States," *The Review of Reviews.* 24 (July 1, 1901): 9.
[391] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 254–63.
[392] Emily Hobhouse, *The Brunt of the War, and Where It Fell* (Methuen & Company, 1902). H
[393] Fisher, *That Miss Hobhouse.*
[394] Heyningen, *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War*, 192.

movements.[395] Nevertheless, her writings primarily focused on the sufferings of white Boers and were steeped in a language evocative of past campaigns that highlighted the suffering of women and children. As noted by her biographer, John Fisher, her main accomplishment was bringing attention to the camps especially considering the high level of government censorship of the media during the war.[396] At a dinner hosted by the National Reform Union, in June 1901, soon after Hobhouse had submitted her report, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, a leader of the Liberal party and a pro-Boer, gave a scathing speech criticizing British military policy. He described the policy as one in which "we should sweep—as the Spaniards did in Cuba; and how we denounced the Spaniards—the women and children into camps in which they were destitute of all the decencies and comforts." Then he denounced the apathy in the House of Commons by noting: "When was a war not a war? When it was carried on by methods of barbarism in South Africa."[397] The phrase "methods of barbarism" became a rally cry for the pro-Boers against British actions similar to Secretary Root's phrase "marked severities" used by Moorfield Storey and the Anti-Imperialist League.

In May 1901 after Hobhouse's return from South Africa, the first articles began appearing in the American press using the term "concentration camps."[398] The language at American Transvaal League (ATL) meetings also shifted from the language of consent of the governed to a focus on the civilized behavior of a state at war. At a September meeting in Chicago, George D. Heldemann of the St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church noted that the "massing of old men, women, and children in the *reconcentrados* of South Africa is the greatest

---

[395] Rebecca Gill and Cornelis Muller, "The Limits of Agency: Emily Hobhouse's International Activism and the Politics of Suffering," *Safundi* 19, no. 1 (January 2, 2018): 16–35, https://doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2018.1404744.
[396] Fisher, *That Miss Hobhouse.*, 206–7.
[397] "Dinner to Liberal Leaders," *The Times*, June 15, 1901, The Times Digital Archive.
[398] "The South African War," *Harrisburg Telegraph*, May 27, 1901, Newspapers.com.

crime of the twentieth century" and even called for armed intervention.[399] At a November meeting of the ATL, Western Starr, an Anti-Imperialist League member as well, spoke to principles governing civilized behavior including the right to intervene to protect civilians, saying Americans "have all power and every right, in the name of humanity, to intervene at this time, and it is our solemn duty as a people, speaking through our Executive to protest." He also asserted, "that in this war, and in any future war, the laws and usages of civilized warfare shall be observed—and that a departure from this principle will be regarded as a declaration of war on all mankind and treated accordingly."[400]

By December 1901, Americans were aware of the full extent of the concentration camps. The Philadelphia Committee for Relief of Boer Women and Children in South Africa issued a petition to Congress in early December declaring that conditions in the war "are not a consequence of lawful venture, but result from reconcentrado camps, an inhuman modern device adopted for strategic purposes, and to gain unfair military advantages." Furthermore, they argued that "any Government which authorizes it in warfare, and thus attempts to conquer heroic men by the torture of their women and children rather than by prowess, should be discredited by its own people and universally condemned."[401] The norms of civilized behavior governed all states, even the largest and most powerful empire, at least in regard to white women and children. On December 21, 1901, the *New York Times* published an appeal to aid the women and children in South Africa, admonishing those "who listened with such a willing ear and open heart to the cries of the Cubans, to the starving distress of India, to the famine-stricken Russian, to every one

---

[399] "See New Hope for Boers," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 24, 1901, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[400] "Pleads to Save Boers," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 25, 1901, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[401] "Petition from Philadelphia, PA," December 2, 1901, Record Group 233, Box 77, Folder HR57A - H7.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.

that was in distress", but who were not coming to the aid of the Boers.[402] The mortality rate was the cause of great concern. The Turin-Verein of Reading, Pennsylvania, a German American ethnic group, described the conditions in their resolution, noting that "pestilence and death have overtaken" the inhabitants "until the mortality has risen to an abnormal and frightful extent, thereby creating a condition far worse than that which justified this, our Country, in making war to free the Cubans."[403] Women and especially children were disproportionately represented in the mortality rate, but this discourse ignored the fact that many male noncombatants as well as Black African noncombatants of both genders were in camps throughout the region.

In addition to norms of civilized behavior, international law was invoked especially in relation to arbitration. Louis Ehrich, an art dealer and at the time a Colorado-based member of the AIL, sent Storey a copy of a letter he wrote to President Theodore Roosevelt, asking Roosevelt to consider arbitrating the war in conjunction with European powers and declaiming that "England would never have committed the crime in South Africa if we had not become her 'kin in sin' by what we are doing in Asia."[404] In this case, he was not referring to camps specifically, but to the crime of great nations taking over "weaker" republics and races. Furthermore, a large wave of petitions created by the ATL questioned the U.S.'s violation of its own neutrality laws by supplying the British military with mules and horses through Port Chalmette in Louisiana.[405] These petitions called for attention to American duties through the vehicle of international obligations and treaties.

---

[402] "Appeal for Boer Women," *New York Times*, December 21, 1901, ProQuest New York Times.
[403] "Petition from Reading Turn-Verein of Reading, PA," December 13, 1901, Record Group 233, Box 77, Folder HR57A - H7.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[404] Louis B. Ehrich to President Roosevelt, November 16, 1901, Box 1, Folder 1900-1901, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
[405] Most of these reached Congress in March 1902.

Similar to the speeches at the ATL meetings, many petitions contended that Britain was departing "from the usages of civilized warfare" by "destruction of property of non-combatants."[406] Several petitions, especially those from the Ancient Order of the Hibernians, used the language of atrocities to describe British actions in the war. Jennifer Sutton maintains that the camps "did not violate any *international* laws among sovereign states, since it arose in struggles *within* empires."[407] While this loophole allowed great powers to avoid responsibility under international law, the organizational leaders and signers of these petitions invoked the norms of civilized behavior of great powers to argue that no empire should treat its subjects and that no state should treat its people in the manner that Britain was treating the Boers. The laws of war were one thing; the behaviors and duties of civilized states were another. Moreover, international law still applied to the actions of the U.S. as the petitions used the language of the Hague Conventions and other international treaties to argue that the U.S. could arbitrate and should not violate neutrality.

Finally, petitions grappled with questions of identity and humanity. The Philadelphia Committee's petition in December for example argued that Americans should assist the Boers because they could be seen as a common race and blood. Some invoked the common Christian identity of the Boers as justification for American support. Others emphasized their common humanity rather than race as justification for action. The Irish-American Societies in Kansas City, for example, elaborated that, "our sympathies, earnest and heartfelt, go forth to every people of every color or race or creed who are in bondage or who are battling against oppression

---

[406] "Petition from Transvaal League of America, Omaha Branch," January 21, 1902, Record Group 233, Box 77, Folder HR57A - H7.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[407] Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism," 296.

and brute force for the God given right of self-government."[408] Even the Philadelphia petition noted that "we esteem humanity to be greater than nationality and hold that the demands of humanity cannot be stopped by national barriers." In some ways, these refrains echo the language of the Meads. While they recognized a commonality with the Boers through their religion and skin color, they also wrestled with a more universal identity. This tension of a common humanity transcending nation-state boundaries but stopping at the color line would continue to shape interpretations of state responsibilities in the face of atrocities.

Although for Louis Ehrich, the Meads, and Storey the actions of the U.S. in the Philippines and the actions of the British in South Africa were analogous, American attention was solidly focused on the white Boer camps with little mention of Black Africans. Racial affinity with the Boers guided much of this myopia, but the African American press also did not have much engagement with the black camps.[409] At the same time, it is unclear that the Americans had extensive awareness of the black camps because Hobhouse and others had not drawn attention to their existence or to the death toll. As much as British connections influenced action, they also shaped silences.

The British Empire and Sovereign Responsibilities

In a letter to James Bryce during the final two months of the war, Charles Eliot, the President of Harvard, commented on the significant times in which they were living.[410] He wrote of Spain, the U.S., and Great Britain:

Isn't it a remarkable thing that three Christian nations at the end of the Nineteenth

---

[408] "Petition from Irish-American Societies of Kansas City, MO," March 21, 1902, Record Group 233, Box 78, Folder HR57A - H7.1, Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
[409] Sutton, "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism," 294.
[410] Charles Eliot to James Bryce, March 14, 1902, USA 1, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.

> Century and the beginning of the Twentieth should have adopted a war measure which is really crueller than anything mankind has yet exhibited in a state of war, – namely, the concentration camp?

Historians note that while the British tried to provide some level of care for the camp inhabitants, they created the conditions in which mortality would be high.[411] Moreover, although camps were not barred by the Hague Convention of 1899, they violated the spirit, specifically Article 46, which states: "Family honours and rights, individual lives and private property, as well as religious convictions and liberty, must be respected. Private property cannot be confiscated."[412]

Throughout the campaign against the war, American and British supporters grappled with questions of justice in the face of a perceived unjust imperial intervention. Many argued for the right of self-government and consent of the governed much as they had during the Filipino crisis. As the actions of the British became untenable, they shifted focus to the humanitarian crises unfolding in South Africa.[413] They invoked international law and norms of state behavior as governing principles both for limiting empire and shaping policy of greater nations towards weaker ones. As a republic with a divine mission, in their minds, the United States had a responsibility to both the international community and its own citizens and subjects to act in a civilized manner. These discourses shaped the notion that sovereignty had limits universal to all nations and that individuals could call on the international community for assistance.

Moreover, the American pro-Boers were reconciling notions of race and civilization in the British empire with notions of the same in the new American empire. For the most part this

---

[411] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*; Kessler, "The Black Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War."; Smith and Stucki, "The Colonial Development of Concentration Camps (1868–1902)."
[412] Spies, *Methods of Barbarism?*, 268.
[413] This shift provides additional evidence for Michael Cullinane's description of the American Anti-Imperial movement as a whole. He argues that by 1900 anti-imperialists who had spoken against the South African war shifted from focusing on self-government to focusing on humanitarianism, especially as they began protesting Belgian imperial policy in the Congo. Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*, 85.

created a hardening of the color line with Irish and other European immigrants using their Boer support to redefine Anglo-Saxon supremacy into a supremacy of whiteness.[414] These "ethnic" Americans felt an affinity with the Boer plight because of their own feelings of exclusion or subordination in broader political and social contexts. This complex interplay between those who were included and those who were excluded in the Anglo-Saxon culture shaped an emerging notion about whiteness in response to the war.

At the same time, some of those involved in the American pro-Boer movement turned their critical lens inward to domestic concerns. They argued that the U.S. was not free of criticism and needed to be held to the standards it demanded of other countries. Edwin Mead pointed to the hardening of the color line in his observations during the Philippine-American war, comparing the current war to the American Civil war. He noted, that "the nation has come in 1899 to act upon the principle which it took up arms to suppress in 1861, that liberty belongs of right only to white men, and that black and brown men must take what white men give," lamenting the reality that the "logic of Luzon has brought back to new life the warring philosophies of 1861."[415] The hypocrisy of the U.S. would be a consistent refrain reflected in the writings and speeches of the Meads, Moorfield Storey, and especially the black community with educators like Anna Julia Cooper. In a 1902 speech, Cooper declared that "a nation cannot long survive the shattering of its ideals. Its doom is already sounded when it begins to write one law in its walls and lives another in its halls."[416] As they began working with African American

---

[414] James Todd Uhlman, "Dispatching Anglo-Saxonism: Whiteness and the Crises of American Racial Identity in Richard Harding Davis's Reports on the Boer War," *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 19, no. 1 (January 2020): 36, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781419000434.
[415] Mead, *The Present Crisis*, 22.
[416] Anna Julia Cooper, "The Ethics of the Negro Question Speech by Anna Julia Cooper" (Speech, September 5, 1902), Addresses, A. J. Cooper Manuscripts, Digital Howard, Howard University, Washington DC, https://dh.howard.edu/ajc_addresses/19.

activists, Storey and other anti-imperialists turned their attention to the atrocities that the U.S. allowed within its own borders, the brutality of lynch law as a tool of racial oppression.

CHAPTER V: RACISM: THE AMERICAN EMPIRE AND SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY

In November 1906, Clement Morgan, an African American attorney in Boston, attended the eighth annual meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League. Slavery-born and Harvard-educated, Morgan listened to the League's reports including those on efforts to achieve Philippine independence, election of its new officers, and memorials for founding members Carl Schurz, Edward Atkinson, and Edwin Burritt Smith. For the second time as President, Moorfield Storey then stepped up to the podium to close the proceedings. His speech at the annual meeting the previous year had focused on the Philippines, upholding the principle of the consent of the governed; his second speech as President broadened his argument. He lamented the dominance of the doctrine that "one nation has the right to govern another without that other's consent," but then he pressed further saying that another doctrine ruled civilization—one that denied rights based on the color of one's skin. He maintained that the "so-called race problem confronts us everywhere", and then traced American actions in the Philippines to events in the U.S. The administration was violating rights in the Philippines just as the Southern states were violating the rights of Black men. In this way, "we see how imperialism abroad begets imperialism at home."[417] Storey recognized lynching as a serious problem prior to the U.S.'s entanglement in the Philippines; this statement does not imply causation. Rather, he argued that ignoring rights based on the color of skin in the Philippines was inseparable from the degradation of rights at home.

The next day Clement Morgan wrote a letter to Storey, thanking him for his "superb

---

[417] Anti-Imperialist League, "Report of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League," December 3, 1906, CDG-A, Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA; "Usurps Powers of the Congress," *Boston Daily Globe*, December 4, 1906, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

address" that was "true to the best, noblest, and highest ideals of humanity." He invited Storey to a meeting to be held a few days later under the auspices of the Niagara Movement, asking him to say "a few words of hope."[418] It is not clear from the documents if Storey attended that meeting, but a letter from another correspondent that year referenced Niagara and W.E.B. Du Bois.[419] The correspondent had spoken with Dr. Horace Bumstead, President of Atlanta University, about Du Bois, remarking that Bumstead "says Du Bois is very bitter – but we may well ask 'How could he well be otherwise?'" A year later Storey began corresponding with Du Bois, saying to him "I have long been anxious to meet you … for I am … in very cordial sympathy with your views. I am glad to find that you feel the same sympathy in the work I have been engaged in." Through Morgan's attendance at the meeting and his letter to Storey, the League's leadership became involved with another movement, one that would try to confront America's own atrocities, the lynching of Black men, women, and children by white mobs. These atrocities were not concentrated to a particular time period as with the Armenian massacres or embedded in war as with the Boer concentration camps. Nevertheless, the language of atrocities applied.

In response, an interracial network emerged at the turn of the century combining the efforts of African American leaders such as Ida B. Wells, W.E.B. Du Bois, Mary Church Terrell and others, with white reformers many of whom were involved in the anti-imperial movement, such as Storey, John Milholland, the Meads, and Oswald Garrison Villard. Through their own work and official organizations, especially the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), they used the language of atrocities to criticize the actions of the

---

[418] James Bryce to Moorfield Storey, August 7, 1915, Box 2, Folder 1915, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[419] Unknown to Moorfield Storey, October 24, 1907, Box 2, Folder Nov-Dec 1905, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.

United States both in its hypocrisy in dealing with other nations and in its unwillingness to face the reality of lynching at home. While earlier campaigns focused on shame at the individual level—goading liberal Northerners into action—the later campaign shifted responsibility from the individual to the federal government. Because of prior events and campaigns, the members of this network had a framework through which to interpret and understand federal responsibility in the face of atrocities at home. In this way, it is possible to see a norm shift, from lynching as a localized private community shame or the problem of an individual American community to one in which the federal government had the responsibility to intervene. In addition to a norm shift, these efforts set the legal foundations, slowly and incrementally, for the protection of civil rights at home culminating in the passage of an anti-lynching bill in the next century.

Lynching in the United States

In the United States, for many the term "lynching" evokes the nation's history of racism. However, the term's definition has shifted over time, space, and purpose. The word has been used to support "community justice" or denounced as "community terror" depending on the rhetorical intentions of the definer.[420] For the purpose of this chapter, lynching is defined as "murder sanctioned by a community", focusing on racial lynching as an act of mob violence used to reinforce white supremacy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, primarily but not exclusively in the southern states of the United States.[421] Lynching was rare in comparison to other types of violence and indignities against African Americans, but white mobs used the

[420] Christopher Waldrep makes this point clearly, refusing to define lynching in his work and demonstrating the shift in definitions based on purpose or audience. Christopher Waldrep, "War of Words: The Controversy over the Definition of Lynching, 1899-1940," *The Journal of Southern History* 66, no. 1 (February 2000): 75, https://doi.org/10.2307/2587438; Christopher Waldrep, *The Many Faces of Judge Lynch: Extralegal Violence and Punishment in America* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).
[421] Waldrep, "War of Words," 79; Waldrep, *The Many Faces of Judge Lynch*, 7.

practice as a tool to inflict terror in targeted communities.[422] Similar to the other events happening at the turn of the century, African Americans activists living through moments of heightened racial violence identified lynching in a way that drew support and brought together adherents to fight against the phenomenon. Lynchings against African Americans, who were the majority of the victims in the U.S. in the late 1890s, were not simply executions. In many cases, they were public spectacles with grotesque treatment of individuals accused of crimes without trial. Mobs brutally tortured, mutilated, and killed men, women, and children using a variety of methods. White mobs also displayed bodies as public warnings and stole body parts to keep as souvenirs. Participants in these mobs aimed to create a climate of fear with the purpose of controlling African American populations.

Similar to other atrocities and war, the chosen definition shapes the statistics gathered, but various individuals, newspapers, and organizations attempted to collect data on lynching in the U.S.[423] During the late 19th century, the *Chicago Tribune* was the main newspaper publishing statistics on lynching. The annual compilation, begun in 1882, reported the lynching of all people, but its statistics indicated that a higher percentage of Black persons were lynched especially beginning in the mid-1880s.[424] Later efforts included the work of James Cutler, the compilations of Monroe Work at the Tuskegee Institute, and the NAACP, although their

---

[422] Amy Louise Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940* (Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 2009), 1.

[423] The NAACP in 1940 attempted to set a precise definition for lynching. The NAACP definition includes evidence that a person was killed; the person was killed illegally by a group of three or more persons; and the group operated under a pretext of serving justice or tradition. For obvious reasons, even the NAACP could not adhere to this definition. For more discussion of the debate over defining lynching, see Waldrep, *The Many Faces of Judge Lynch*, 3.

[424] Waldrep maintains rightly that there are issues with the *Tribune's* approach. He notes that the increase in the percentage of Black persons may have coincided with a shift in the definition to racial lynching. Waldrep, 113. At the same time, other sources demonstrate the same increasing percentage of Black persons killed and decreasing percentages of whites. Robert L. Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980), 6–7.

definitions diverged over time.[425] Staff of the NAACP's magazine, the *Crisis*, began compiling statistics in 1912 resulting in the 1919 volume, *Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918*. According to those records, 3224 people were killed in that thirty-year period with 2522 of them African Americans, predominantly men. While lynchings were not confined to the Southern states, most of the activity occurred in the former Confederate region with Mississippi, Florida, Arkansas, and Louisiana having the highest rates.

Contemporary calculations, of course, still depend on definitions and time frames, but they present similar numbers. Robert Zangrando drew on the Archives at Tuskegee Institute from 1882 to 1968, which documented 4743 instances of lynching of which 3446 were people of color. Sociologists Stewart Tolnay and E.M. Peck assert that 2805 people died at the hands of lynch mobs in Southern states from 1882 to 1930.[426] Of those, 2462 were African Americans and 94% of them were killed by white mobs. More recent calculations come from the Equal Justice Initiative, which defines "racial terror lynchings" as "violent and public acts of torture" directed at racial minorities.[427] Using that definition and reviewing court documents, newspapers, and archival sources, they counted 4084 racial terror lynchings between 1877 and 1950.[428]

Similar to the other events described in this dissertation, historians and activists will continue to debate the exact numbers of those Black Americans lynched during the turn of the century. Despite these debates over definitions and numbers, individuals in groups used violence

---

[425] James Elbert Cutler, *Lynch-Law: An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States.* (New York: Longmans, Green, and co., 1905), HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001134313; Monroe Nathan Work, *Negro Year Book* (Tuskegee: Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, 1912), https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/012238867; Waldrep, "War of Words."
[426] Stewart Emory Tolnay and E. M. Beck, *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), ix.
[427] This definition does not include violence committed after a trial process or targeted against non-minorities.
[428] Equal Justice Initiative, *Lynching in America: Confronting the Legacy of Racial Terror* (Equal Justice Initiative, 2017), https://eji.org/wp-content/uploads/2005/11/lynching-in-america-3d-ed-110121.pdf.

as a tool to target racial minorities in the United States and uphold white supremacy.[429] They were often neither brought to justice nor spurned by the communities in which they lived. As with other acts of violence, one must assume that these numbers are an undercount as they are based on those victims who were found, documented, and counted. Such firm knowledge was not always possible. Moreover, lynching activities took on a veneer of show. James McPherson notes that lynchings became more of a public spectacle at the turn of the century with the murder of Sam Hose in Georgia in 1899 as the height of grotesque display.[430]

During the 1890s, numbers of reported lynchings significantly increased with peaks in 1892 and 1893. By the time of the creation of the Anti-Imperialist League, the numbers of those lynched had subsided slightly, but spiked again with highs in 1908 and following World War I and coinciding with the development of the NAACP.[431] These killings were dispersed over time and conducted, in many cases, by actors or officials acting in a private capacity. As such they are not often put in the same frame as international atrocities or outcomes of war. Nevertheless, local and state governments, the very institutions from which African Americans could have hoped to have received protection, often gave tacit or explicit approval to the actions of the mobs. In the Forward to *Thirty Years*, John Shillady, the Secretary of the NAACP, noted that, "the United States has long been the only advanced nation whose government has tolerated lynching."[432] To

---

[429] Amy Louise Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940* (Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 2009), 8.

[430] Waldrep questions the idea that there was an *increase* in public display or ritual through late 19th century as lynching became racialized. At the same time, it is undeniable that public displays were used to intimidate the Black populations. Moreover, many opponents at the time expressed concern with the commercialization of lynching through the selling of photographs and artifacts as Wood has documented. Waldrep, *The Many Faces of Judge Lynch*, 111; McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*; Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle*.

[431] Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 6–7; Tolnay and Beck, *A Festival of Violence*, 29–31.

[432] *Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918* (New York: Negro Universities Press; NAACP, 1919), 5, https://heinonline-org.

understand the trajectory of the anti-lynching campaigns and especially the campaign within the NAACP, it is first necessary to start with Ida B. Wells's own efforts in the mid-1890s. Her arguments, fact-finding missions, and personal connections set the stage for the discussions and advocacy to come.

Early Anti-Lynching Efforts

In 1893, Ida B. Wells left for Great Britain, a trip that established her as a leading American figure in the anti-lynching campaign. During her time in Britain, she worked with many individuals agitating for reforms at home and abroad. After her return to the U.S., she continued to revolve in both black and white reform circles. Even though historians have examined the legacy of Wells's activity, their discussions of her British campaign tend to be bounded by the years 1893 and 1894.[433] As someone who felt a sincere call to respond to injustices against the Black community, Ida B. Wells served as a central node connecting reformers across races, issues, and time. From her British trip when she stayed with P.W. Clayden, the editor of the *Daily News* and Secretary for the Liberal Forwards, to her role in the founding of the NAACP with several anti-imperialists, including Storey, John Milholland, and Oswald Garrison Villard, she overlapped with key humanitarians and reformers. She was also often excluded from circles by virtue of her race, her gender, and her forceful views. However,

---

[433] Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History* (London: Verso, 1992); Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Carolyn L. Karcher, "The White 'Bystander' and the Black Journalist 'Abroad': Albion W. Tourgée and Ida B. Wells as Allies Against Lynching," *Prospects* 29 (January 2005): 85–119, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0361233300001708; Carolyn L. Karcher, "Ida B. Wells and Her Allies against Lynching," *Comparative American Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 2005): 131–51, https://doi.org/10.1177/1477570005052526; Sarah L. Silkey, "Redirecting the Tide of White Imperialism: The Impact of Ida B. Wells's Transatlantic Antilynching Campaign on British Conceptions of American Race Relations," in *Women Shaping the South: Creating and Confronting Change*, ed. Judith N. McArthur and Angela Boswell (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2006); Crystal Feimster, *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009); Sarah L. Silkey, *Black Woman Reformer: Ida B. Wells, Lynching, & Transatlantic Activism* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2015).

she was well-known as a public persona and continued to influence the anti-lynching campaign well into the 20th century.

A key component of Wells's campaign was changing the rhetoric around lynching through the mechanism of British moral pressure on the United States.[434] The American press in the 19th century offered various narratives to explain lynching to itself and to a horrified British public. Earlier narratives justified lynching in situations where the legal systems were not fully formed or incapable of providing redress.[435] A new narrative developed in the late 19th century that targeted African American men, especially after the lynching of Henry Smith for the accused rape and murder of a white child in Paris, Texas in February 1893. After this lynching, rape accusations became more common in which lynching was justified as a method for protecting white women against the presumed malicious intent of Black men.[436] Wells's campaign countered this final narrative by gathering statistical evidence on the reasons for lynching. The 1892 lynching of her friends and owners of the People's Grocery in Memphis gave Wells even more motivation to examine the reasons for extrajudicial actions of mobs. In her writings, she countered the lynching for rape narrative with the argument that lynching was designed to keep African Americans from achieving equality and as a tool of white oppression.

The lynching of Henry Smith also gained the attention of the British anti-slavery reformers Catherine Impey and Isabella Mayo who founded the Society for the Recognition of

---

[434] Seguin and Nardin date a shift in international discourse about lynching to the 1891 lynching of the Italians in New Orleans. They maintain that Ida B. Wells borrowed on that previous rhetoric condemning the practice as uncivilized to bolster her arguments. This chapter begins with Wells because she had direct personal connections with many of the people, domestically and abroad, who became key figures in the later anti-lynching efforts. Charles Seguin and Sabrina Nardin, "The Lynching of Italians and the Rise of Antilynching Politics in the United States," *Social Science History* 46, no. 1 (2022): 67, https://doi.org/10.1017/ssh.2021.43.

[435] This was the justification for the lynching of eleven Italian Americans in New Orleans in 1891. Silkey, *Black Woman Reformer*, 44.

[436] Sarah Silkey calls this the "Southern rape complex". Silkey, 44.

the Brotherhood of Man. They invited Frederick Douglass to come to Great Britain and lecture, but he declined citing his age, and he suggested Wells as a possible replacement. Impey extended her invitation to Wells, and she accepted making her first trip in April 1893 and her second in March 1894. In an editorial letter in the Birmingham *Daily Post* in May 1893, Wells noted why her trip to Great Britain was necessary, saying that

> It is to the religious and moral sentiment of Great Britain we now turn. These can arouse the public sentiment of America so necessary for the enforcement of law. The moral agencies at work in Great Britain did much for the final overthrow of chattel slavery. They can in like manner pray, write, preach, talk and act against civil and industrial slavery; against the hanging, shooting and burning alive of a powerless race.[437]

By appealing to the sentiments of British reformers, Wells intended to shame the U.S. into enacting laws to "put a stop to America's disgrace."[438] Her approach to engaging with the British public was successful partly because rape accusations did not match with British experiences in the colonies.[439] As with other atrocities, British reformers began using the language of civilization to highlight America's shame, saying that the United States was violating its own democratic principles. Wells's campaign in 1894 was more successful after she met the Reverend Charles Aked, a radical Baptist minister involved in many reform movements, including the South African Conciliation Committee. Aked drew on his network to introduce anti-lynching resolutions at the annual meetings of various religious organizations and helped to create the London Anti-Lynching Committee in 1894.[440] Through Wells's activity and insistence on presenting lynching as an affront to civilization, she was able to shape British discussions of the issue even though the Committee focused on the immorality of lynching rather than the

---

[437] Wells-Barnett, *Crusade for Justice*, 86.
[438] Wells-Barnett, 112.
[439] Silkey, *Black Woman Reformer*, 44.
[440] McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, 304.

underlying cause of racial oppression.

A constant in Wells's writings was the desire to bring attention to the hypocrisy of American tolerance of lynching. For example, in one of her *Inter Ocean* dispatches she described an interaction with a British observer who said that the U.S.'s claims for democracy were "absurd" in the light of its caste system. Wells wished that the U.S. could "become as great intellectually and morally as she is materially to protect and honor all her citizens." Only by doing so would the U.S. "make her professions a living reality."[441] The United States was not immune to criticism in the face of its own atrocities. For Wells, however, the main focus was on shaming individuals and communities to stop lynching. As Gail Bederman maintains, Wells used the rhetoric of civilization to appeal to the manliness of white Northerners. She notes that Wells's actions "convinced nervous white Northerners that they needed to take lynch law seriously because it imperiled both American civilization and American manhood."[442]

After her return to the U.S., though, her language began to shift to focus on the rights of citizens within a federal system. Similarly, one of Wells's close correspondents and a fellow antislavery activist, Albion W. Tourgée, argued in his regular *Inter Ocean* column that the Constitution gave the same rights to all citizens and that the U.S.'s neglect in protecting those rights was an affront to all.[443] Other countries should censure the U.S. for failing to protect or redress those rights. Wells's later speeches reflected that line of argumentation—that individuals and communities played a role, but the federal state also had a responsibility to protect its people.

In her autobiography, Wells pointed to a decline in lynchings during the 1890s as a sign

---

[441] Ida B. Wells, "Ida B. Wells Abroad," *The Daily Inter Ocean*, May 28, 1894, Center for Research Libraries.
[442] Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization*, 46.
[443] Albion Tourgee, "A Bystander's Notes," *The Daily Inter Ocean*, July 28, 1894, Gale Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers; Karcher, "Ida B. Wells and Her Allies against Lynching," 146.

that increased British pressure and her campaign worked.[444] In addition to measurable changes in numbers, Wells was key to creating "the discursive space in which future debates on American lynching operated."[445] This space was facilitated by her cultivation of a transnational biracial network that was deeply embedded in other issues and campaigns. The network lasted well beyond 1894 and influenced later campaigns by setting a model through which members of the two races could work together to deal with issues affecting African Americans. These biracial alliances although fraught and unequal would be a key characteristic of the anti-lynching debate in the 20th century.[446] The writings and speeches of other white reformers, including P.W. Clayden, Charles Aked, and Albion Tourgée at the time and the Meads and Moorfield Storey later, agreed with and supported many of her ideas. The claim that the U.S. was not meeting its own standards provided the basis for key legal arguments in the 20th century. Organizations and activists from the National Afro-American Council (NAAC) to the NAACP argued that lynching was a national issue, and that the federal government had a duty to intervene. Rather than hoping for individuals to do better or deferring to local action, the U.S. government had the responsibility to resolve a national problem with a federal solution. The question was how to do so within the bounds of the Constitution as it had been interpreted by the United States Supreme Court from the 1870s to the 1890s.

One of the organizations that Wells influenced was the National Afro-American Council (NAAC), which brought together African American leaders from across the country. Alongside the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, the NAAC was one of the few national

---

[444] Wells-Barnett, *Crusade for Justice*, 159.
[445] Silkey, *Black Woman Reformer*, 149.
[446] Karcher traces this transnational biracial network to the NAACP. Karcher, "Ida B. Wells and Her Allies against Lynching."

groups focused on issues affecting African Americans from the late 1890s to the 1900s.[447] The NAAC had major organizational challenges, the least of which included the conflicting personalities of Bishop Alexander Walters, the journalist Thomas Fortune, and North Carolina Congressman George White, the only African American member of Congress in the late 1890s. In its final years, moreover, the Council was a battleground between supporters and opponents of accommodationist Booker T. Washington and the emerging Niagara movement. Nevertheless, the organization set the stage for later fights for political rights of Black citizens and helped to maintain discussions about lynching into the new century.

Following the lynching of Frazier Baker, a postmaster in South Carolina, Walters and Fortune convened a meeting in February 1898 to lay the foundation for the emerging organization. The Council, which focused on civil and political rights, included an anti-lynching bureau, headed for a time by Wells.[448] They held a conference in December in Washington, D.C., which became subsumed by the aftermath of the November 1898 coup in Wilmington, North Carolina, and President McKinley's lack of response to the lawlessness. Wells's forceful speech in D.C. evoked the violence against Baker and in Wilmington and called for political engagement as the only way to stop violence.[449]

Discussions about lynching continued at the 1899 conference in Chicago. At this point, their language began to shift to a stronger focus on federal action against lynching parties. Attendees proposed a federal statute that declared the taking of a life or the harming of a person

---

[447] Emma Lou Thornbrough, "The National Afro-American League, 1887-1908," *The Journal of Southern History* 27, no. 4 (1961): 494–512, https://doi.org/10.2307/2204311.
[448] The lynching of Frazier Baker was a theme in the speeches of Storey and the Meads at this time as well. It also brought Wells together with Senator William E. Mason and other members of the AIL who were working to achieve justice for Baker's family.
[449] Benjamin R. Justesen, *Broken Brotherhood: The Rise and Fall of the National Afro-American Council* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008); "Aims to Help Negro," *The Washington Post*, December 30, 1898, ProQuest Washington Post.

without due process as "a crime against the Government of the United States."[450] In the closing address, the NAAC called for Congress to give the federal government authority to act in response. Although more forceful resolutions were rejected by conservative elements, the language and idea that the U.S. had a responsibility to intervene in what was seen as a local or state issue dominated. Rather than focusing on shaming people into action, the NAAC called on the federal government to take responsibility. For example, Edward Everett Brown, a Bostonian lawyer, gave a speech on lynching at the conference in which he noted:

> We are all National citizens before we are citizens of any state. Our first allegiance is to the United States Government, second to the state in which we live; this proposition being true, the first duty of the General Government, which is supreme upon every inch of American soil, is to protect its humblest citizen in any state whether black or white, rich or poor.[451]

Soon after the conference, Brown drafted an anti-lynching bill that framed its argument in terms of national citizenship and the duty of the government to its citizens. While nothing came of the bill, the NAACP's later fight against lynching reflected these arguments.[452]

For the rest of the NAAC's short life, the leadership continued to issue resolutions calling on McKinley and later Theodore Roosevelt to make lynching a federal crime. The Council remained active until 1907 when it held its final conference in Baltimore. By that time members of the Niagara movement had started influencing the group, diverging from Booker T. Washington's camp. At the Baltimore conference Bishop Walters gave his final NAAC speech noting that attitudes had changed regarding lynching since the start of the Council. He argued that the Southern press no longer openly supported lynching in the same way it had in the 1890s.

---

[450] "A Law to Stop Lynching," *New York Times*, August 18, 1899, ProQuest New York Times.
[451] "Negro Leader Is Upheld," *Chicago Tribune*, August 20, 1899, Newspapers.com.
[452] "A National Anti-Lynch Movement," *Parsons Weekly Blade*, August 25, 1899, Newspapers.com; "Duty of the Government," *The Colored American*, November 25, 1899, Newspapers.com.

Nevertheless, he maintained that "the strong arm of the National Government is needed to deal a knock-out blow to lynch law."[453]

Although anti-lynching legislation continued to die in Congressional committees, the efforts of many, including Edward Everett Brown, Ida B. Wells, George White, and others, helped to refine arguments for a national commitment to protect citizens. Many core members or founding members of the Council eventually became members of the NAACP, including W.E.B. Du Bois, Bishop Walters, George White, and others. The National Afro-American Council suffered from competing interests and personalities leading to a perception of its ineffectualness. The group may have had few tangible accomplishments, but as historian Benjamin Justesen demonstrates, the group helped sustain momentum for various issues related to the Black community into the new century, despite facing increasing resistance because of the hardening of the color line.[454]

Debates over Race at the Turn of the Century

The 1890s to the 1930s were marked by a reinforcement of racial lines in intellectual thought in addition to everyday life. Understanding the development of ideas about lynching and the emergence of bi-racial cooperation requires exploring the debates within this dominant mode of thought. From theories of scientific racism in professional social sciences to the emergence of the Dunning school of historians that rejected the gains of Reconstruction, the predominant intellectual currents focused on discourses of racial difference. James Bryce, as one of the foremost commentators on American institutions, often weighed in on the racial divide in the

[453] "The Meeting of the Council," *New York Age*, June 27, 1907, Newspapers.com.
[454] Justesen, *Broken Brotherhood*, 207.

U.S., especially the South, as one of the main challenges facing the nation.[455] After Representative Henry Cabot Lodge's introduction of the Federal Elections Bill in 1890, which called for the federal regulation of elections to the House of Representatives, Bryce wrote an article in the *North American Review* called "Thoughts on the Negro Problem."[456] This article articulated Bryce's racial worldview through his argument that Black persons in the south had shown themselves "naturally inferior to whites" even though some had advanced slowly with education. While he believed that Black persons could advance, they would never be fully equal with white Europeans. Bryce, despite his calls for self-determination for other nations, stayed solidly within the scientific racism fold, serving as "a patron saint of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant supremacy."[457]

He also expressed his views in this article on lynching and federal intervention to protect Black Americans. He played down the problem, noting that Black people "are sometimes lynched or shot by individual whites whom they have offended" and that most of those whites participating in lynch mobs were poor and not "the descendants of slave-owners."[458] Moreover, he rejected the federal government's intervention to protect rights because it would exacerbate tensions between the races. Instead, he recommended that states create an educational qualification for voting, not to ensure the rights of educated Black people, but to ensure that states were not violating the Constitution. In his view, the federal government should let nature take its course.

---

[455] Historian Thomas E. Smith calls Bryce "the most respected commentator" on race in the United States. American newspapers and magazines often reprinted portions of his lectures and writings affording his views to a wide audience. Thomas E Smith, *Emancipation without Equality: Pan-African Activism and the Global Color Line* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2018), 117.
[456] James Bryce, "Thoughts on the Negro Problem.," *The North American Review*, December 1891, JSTOR.
[457] Katherine A. Bradshaw, "The Misunderstood Public Opinion of James Bryce," *Journalism History* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 23.
[458] Bryce, "Thoughts on the Negro Problem.," 645, 659.

Ten years later, Bryce provided more insight into his views on race during a lecture at Oxford, which would become a touchstone for other writers.[459] He firmly asserted his racial hierarchy, calling some races "advanced" and others "backward." He maintained that closer contact in the new century between "advanced races," meaning primarily Anglo-American, and "backward races" marked a crisis point in history. He acknowledged different races had always been in contact but that with the rise of great powers and economic expansion, the "backward races" had become more dependent on the "advanced." He posited four pathways in the relationships between the races, maintaining that the weaker race either died out, became absorbed into the stronger, commingled with the stronger, or existed separately. He noted that commingling happened but was less common when there were skin color differences, as for example with the white and black races.[460] In closing, Bryce turned to the United States and its African American population. He recognized that Black people in America had made advances despite being "backward." He also recognized that Black people should receive private rights, noting that they "ought to have as full a protection in person and property, as complete an access to all professions and occupations, … as the more advanced race enjoys." He argued against political rights, however, and maintained that they could not legislate away scientific facts, declaring "the actions taken in A.D. 1870 a mistake."[461] A key question faced the Southern states: "What should be the duty and the policy of a dominant race when it cannot fuse with a backward race?" The only hope was for the dominant race to have better sentiment towards the weaker. Echoing his previous article, he believed that legislative actions would not hold without

---

[459] Seaman, *A Citizen of the World*, 194.
[460] James Bryce, *The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind*, The Romanes Lecture. 1902 (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1902), 37.
[461] By this he was referring to the Enforcement Acts of 1870 and 1871. Bryce, 39.

changes in sentiments. With this speech and his later additions to *The American Commonwealth*, Bryce demonstrated his racial presumptions and his firm belief in Anglo-Saxon supremacy.

Bryce was not alone in his views and many of the older generation of anti-imperialists actively opposed political rights of Black citizens. For example, Thomas Wentworth Higginson believed the 15th amendment was a mistake, and Charles Eliot endorsed the separation of races.[462] At the same time, others began questioning the assumptions of the ideology he promoted, a key shift in discourse. Although wider press coverage supported Bryce's statements, his remarks were met with surprise by some reformers, including his close associate, Wendell Garrison.[463] The *Congregationalist* pointed out that his speech was surprising coming from a well-known Liberal politician.[464] Anna Julia Cooper, an African American scholar and educator, responded to his claims in a speech to a Quaker congregation in 1902. She conceded that Black people in the U.S. were behind in social development, but that was because they had been kept that way by wider society. Moreover, she maintained that Bryce's speech and other works proclaiming that Black people were "unabsorbed and unabsorbable" ignored the existence of codes based on the color of skin. Because of their previously conceived notions, scholars on American society, especially those from the outside, could not "see or suspect the existence of intelligent aspiring thinking men and women of color."[465] They were blinded by their race prejudice from seeing the realities of the structural systems of oppression that shaped the lives of

---

[462] Charles Flint Kellogg, *NAACP: A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967), 3–4.
[463] Wendell Garrison to James Bryce, March 2, 1903, USA 4, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK; Hugh Tulloch, *James Bryce's American Commonwealth: The Anglo-American Background* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1988), 202.
[464] "Mr. Bryce On the Backward Races," *Congregationalist and Christian World*, July 19, 1902, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[465] Cooper, "The Ethics of the Negro Question Speech by Anna Julia Cooper," 20.

Black Americans. In closing, she provided a pithy comment that would echo the refrains in Wells's and Storey's discourse: "The right to rule entails the obligation to rule right."[466]

Historian James McPherson notes that anti-imperialists were caught between these two lines of debate, acknowledging that some took a more conservative racial view. However, he maintains that many resisted or questioned the prevailing ideas of the time by drawing on new ideas, such as those espoused by the anthropologist Franz Boas and sociologist Jean Finot. At the same time, they were caught between "egalitarian faith and the 'truths' of science."[467] Edwin and Lucia Mead tackled these questions in their writings and speeches. In his October 1897 editorial for *New England Magazine*, Mead wrote about the lawlessness problem in the U.S., remarking that "the record of lynchings in our Southern states is one of the blackest and most barbarous chapters in our history."[468] In a later editorial he addressed ideas about race relations proclaiming the rise of "universal human characteristics". He noted that racial distinctions were beginning to break down "because of the intermingling of peoples in all quarters of the globe."[469] At the 1902 Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, Edwin's speech focused on the need for public education especially regarding international issues. In reference to beliefs in Anglo-Saxon supremacy, he asserted that it "is imperative that we should be shamed out of this racial prejudice which is instrumental in so much evil to the world."[470] Lucia's speech addressed her concerns about the impact of imperial actions and war on domestic life. She blamed the increase in militarism on a breakdown of law and order generally, observing "in both England and

---

[466] Cooper, 24.
[467] McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, 339, 352.
[468] Edwin D. Mead, "On Lawlessness," *New England Magazine* 17, no. 2 (October 1897): 252–59, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000548075.
[469] Mead, "Editor's Table - The Peace Movement in Boston."
[470] Edwin D. Mead, "More Earnest Work for the World's Peace ...," in *Report of the Third Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration* (Mohonk Lake, N.Y: Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1902), 6, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/006921960.

America a decrease of the democratic spirit, an apathetic attitude toward injustice, and a callousness toward cruelty."[471] In the case of the United States, the major indicator of this negligence was the use of lynching as evidenced in Indiana, Ohio, and Paris, TX. She compared American lack of concern for the horrors of lynching to the British lack of concern for its policies in South Africa.

The Universal Races Congress later brought together many of these people, including the intellectuals Franz Boas and Felix Adler, joined by Edwin Mead, J.A. Hobson, and W.E.B. Du Bois, plus a variety of intellectuals from around the world. The attendees examined a wide range of topics related to race and race relations in diverse fields. The Congress primarily focused on the impact of European imperialism on other areas of the world and excluded discussion of American issues. However, many Americans were in attendance. Historian Susan Pennybaker notes that although the conference rejected the scientific basis for racial arguments, it was still conservative in its approaches to reforming the imperial system.[472] At the same time, Du Bois described the event as a key moment in race relations, writing that "every word uttered, every step taken by this Congress is in direct opposition to the dominant philosophy of race hatred, suppression and lynching current in the United States."[473] The Universal Races Congress and other writings from these reformers reflected attempts to push back on dominant ideas about race at the turn of the century. These shifts in the larger ideology created space for reformers to question the United States' treatment of its Black population. The language of inferiority could not be used as cover for the federal government to shirk its responsibilities to its own citizens.

---

[471] Mead, "Address of Miss Lucia T. Ames," 61.
[472] Susan D. Pennybacker, "The Universal Races Congress, London Political Culture, and Imperial Dissent, 1900-1939," *Radical History Review*, no. 92 (Spring 2005): 104, https://doi.org/10.1215/01636545-2005-92-103.
[473] "Universal Race Congress," *The Crisis*, September 1911, 196, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.

Moorfield Storey's statements on race and race relations in the U.S. also evidenced this shift. It is clear in his speeches and articles that notions of biological race influenced Storey. Moreover, in his earliest writings he described Reconstruction as a failure, and at the beginning of the Philippine-American war, he compared Americans in the Philippines to "carpetbaggers" in the South.[474] His views, however, evolved especially after his work with the Anti-Imperialist League. He endeavored to disconnect ideas about race from assumptions of inferiority as conveyed in the dominant strains of thought. In his later writings, his views shifted from a discourse of uplift to one of justice and obligation.

His first writings on race asserted that African Americans were not inferior and had proven themselves capable through advancement. He gave his earliest formal statement on issues connected to race in a speech before the New England Suffrage Conference in 1903. Clifford H. Plummer of the Colored Anti-Imperialist League organized a convention to examine claims that black suffrage had been "a failure," including a public statement made by President Roosevelt's Secretary of War Elihu Root. Storey argued that suffrage had not been a failure, maintaining that Blacks had risen quickly in society, quicker than Irish and German immigrants. He maintained that the record of African American people in the U.S. was proof "that the way to elevate and civilize a man is to recognize him as a man and to trust him."[475] The problem was not the inferiority of Black men, but rather "bad government in the South" where suffrage had been interrupted through racist actions. He used this notion to give a powerful statement at the Anti-Imperialist League meeting that Clement Morgan had attended in 1906, arguing that "the present creed of the white man seems to be that greater strength gives him the right to deal with his

---

[474] McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, 335.
[475] Moorfield Storey, *Negro Suffrage Is Not a Failure: An Address before the New England Suffrage Conference March 30, 1903* (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1903), 15, HathiTrust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/emu.010001334257.

inferiors as he pleases, and to force his will upon them no matter what the cost to them. True superiority cherishes, helps and lifts the lower man or race. It does not trample or kill."[476] This statement reflected his belief in the idea of uplift, but he placed the blame for the color line squarely on the shoulders of white civilization, which was a major shift in his discourse.

He also frequently commented on race relations and lynching while talking about the Philippines. For example at the 1909 annual meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, he noted that "of all civilized people we are most affected by the prejudice of color, and for that reason we are the least fit to govern men whose skin is darker than our own."[477] During an address before the Twentieth Century Club in Boston, he maintained that "we talk of our civilization, our Christianity, but have Christian principles been used by the civilized powers in China, by the United States in the Philippines, in our states where they have burned the negro at the stake?"[478] Even before his work with the NAACP began, he acknowledged the existence of the global color line and demonstrated the interconnectedness of the U.S.'s actions abroad and at home.

Storey's later speeches took a stronger stance that racism and white treatment of African Americans was the source of America's race problems. In one speech he noted, "for any evils or difficulties which spring from the presence of the colored race in this country the white race is responsible, and upon the white race, therefore, rests the duty of preparing the wrong which it has done."[479] He repeated this refrain many times, saying it most clearly in a 1918 speech: "It is a white man's problem which confronts us. The fault is in us, not in our colored neighbors. It is

---

[476] "Usurps Powers of the Congress."
[477] Anti-Imperialist League, "Report of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League," November 30, 1909, CDG-A, Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.
[478] "Municipal Problem," *Boston Daily Globe*, February 14, 1901, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[479] Moorfield Storey, *Abraham Lincoln: An Address Delivered at the Shawmut Congregational Church in Boston on February 14, 1909* (Boston: G. H. Ellis co., printers, 1909), 13, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009559135.

our senseless and wicked prejudice against our fellow-men which is the root of all our troubles."[480] He delineated clearly the impact that white prejudice and racism had as sources of racial violence.[481]

A primary discursive tactic for Storey to gain adherents among white observers was to point to the impact of prejudiced actions on wider American society. He used this tool in his Philippines argumentation but echoed it in descriptions of lynching and racial relations. In "Lawlessness," he maintained that "the lesson has thus been taught to a whole generation that the political rights of a citizen may be violated, and the law which secures them to him set aside with impunity, if only he belongs to the colored race."[482] Similar to Lucia Ames Mead, Storey was concerned about the spreading lawless tendencies in the U.S., firmly believing that the trend would fray the fundamental core of social relations.

Much of Storey's work focused on balancing the tension between his views about the obligation of the U.S. to its citizens and subjects and the reality of the federal system. On the one hand, the Constitution required the state to protect the life, liberty, and property of all citizens. He noted this most clearly in his open letter written in response to Alfred Thayer Mahan's article in the *Harvard Law Review* about the Philippines. He writes:

> None of them can question its [the United States] absolute power. As against its own citizens and subjects, its powers are limited. … The government of the United States cannot deprive its meanest subject of liberty or property without due process of law. … The question which we are considering is what rights our agents, the President and Congress, have as against the persons whom they govern, —what position we as a nation must take toward our citizens or subjects.[483]

---

[480] Moorfield Storey, *The Negro Question: An Address Delivered before the Wisconsin Bar Association,* (1918), 17, HathiTrust, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/loc.ark:/13960/t8gf0w52s.
[481] Moorfield Storey, *Problems of To-Day* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920), 116, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008676742.
[482] Moorfield Storey, "Lawlessness," *The American Lawyer*, July 1905, ProQuest American Periodical Series III.
[483] Storey, *Our New Departure*.

Storey wrote this statement in regard to American treatment of the Filipinos to argue that the U.S. was bound by a duty to govern with their consent and to protect their rights. These words, however, held true for Black citizens whose rights the U.S. also had a duty to protect.

At the same time, the Constitutional basis of the federal system created roadblocks for the full realization of those obligations. Although he recognized that lynching events were atrocities and needed to be prosecuted, Storey was a lawyer with a firm belief in the law and the Constitution. As such, he saw a challenge for tackling lynching in the federal system itself, especially after the Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Cruikshank* in 1874, which maintained that the federal government did not have the purview to punish crimes committed by individuals even if those crimes violated political rights.[484] As a result of the limitations in the federal system, Storey turned to moral suasion as a tactic for changing American behavior, especially in the early years of his work with the NAACP. Similar to Wells, Storey appealed to the principles of the nation and to "civilized behavior" as a way to convince Americans to change.

Throughout Storey's anti-imperialist work, as discussed in Chapter 3, he pointed to the principles on which the United States was founded, particularly those embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. He recognized that the U.S. had not always lived up to its ideals in its treatment of native populations and its continuation of slavery. At the same time, not living up to those principles in the past did not justify continued hypocrisy especially as the U.S. was proclaiming itself as a benefactor to the world. The founding documents set high standards, but "our failures in the past are to be regretted, not repeated."[485]

---

[484] This case will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter.
[485] Storey, *Our New Departure*, 4.

This statement was made in reference to the conquering of Native Americans as justification for the conquering of the Philippines, and he applied the argument to the African American population. In his 1903 speech "Negro Suffrage," he admonished the founders of the republic who insisted "that all men were created with an equal right to life and liberty" but "undertook to hold nearly half a million men as slaves."[486] Despite the failures, the 14th and 15th Amendments corrected these mistakes by giving former enslaved peoples the right to life, liberty, property, and, to freedmen, the right to vote. He used this example to demonstrate that it was possible for Americans to learn from the past and implement their founding principles into law.

In addition, Storey consistently stressed that the U.S. needed to focus on its domestic treatment of its populations of color first. In a speech celebrating Abraham Lincoln's birthday, Storey maintained that "our troubles at home and abroad, our race problem, our Philippine difficulties, our difficulties with Japan and China, come because we are not true to ourselves, because we will not admit that all men are equal, but instead deny that the same blood flows in the veins of 'all the nations upon earth'."[487] Later in life, he summed up his views in an address before the Wisconsin Bar Association. He offered a rebuke to the audience saying that Americans should focus on their own atrocities before criticizing the actions of others and compared our shame to the horrors done in "Turkey, or Russia, or by Germans in Belgium or Poland."[488] In addition to pointing out the hypocrisy of American inaction in the face of its own horrors, he invoked the discourse of civilization: "How do you suppose such things affect our country's reputation with really civilized nations?" Storey connected with the civilizational discourse that many, including James Bryce, used to justify white supremacy and control over

---

[486] Storey, *Negro Suffrage Is Not a Failure*, 3.
[487] Storey, *Abraham Lincoln*, 23–24.
[488] Storey, *The Negro Question: An Address Delivered before the Wisconsin Bar Association,* 24.

black populations.

His attempt to hold the U.S. to the standards of civilization became most evident in his direct discussions of lynching. More than once he asked how the U.S. could call itself civilized when treating its own population in such a terrible manner. In this sense, Storey drew on the rhetoric developed by Wells during her anti-lynching campaign and echoed by other anti-imperialists and reformers. At the 1911 NAACP celebration of the abolitionist Wendell Phillips's birth, Storey reviewed the long list of offenses against African Americans, ending with the "hideous torture" of lynching in both the North and the South. He continued, "while this prejudice endures how can we call ourselves either Christian or civilized? Had the mob of Coatesville, a few weeks ago, burned a house or a dog alive in the public square the country would have rung with horror, and those who were guilty of such cruelty to an animal would have been punished as they deserved."[489]

Moreover, although the federal system limited the ability of the national government to intervene, Storey maintained that the laws created an obligation to protect. In *Problems of To-Day*, he described these as "the rules which regulate the relations of men to society and to each other, which determine the rights of the citizen and his obligations to every other citizen and to the community at large, represented by city, state or nation."[490] In a country defined by the consent of the governed, individuals had the obligation to uphold the laws of the government or find ways to change the laws in a legal manner. In the United States, the constitution guaranteed

---

[489] Storey was referring to the lynching of Zachariah Walker on August 13, 1911, in Coatesville, Pennsylvania. The lynching elicited a national response because of its brutality and the fact that it took place in a northern state. Walker's lynching was a galvanizing moment for the creation of the NAACP's anti-lynching campaign as will be discussed later in this chapter. "As Champion of Liberty," *Boston Daily Globe*, November 29, 1911, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[490] Storey, *Problems of To-Day*, 53.

the protection of life, liberty, and property. Lynch law violated those fundamental principles as defined in the legal system and the rights of states could not trump that guaranteed protection.

With the progression of the first world war, Storey's discourse became increasingly focused on the U.S.'s international standing. At the NAACP conference in 1918, he maintained that the U.S. ranked among uncivilized nations of the world "until lynching is recognized as a crime, not only against the victim, but against the State, a treason which shakes the very foundations of free government."[491] Despite his recognition of the difficulties of the federal system, he believed that lynching was used not only as a tool by private mobs, but in violation of American principles as a form of public action to control a population. By the 1920s he adopted the language of international law to talk about America's shame, observing that "the liberty of a people depends on its success in curbing by a written or unwritten constitution the power of its rulers, and that the cause of justice in the world is advanced by observing the law of nations."[492] Storey's rhetoric of America's moral standing in the world was borrowed from Wells, but he also believed that a legal solution was possible, if the argument could be found. He along with others would work to find that legal solution during his time with the NAACP.

In the early 20th century, the paths of these various reformers began to merge. These critical years saw the coming together of several key figures who shaped the future NAACP and defined the organization's approach to an anti-lynching campaign.[493] First, with the decline of

---

[491] "Full Equality of Races Demanded," *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 5, 1918.
[492] Storey, *Problems of To-Day*, 53.
[493] Several works cover the history of the NAACP and the trajectories of individual members. The primary work is Kellogg, *NAACP: A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.* Others covering specific aspects or individuals include McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*; Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*; David L Lewis, *W.E.B. Du Bois* (New York: H. Holt, 1993); Carolyn Wedin, *Inheritors of the Spirit: Mary White Ovington and the Founding of the NAACP* (New York: Wiley, 1998); Patricia Sullivan, *Lift Every Voice: The NAACP and the Making of the Civil Rights Movement* (New York, N.Y.: New Press, 2009); Megan Ming Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

the NAAC and failed attempts to reconcile the Washington and Du Bois's camps, radical African American reformers began focusing efforts on the Niagara Movement. One of the critical connections between the Niagara Movement and white reformers was Mary White Ovington, a white settlement worker who had started corresponding with Du Bois and attended the second Niagara meeting in 1906. Second, members of the Anti-Imperialist League were overwhelmingly represented in the list of white reformers who were part of this movement.[494] While most anti-imperialists were initially supporters of Washington, many, such as Storey, were swayed by Du Bois's arguments. James McPherson notes that with this shift "they began to emphasize the need for social change more than the need for black self-improvement, rights more than duties, opportunity more than preparation."[495] The members of the AIL had been discussing sovereign responsibility in various ways since the start of the Philippine-American war. When confronted with similar issues in their own country, these individuals had a framework through which to think about the role of the federal government and possible solutions.

Oswald Garrison Villard, a key figure, took more time to defect from Washington. As the nephew of Wendell Garrison and Henry Villard, the owner of the *New York Evening Post* and the *Nation,* and grandson of the abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, Villard came from a distinguished lineage of reformers and rights advocates. Upon the death of Henry, Oswald and his aunt, Fanny Villard, inherited control of the newspapers. Oswald Villard and Wendell Garrison began shifting the tone of the magazine from traditional racial views to egalitarian perspectives.[496] After the 1906 race riots in Atlanta, Villard moved from a belief in uplift to a

---

[494] James McPherson notes that the shift of the AILs to the issue of black rights was critical especially as many women in the white women's suffrage movement had stopped supporting the enfranchisement of Black men. McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, 361.
[495] McPherson, 370.
[496] McPherson, 331.

firm conviction that access to privileges and rights mattered more. He spoke at the NAAC conference in October 1906 on race relations, using strong words for "the race that proudly calls itself the superior, the better civilized" by noting that it was no longer possible to "to degrade the negro to a servile position."[497] Villard was particularly upset after the riots in Springfield, Illinois, the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln and a northern city.[498] In response to those riots, a small group including Mary White Ovington, William English Walling, and Henry Moskowitz met in New York and asked Villard in February 1909 to assist with a call to create a national conference addressing racial inequality; Villard readily joined. Signers of "The Call" included both AIL members such as Jane Addams, John Milholland, and Albert Pillsbury as well as prominent African American leaders such as Mary Church Terrell, Ida B. Wells, and W.E.B. Du Bois.[499]

Many of the signers and others attended the first National Negro conference in 1909. Moorfield Storey, though not able to attend the conference, signed on as a sponsor.[500] The second conference in 1910 inaugurated the official start of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Ida B. Wells gave a passionate speech condemning lynching and arguing that public sentiment was not enough, that the only answer was federal protection. She also asserted that true access to the ballot was the prerequisite to stop lynching, noting that "with no sacredness of the ballot there can be no sacredness of human life itself."[501] At the conference, participants chose Moorfield Storey to be President with Villard, Ovington,

---

[497] "Urges Negros to Protect Themselves," *The Tacoma Daily Ledger*, October 11, 1906, Newspapers.com.
[498] Kellogg, *NAACP: A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.*
[499] The Constitution League worked on "establishing the constitutional rights" through the use of test legal cases. Kellogg, 16.
[500] Kellogg, 17.
[501] Ida B. Wells, "How Enfranchisement Stops Lynching," May 12, 1910, 39, Folder: 001412-008-0000, ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 01: Meetings of the Board of Directors, Records of Annual Conferences, Major Speeches, and Special Reports.

and Du Bois taking key leadership roles. While some historians describe Storey as a figurehead President, his writings and speeches, as well as the NAACP record itself, show an involved and passionate figure with access to a variety of venues in both white and black communities. Du Bois's biographer, David Levering Lewis, describes Storey as "judicious, principled, possessing enormous, if waning, influence in national circles of power, … the perfect choice to head an organization for which no black person, however distinguished, could be considered in 1910."[502] His stature was waning; at the same time, his ideas and rhetoric reflected an approach that was more in line with the young reformers who surrounded him. He became a key figure in future anti-lynching campaigns and helped, along with others, to craft an argument in support of federal intervention to stop the atrocities. This chapter will now turn from their theories and rhetoric about race to discuss the NAACP's campaign to fight against the atrocity of lynching.

NAACP's Campaign Against Lynching

The NAACP's campaign against lynching borrowed a toolkit of tactics from both its abolitionist roots and approaches developed in more recent humanitarian causes. From the outset, their efforts against lynching were multi-pronged and included investigating events at lynching sites, reporting on numbers of people lynched, promoting news coverage, encouraging state-level legislation, shaming the United States, and engaging with political leaders. While the organization focused on a variety of issues, the sheer numbers of lynched African Americans required response, and, after the lynching of Zachariah Walker in Coatesville, Pennsylvania in 1911, the campaign began in earnest.[503]

---

[502] Lewis, *W.E.B. Du Bois*, 406.

[503] Ming Francis begins the campaign in 1916 with the start of the Anti-Lynching Committee but doing so ignores the efforts from this earlier period after the founding of the NAACP. Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*; Wedin, *Inheritors of the Spirit*, 125.

The key mouthpiece for the NAACP's anti-lynching campaign was the magazine the *Crisis*, edited by W.E.B. Du Bois. In the second issue, Du Bois maintained that their investigations and reports would counter the arguments used by Bryce and others that lynching was inevitable because of skin color. Du Bois asserted: "It is not inevitable. It is criminal injustice."[504] In each month's issue, the magazine compiled statistics of the numbers of people lynched. This reporting helped to raise money for additional funds, which were used to support on-the-ground investigations.[505] For example, in July 1916 the *Crisis* published a supplement that recounted the details of the lynching of Jesse Washington in Waco, Texas. NAACP Secretary-Treasurer Roy Nash had asked social worker Elisabeth Freeman to go to Waco to gather facts and write the story that the mainstream newspapers were not covering.[506] This was the starting point for an ambitious fund-raising campaign for a goal of $10,000 with Storey and Albert Pillsbury both committing $1000 if the funds could be raised. The Anti-Lynching Fund was used to collect statistics on lynching, to provide support for investigations into lynchings around the country, and to encourage Southern voices to take up the cause. In letters supporting the proposed campaign, many writers urged putting the gathered facts before the American public. Archibald Grimké noted that he and Kelly Miller believed that the publishing of statistics would arouse public consciences and "lead in time to some effective remedy for this grave national disease and danger."[507]

---

[504] "Lynchers Triumphant," *The Crisis*, December 1911, 60, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[505] "The NAACP," *The Crisis*, December 1911, 64, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[506] Michael A Bernstein, "Introduction: The Puzzle of the 1930s and Chapter 1: Long-Term Economic Growth," in *The Great Depression: Delayed Recovery and Economic Change in America, 1929-1939* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
[507] Archibald Grimke to Roy Nash, Undated, 58, A Proposed Campaign Against Lynching "NAACP Anti-Lynching Committee," February-October 1916. Folder: 001529-002-0730., ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti- Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955.

In addition, a regular feature in the *Crisis* was a column devoted to reprinting domestic and international news coverage on African American issues and race relations. For example, the Rhode Island *Sun* decried the hypocrisy of the U.S. promoting itself as an example during World War I, saying that "the principle of 'peace without victory' ought to be coupled with the principle of 'justice without lynching'."[508] In addition to reprinting quotes, the leadership of the NAACP was adept at using the mainstream news media to bring attention to their issues. Through countless press releases and several major print advertising campaigns, the NAACP became known as a force in American race relations.

Moreover, as in the Rhode Island *Sun,* the *Crisis* used the tactic of shame to draw attention to the country's hypocrisy. For example, during World War I and amid new Turkish attacks on Armenians, Rustem Bey, the Turkish Ambassador to the U.S., commented that American humanitarians should be wary of criticizing Turkey when they had daily lynchings and used 'water cures', or a form of water torture, in the Philippines.[509] In addition to publicizing international thoughts on American race relations, Du Bois often wrote biting editorials. During the Mexican expedition in 1916, the *Crisis* published a reprint of the U.S. President's letter to Mexico expressing disappointment with the revolution's bloodshed and attacks on American property. Alongside that letter was a mock letter by the President to the State of Georgia expressing horror at the crime of lynching. The letter ended with words taken verbatim from the President's letter to Mexico with a slight modification: "If the *State Government* is unwilling or unable to give its protection … that does not relieve this Government from its duty to take all the

---

[508] "America and the World," *The Crisis*, April 1917, 291, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[509] "The World War," *The Crisis*, November 1914, 15, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.

steps necessary to safeguard American citizens on American soil." It ended with the proclamation that if Georgia could not protect the lives of its American citizens, then the U.S. had the duty to intervene.[510]

The NAACP frequently used letter writing to public officials as a tactic and called on its members and branches to do the same.[511] These letters often elicited responses from public officials. For example, after the NAACP wrote a letter regarding the lynching of a mother and her child in Oklahoma, the Governor wrote back decrying the use of lynching and defending his actions to try the perpetrators.[512] Presidents, of course, were frequent recipients of letters. In April 1917, the organization's leaders, including Storey, Villard, Du Bois, and others, wrote an open letter to President Wilson acknowledging that under the current federal system, states had jurisdiction over lynching crimes, but that the shame fell on the national government if it continued to do nothing when states refused to act. If Wilson would address the issue directly, then it would "do a great deal to help the cause of civilization and good government and to hold up the hands of those who are trying to prevent mob violence."[513] Often the NAACP highlighted the incongruities between humanitarian policy abroad and reaction at home. In a telegram to President Wilson, John Shillady praised the President for speaking "nobly against German crimes in Belgium" and implored him to "break your silence" and "denounce properly these terrible mob acts which covers us with shame and humiliation."[514]

---

[510] "Two Letters," *The Crisis*, August 1916, 163–64, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[511] Historian Robert Zangrando compiled data for these outreach campaigns in the year 1918 demonstrating the remarkable reach of the national office alone. Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 47.
[512] "The Oklahoma Lynching," *The Crisis*, August 1911, 154, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[513] "America and the World," 284.
[514] John Shillady to Woodrow Wilson, "Telegram from John Shillady to President Wilson," February 13, 1918, Box 2, Jan - Feb 1918, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.

In addition to investigating stories, reporting statistics, and writing letters, the NAACP also encouraged the creation of state-level legislation to punish lynchers. The model for such efforts was Ohio's anti-lynching legislation. Written by Albion Tourgée and introduced by Harry C. Smith, a Black newspaper editor and member of the Ohio General Assembly, the law called for criminal proceedings against participants in lynch mobs and monetary penalties for counties in which lynching occurred.[515] In the original bill, victims or their families could sue for $10,000 if the victim was killed or up to $5000 if seriously injured. After a two-year fight to pass the bill, the Governor of Ohio and future president, William McKinley, publicly supported the bill in 1896, and it finally passed although with a reduced maximum penalty. Du Bois called this act "the most successful statute of its kind in the country," and it served as a model for legislation in other states.[516] Over the next ten years there were efforts to create state-level legislation in South Carolina, Kentucky, Illinois, West Virginia, and more.[517] In addition, these efforts served as models for attempts to pass federal legislation.

As Europe entered the war in 1914, the numbers of lynchings in the United States continued to grow and became a key concern for the NAACP.[518] In the spring of 1916, they

---

[515] In an open letter to William McKinley in 1894 Tourgée used the language of spreading anarchy to argue for the bill. He maintained that the high penalty was necessary claiming that lynchings would be virtually eliminated if communities had to pay steep fines. Gerber maintains that Tourgee's proposal overestimated the power of "rational self-interest" to stop lynchings and underestimated the necessity of local officials to enforce. Albion Tourgee, "That Lynching," *Cleveland Gazette*, March 3, 1894, Readex: African American Newspapers; David A. Gerber, "Lynching and Law and Order: Origin and Passage of the Ohio Anti-Lynching Law of 1896," *Ohio History* 83 (1974): 45.

[516] "A Fighting Editor," *The Crisis*, October 1913, 272, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/; Gerber, "Lynching and Law and Order: Origin and Passage of the Ohio Anti-Lynching Law of 1896," 36; Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 13; Mark Elliott, *Color-Blind Justice: Albion Tourgée and the Quest for Racial Equality from the Civil War to Plessy v. Ferguson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 237–38.

[517] "Anti-Lynching Bill in West Virginia," *The Crisis*, June 1921, 67, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/; Gerber, "Lynching and Law and Order: Origin and Passage of the Ohio Anti-Lynching Law of 1896," 48.

[518] NAACP Anti-Lynching Committee, "A Proposed Campaign Against Lynching," Undated, 63, February-October 1916. Folder: 001529-002-0730, ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti- Lynching

created an Anti-Lynching Committee of which Storey was a member. At the annual meeting in January 1916, Arthur Spingarn, a lawyer for the organization and a NAACP Vice-President, remarked that "the most striking achievement of the NAACP during 1916 has been to inject lynching into the public mind as a national problem."[519] While few thought a quick solution could be found, all believed that changing public opinion and shaping norms were possible.[520] These efforts in the summer of 1916 reinvigorated focus on the issue of lynching just as the nation was entering one of its worst periods for racial violence.

In winter 1919, Storey invited members of the Anti-Lynching Committee to his office in Boston where they decided to organize a conference against lynching that would be held in May.[521] They wanted to bring together leading public figures from both the North and the South to address the problem and to present possible solutions. The organizers decided that the conference needed to have the endorsement of notable leaders. They also wanted the conference to seem as if it were a collaboration between those figures rather than an official event organized by the NAACP. They were concerned that if the NAACP sponsored it, few southerners would attend because of the organization's endeavors to support social and political equality.[522] Several invited figures expressed regret mentioning their apprehension about the NAACP; some

---

Campaign, 1912-1955. Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955; Sullivan, *Lift Every Voice*, 75.

[519] Arthur Spingarn, "NAACP Press Release," July 1, 1916, Box 2, Folder 1907-1918, Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington: DC; "NAACP Annual Report," *The Crisis*, February 1917, 166, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.

[520] The views of those involved contradicts Ming Francis's thesis that the leadership of the NAACP gave up on shaping public opinion to focus on Presidential actions. Her linear approach ignores the multi-pronged reality of the NAACP's anti-lynching campaign as evidenced in their letters and in the pages of *The Crisis.* See Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*, 30.

[521] "Anti-Lynching Conference, May 5-6," *The Crisis*, May 1919, 23, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.

[522] Frederick Sullens to Moorfield Storey, "Letter to Storey," February 17, 1919, 80, "National Conference on Lynching," March 5-7, 1919. Folder: 001529-027-0177., ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955.

denounced the violence of lynching but could not support the organization's promotion of the idea of equality.[523] In addition, several Southern leaders lamented the optics of holding a conference on a "Southern problem" in the North. For example, Federick Sullens, the editor of the *Jackson Daily News*, wrote in February 1919, that "the proper place to discuss this question is in the South, and the proper persons to handle it are Southern men."[524] Moreover, he noted that Oswald Garrison Villard's association with the event would hinder the movement's growth in the South. Storey and others, however, were adamant that the conference should be held in the North. In a letter to Dr. Robert Russa Moton, the President of the Tuskegee Institute, Secretary John Shillady noted that the signatories on their call for the conference "believe that the time has come to put lynching before the nation, that it is not a Southern question, but a national one."[525]

The conference opened at Carnegie Hall in New York City on May 5, 1919 with around 2500 people, black and white, in attendance. Charles Evans Hughes, former Governor of New York, opened the proceedings as the keynote speaker. The *New York Times* remarked that Hughes's speech elicited a standing ovation when he proclaimed that the principles embodied in the developing League of Nations should begin at home. While his primary focus was on lawlessness and not racial equality, he argued that "the black man shall have the rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution of the United States."[526] Two speeches were featured in the *Chicago Defender* as providing forceful admonishments of the United States. These speakers

---

[523] William O. Scroggs to Moorfield Storey, "Letter to Storey," March 8, 1919, 57, National Conference on Lynching," March 7-8, 1919. Folder: 001529-027-0275., ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955.
[524] Frederick Sullens to Moorfield Storey, "Letter to Storey," February 21, 1919, 79, "National Conference on Lynching," March 5-7, 1919. Folder: 001529-027-0177., ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955.
[525] John Shillady to R.R. Moton, "Letter to Moton," March 18, 1919, 57, "National Conference on Lynching," March 11-18, 1919. Folder: 001529-027-0392., ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti- Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955.
[526] "Hughes Condemns Lynching of Negro," *New York Times*, May 6, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

highlighted the place of the U.S. in the world and the hypocrisy of its actions. Emmett O'Neal, ex-Governor of Alabama commented first that "the United States today stands solitary and alone among the civilized nations of the world that tolerates the cruelty, savagery and infamy of mob violence." James Weldon Johnson, the NAACP Field Secretary and only Black speaker, continued arguing:

> I ask not only black Americans but white Americans, are you not ashamed of lynching? Do you not hang your head in humiliation to think that this is the only civilized country in the world—no, more than that, the only spot on earth—where a human being may be tortured with hot irons and then buried alive? The nation is today striving to lead the moral forces of the world in the support of the weak against the strong. Well, I'll tell you it can't do it until it conquers and crushes out this monster in its own midst.

He compared the lack of response to lynching of Black citizens to the outpouring of interest in the Turkish treatment of the Armenians. He maintained that Americans expressed concern about the treatment of people in other countries, but "every year atrocities are committed in this enlightened land."[527]

On the closing day, the speeches focused on justice for Black Americans. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise of the Free Synagogue called on Americans to recognize the stain of lynching. He noted that "touching on my own people, I have always felt that there should be no such thing as 'Jewish rights'—only human rights. But I do demand, in the name of democracy, justice for the negro race." Moreover, the Dean of Morgan College in Baltimore, William Pickens, argued that the basis for lynching was a blatant disregard for the Black race. He called for an end to disenfranchisement and segregation as starting points for the cessation of lynching.[528] In the *Crisis,* Du Bois described the feeling at the Anti-Lynching Conference as like the old abolitionist

---

[527] "National Conference on Lynching Opens with Large Attendance," *The Chicago Defender*, May 10, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[528] "Sees the End of Lynching," *New York Times*, May 7, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times.

meetings, energizing the believers into action.[529]

Some historians note that the conference had little political impact and occurred on the cusp of the Red Summer, one of the most violent periods of racial violence in the U.S.[530] At the same time, the conference, along with the wider anti-lynching campaign, helped to bring the issue to the national stage, raising the profile of the NAACP in the process, though they were not the "official" organizer. As a result of the conference, they raised additional funds, membership numbers, and circulation of the *Crisis* magazine.[531] Finally, lynching became seen less as a Southern phenomenon and more as a national issue with a federal solution. In many ways, this was the stated goal of the conference—encouraging Congress to find a path to stop the atrocities. Advocates insisted that the federal government had the right and the obligation to protect its citizens, all citizens, from harm. The NAACP leadership brought immense knowledge of activism and advocacy from their own backgrounds. Combined with Du Bois's forceful words and editorial abilities, they were able to hone their approaches as they moved to the next phase—an attempt to create federal legislation in the face of increasing numbers of lynchings throughout the United States.

The Fight for Federal Anti-Lynching Legislation

In the aftermath of the Civil War, Congress made some efforts to compel federal intervention to protect the rights of freedmen, efforts that would have supported anti-lynching legislation. In 1870 and 1871, Congress passed the Enforcement Acts, three laws designed to

---

[529] "The Anti-Lynching Conference," *The Crisis*, June 1919, 92, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[530] Lewis, *W.E.B. Du Bois*; Cameron McWhirter, *Red Summer: The Summer of 1919 and the Awakening of Black America* (New York, N.Y.: Henry Holt & Co., 2011).
[531] "$10,000 Fund Raised to Fight Lynching," *The Chicago Defender*, May 17, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers; "The Anti-Lynching Movement Aided," *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 15, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

protect the rights of individuals against political violence by enforcing the Reconstruction amendments. They also established the Department of Justice in 1870 to prosecute violators of these and other civil rights laws in Federal courts.[532] The KKK Act of 1871 was the most significant because it made "violence infringing civil and political rights a federal crime."[533] By 1873, the Supreme Court limited the scope of the amendments through a series of cases, thereby reversing those gains. In the *Slaughter-House Cases* of 1873, which used the 14th amendment to stop a state monopoly, Justice Samuel F. Miller argued for the majority that the amendment only applied to former slaves. Furthermore, in his ruling he distinguished national citizenship from state citizenship and argued that most citizens' rights were under state control.[534] In addition, *U.S. v. Cruikshank* decided in 1876 argued that the Reconstruction amendments gave the federal government jurisdiction over *states* that were violating the rights of Black people. Only state and local governments had the power to punish crimes committed by private individuals. Historian Eric Foner describes *Cruikshank* as making "national prosecution of crimes committed against blacks virtually impossible" giving "a green light to acts of terror where local officials either could not or would not enforce the law."[535] By the 1890s, anti-lynching advocates and those arguing for federal intervention were facing an uphill battle both against cultural norms and legal precedent. The leadership of the NAACP believed that the federal government had a responsibility to protect its citizens, but their efforts were hampered by these cases.

---

[532] These are the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The 13th amendment abolished slavery and involuntary servitude. The 14th amendment established citizenship rights in the nation and state and guarantees equal protection under the law. The 15th amendment prohibits denial of voting rights based on race or previous condition of servitude. "The Constitution: Amendments 11-27," National Archives, November 4, 2015, https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/amendments-11-27.
[533] Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*, 2014, 455; Elliott, *Color-Blind Justice*, 268.
[534] Nancy Cohen, *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Foner, *Reconstruction*, 531.
[535] Foner, *Reconstruction*, 531.

North Carolina Congressman George White and others attempted to introduce anti-lynching legislation in the 1890s, but none were successful. In 1902, Albert Pillsbury, the former Massachusetts Attorney General, drew up an anti-lynching bill that Senator George Hoar of Massachusetts introduced. The Hoar bill based its argument on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, contending that a state's inability to prevent lynching should be considered a denial of equal protection to its citizens. As with other anti-lynching efforts, this bill would be left to die in the Senate Judiciary Committee because of constitutional concerns. Senator Hoar headed the very committee in which the bill died, but he had decided that the federal government did not have the right to intervene in state matters.[536] Despite the death of this attempt, the Hoar bill along with the Ohio law discussed in the previous section served as models for later anti-lynching efforts.[537]

In 1902, Pillsbury published an article in the *Harvard Law Review* arguing the case for federal intervention, which was later reprinted in the *Crisis.*[538] He argued that on its face, in a federal system, the United States did not have the power to intervene if states were not protecting their inhabitants. However, he asserted that the U.S. needed to address the issue because lynching was anarchy that interrupted the peace of the country. Comparing the U.S.'s inaction to other countries where atrocities had occurred, Pillsbury noted that "where there is a recognized duty, there must be a governmental power adequate to its discharge." In other the words, the U.S. had the duty to protect the peace within its borders, therefore victims of lynching should be

---

[536] Adam Burns, "Without Due Process: Albert E. Pillsbury and the Hoar Anti-Lynching Bill," *American Nineteenth Century History* 11, no. 2 (June 2010): 241, https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2010.481875.
[537] Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 16; Burns, "Without Due Process," 243.
[538] Albert E. Pillsbury, "A Brief Inquiry into a Federal Remedy for Lynching," *Harvard Law Review* 15, no. 9 (May 1902): 707–13, https://doi.org/10.2307/1323748; "A Federal Remedy for Lynching," *The Crisis*, March 1912, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/; Burns, "Without Due Process," 242.

protected. Furthermore, "the United States owes them the duty of protection; and that the power of protection follows upon the duty." Affirming that the equality clause of the 14th amendment forbids states from denying any person in their jurisdictions the equal protection of the laws, he noted that although "the power to protect the lives of citizens or subjects" was inherent in any government, the 14th amendment's equality clause established that power in the Constitution.[539]

Future arguments would use the 5th amendment's due process clause to support federal anti-lynching legislation. After the NAACP in 1912 asked President Taft his views on lynching, the Justice Department wrote a letter saying that Federal authorities had no jurisdiction over state criminal cases. They could only intervene if "for the purpose of protecting a citizen in the exercise of rights which he possesses by virtue of the Constitution." An editorial in the *Crisis* noted that under the 5th amendment no person could "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law", therefore the Constitution applied in cases of lynching where people were being denied those rights.[540]

In 1918, after observing the riots against Black people in East St. Louis, Leonidas C. Dyer, a Republican representative from Missouri, became a leading anti-lynching advocate. Reeling from the racist riots, Dyer introduced a bill in April 1918 that was the strongest call for federal intervention out of the set of bills being introduced. Similar to the Ohio law, the Dyer bill had a community element as it compelled counties where lynchings occurred to pay $5000 to $10000 to the victim's dependents and made lynching a federal offense.[541] In May 1918, Walter White, then a new assistant secretary at the NAACP, wrote to Storey asking him to examine the

---

[539] "A Federal Remedy for Lynching," 207.
[540] "Lynching Again," *The Crisis*, May 1912, 27, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[541] "U. S. Lynch Bill Is Aimed at South," *The Chicago Defender*, May 24, 1919, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Chicago Defender.

constitutionality of the current anti-lynching proposals. In July 1918, Storey wrote back a detailed exposition of his views regarding the Moore, Dyer, and Spingarn bills before Congress. He began his brief noting that "no one could wish more strongly than I that the Federal Government should be placed in a position to prevent and punish the crime of lynching." He argued that the Moore and Dyer bills could not be upheld. The Dyer bill claimed that the federal government had the duty to protect all citizens and Congress could enforce that duty under the 14th amendment, echoing Pillsbury's old language. Storey offered a pessimistic assessment. He maintained that the Supreme Court had decided that the 14th amendment protected against state encroachment on individual rights but not actions by private citizens. Furthermore, the rights of life and liberty were not granted by the constitution, and "it is only rights granted by the constitution that can be protected by such laws." He thought that the Spingarn bill had some merit. This bill protected people of draft age and soldiers from lynching; it went too far, however, by arguing that the relatives of soldiers should be extended protection. Storey maintained that the federal government could justify the protection of soldiers, but he argued that the only way lynching could be stopped was either by creating an amendment to the Constitution to make lynching a federal crime or pressuring states to take local action through legislation.[542] Despite these setbacks, the fight continued even as the country entered a terrible period of racial violence as Black soldiers began returning home from war.

In May 1919, the U.S. saw an alarming rise in the numbers of lynchings and racially motivated riots and violence around the country. Known as the Red Summer, the largest events

---

[542] Moorfield Storey to Walter White, May 2, 1918, Moorfield Storey Correspondence on Fundraising and Antilynching Legislation, Folder: 001412-024-0009, ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP, Part 01: Meetings of the Board of Directors, Records of Annual Conferences, Major Speeches, and Special Reports.; Hixson, *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition*, 165.

took place in Charleston, Washington D.C., Norfolk, Chicago, Knoxville, and Omaha with an Arkansas massacre in September killing several hundred African Americans. In addition, a white mob, including public officials, brutally attacked the NAACP Executive Secretary John Shillady, a white man, after he met with a local NAACP chapter in Austin, Texas. After these racially motivated attacks, the NAACP leadership, especially Storey, began to shift their views on the possibilities for federal action against lynching.[543] The Tulsa massacre the next May was a motivator for a renewed push for legislation, along with the results of the 1920 election, when Republican Warren Harding became President, and the Republican Party won a large majority in the House. Because the Republican Party had created a plank committed to finding a solution to lynching and President Harding had endorsed it, the NAACP leaders believed that 1920 could be the prime time for new legislation.[544] The Dyer bill was introduced in the House again, and James Weldon Johnson, Archibald Grimké, and Joel Spingarn testified before the House Judiciary subcommittee. Spingarn noted that "the greatest blot on American civilization today is its record for lynching" and that the brutalities in the U.S. outweighed excesses even "during the worst Armenian massacres." When asked about the constitutionality, Spingarn reminded the committee that the legislative body did not decide on constitutional matters. He encouraged them to let the law pass as a good law and "if it is not constitutional, then for Heaven's sake, let us change the Constitution" as had happened with suffrage and prohibition.[545] At the time, Storey demurred from testifying because of his concerns about the bill's constitutionality. Later though,

---

[543] William B. Hixson, "Moorfield Storey and the Defense of the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill," *The New England Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1969): 67, https://doi.org/10.2307/363500.
[544] Zangrando provides the most comprehensive history of the push for anti-lynching legislation. Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 54–71.
[545] "Lynching Before the United States Congress," *The Crisis*, April 1920, 324, Modernist Journals Project.

his views shifted to argue that the crime was so great that a law should be passed and would do good even if it was later declared unconstitutional.[546]

In October 1921, under pressure from the NAACP, through the tireless efforts of James Weldon Johnson, and with President Harding's approval, the House Judiciary Committee favorably reported out the Dyer bill.[547] The House approved the bill on January 26, 1922, with votes 230 for to 119 against, after which it was forwarded to the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Chair of the Senate committee, William E. Borah, a Republican from Idaho, along with Republican Senators William Dillingham of Vermont and Thomas Sterling of South Dakota expressed support for some form of anti-lynching legislation, but they wanted to be satisfied about its constitutionality. In February 1922, Borah wrote to Storey asking for his opinion.[548] Albert Pillsbury also offered Storey his views, noting that under the clauses of the 14th and 5th amendments, the key duty imposed on states was "protection". He wrote that "protection is an affirmative thing." States omitting to protect people on the basis of race was a violation of the equality clause.[549] State inaction, in other words, could be rightly construed as a form of action.

In response, Storey wrote a brief supporting the Dyer bill arguing that the best constitutional basis for anti-lynch legislation was the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and the due process clause of the 5th amendment. Storey, in the introduction, highlighted that to "admit that the Nation is powerless to abate such an evil and to protect its own citizens is to admit that our Government is weaker than any other civilized government." The

---

[546] Hixson, "Moorfield Storey and the Defense of the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill," 73.
[547] Historian Megan Ming Francis argues that the Committee approved the bill this time directly because of the NAACP's lobbying efforts. She provides a detailed discussion of Johnson's and the NAACP's lobbying efforts. Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*, 103.
[548] Hixson, *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition*, 169.
[549] Albert E. Pillsbury to Moorfield Storey, April 5, 1922, Box 2 - General Correspondence and Subject File. Folder Anti-Lynching Correspondence 1922 Jan - Apr., Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929, Library of Congress Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.

14th amendment "forbids the abridgment of the rights belonging to 'American citizens'" and the federal government has the obligation to protect the rights of citizens as Americans. Second, he separated out rights that are "recognized and declared" under the Constitution from those what were "created by, arising under, or dependent upon" the Constitution (these could be enforced in any manner considered appropriate by Congress). Storey argued that life and liberty were the latter under the 5th amendment. He maintained that "the Southern states had manifestly defaulted in their obligation to provide due process and equal protection" to Black Americans.[550] After receiving briefs from Storey and other lawyers engaged by the NAACP, the committee reported the bill out in July 1922, and Republican Senator Samuel Shortridge of California presented it on the Senate floor. Opposing senators, primarily Southern Democrats, used procedural maneuvering and a filibuster to prevent it coming for a vote. During the short session of Congress in December 1922, the Republican leadership abandoned the bill and claimed they would pick it up again in the next Congress.[551]

Supporters of anti-lynching legislation and the NAACP tried again the next year with no success, and the Dyer bill was never brought up for vote in the Senate, despite President Calvin Coolidge openly supporting the bill in his message to Congress.[552] The NAACP saw the failure to do so as a betrayal by Republicans because they had the majority in the Senate, but caved to Southern pressure to save other legislative agendas.[553] Du Bois lamented the lack of will in the *Crisis,* noting that while the Dyer bill was not perfect, it was "a sincere attempt" to stop lynching, and the least Congress could have done was to debate it, perfect it, and make it

---

[550] U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, "Antilynching Bill" (April 20, 1922), Report Number 837; Serial Set 7951 S.rp.837., ProQuest Congressional.
[551] Hixson, *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition*, 174; Sullivan, *Lift Every Voice*, 109.
[552] "Bill HR1: The Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill," *The Crisis*, February 1924, 165, Google Books.
[553] Sullivan, *Lift Every Voice*, 109.

stronger. Instead, Congress would not even discuss it. In terms of failure, he decried, "can one call this failure? Quite the contrary. It is the failure and the disgrace of the white people of the United States."[554]

Over the next decade, the NAACP continued the fight against lynching even though national legislation had not passed. The numbers of lynchings slowly declined with occasional spikes, leading Du Bois to remark in 1929 that the association of public shame with the act of lynching demonstrated a "revolution in public sentiment."[555] The campaign's direct impact on numbers is impossible to determine but based on the press reprintings in the *Crisis*, lynching came to be seen more often as an aberrant activity. Nevertheless, the act of lynching never died off. The NAACP continued to support those in danger of being lynched or facing a "lynch trial," through the efforts of the state branches to pay for legal fees, stop the extradition of accused persons who would not receive a fair trial, and more.

Lynching Atrocities and Sovereign Responsibilities

Despite legislative setbacks, the development of a legal strategy that centered upon the responsibility of the federal government to protect all citizens' fundamental rights would have long-term consequences. The NAACP had incremental success; one of those successes was the Supreme Court's decision in *Moore v. Dempsey*, a case that was the epitome of trial lynching. In 1919, Black sharecroppers in Phillips County, Arkansas attempted to hire legal representation to stop the exploitative practices of white landowners. A white mob attacked a small group and the

---

[554] "Loss," *The Crisis*, January 1923, 103, Internet Archive.
[555] For decreasing numbers see Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 5–7. Du Bois is cited in Sullivan, *Lift Every Voice*, 143. The full reference is in W.E.B. Du Bois, "What the NAACP Has Meant to American Life" (Speech, June 26, 1929), Folder: 1929 Annual Conference, Correspondence (September-December) and Speeches, History Vault, Papers of the NAACP, Part 01: Meetings of the Board of Directors, Records of Annual Conferences, Major Speeches, and Special Reports, https://congressional.proquest.com/histvault?q=001412-008-1252&accountid=14707.

violence spread ending with the deaths of more than two hundred Black people. A group of twelve Black sharecroppers were convicted for the death of one white man after a trial that included armed white mobs at the courthouse. The NAACP sent Walter White to investigate the facts and raised money for lawyers to appeal the case. After three attempts to free the sharecroppers, the case finally made its way to the Supreme Court where Moorfield Storey and James Weldon Johnson wrote writs of *habeas corpus*, and Storey appeared before the court in January 1923.[556] The Supreme Court overturned the conviction under the due process clause of the 14th amendment, and the case was referred back. In November 1925, the Governor of Arkansas commuted the sentences, and the men were released a few months later. The primary impact of this legislation was establishing a legal precedent of using writs of *habeas corpus* to overturn state court convictions if those decisions violated constitutional rights.[557] *Moore v. Dempsey* was significant for directly addressing the federal protection of rights denied at the state level. Over time, the Supreme Court increasingly incorporated portions of the Bill of Rights under the 14th amendment, thereby making them applicable to the states. The NAACP was unable to enact anti-lynching legislation, but the era helped establish the idea that the U.S. government had the responsibility to protect the rights of its citizens if the states could or would not.

Attempts to dilute the power of the federal government during Reconstruction had a lasting impact on the protection of Black citizens within the U.S. The number of lynchings during the 1890s and 1900s and the increasing awareness of them brought the question of federal

---

[556] Francis provides a detailed description of the cases' path through the state and federal judiciaries. Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*, 149–55.
[557] Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*, 85; Francis, *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*, 171.

responsibility before the nation.[558] Dr. William H. Wilson, member of the D.C. branch of NAACP, reflected this sentiment with the assertion: "In the final analysis, government has no reason for being except the protection of the people who constitute it. A government which fails to protect the people … to that extent is no government at all."[559] The efforts of these individuals and the NAACP shifted language about lynching from a private act to one for which the federal government should be held accountable. Doing so, helped to set the intellectual foundations for incremental legal changes and a reinvigorated 14th amendment. In addition, the work begun in the early 1900s laid the legal foundations for future civil rights protection in domestic law. These efforts established an incremental process that continues to influence case law and legislation even in the present day, such as in 2022 when the U.S. Congress finally passed the Emmett Till Antilynching Act that designated lynching as a hate crime.

Through this work the transnational anti-lynching campaign that Ida B. Wells began can be seen as a continuum of agitation influenced and shaped by other issues and other contexts. The treatment of African Americans in the U.S. should be seen within the larger international framework as it helps us better understand how these atrocities fit within the debate over empire and human rights. The NAACP leadership was unique in some ways, swimming against the tide of beliefs about racial difference and the supremacy of the Anglo-American and white race. In doing so, they served as "norm entrepreneurs," a necessary individual or group whose ideas are so ahead of their time that they help to establish a new norm.[560] For Storey, his arguments were

---

[558] Wood argues that as images of lynching spectacles spread the practice became "detached from local settings and local sensibilities." This detachment enabled the growth of the anti-lynching movement. Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle*, 14.
[559] "Lynching Before the United States Congress," *The Crisis*, April 1920, 324, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.
[560] Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*.

steeped in nineteenth-century abolitionist views about equality before the law, but he also looked toward an emerging global perspective that encompassed community and international obligations. His collective experience with a variety of events, campaigns, and individuals throughout his career shaped the outlook that brought him to the anti-lynching campaign. In the end he was looking toward U.S.'s responsibilities both domestically and within the emerging international order. As such, his views of race relations and the U.S.'s obligations to its citizens were influenced by that international framework.

As W.E.B. Du Bois often argued, America's atrocities did not happen in a vacuum, isolated from the rest of the world.[561] Drawing on lessons learned during the Philippine-American War and by comparing the U.S. with other empires, these reformers saw lynching as not just a Southern or a domestic issue. The act of lynching impacted the international standing of the United States. In allowing people to violate the life and liberty of its citizens, the U.S. could not count itself as a civilized country. Moorfield Storey highlighted this in his speech for the 1926 NAACP conference saying: "we are the only people on earth where human beings are burned alive at the stake, where men, women, and children look on with approval and where the murderers go unwhipped of justice and walk the streets."[562]

Americans often saw the nation as a moral beacon for the world, yet it was not living up to its own standards at home. At the same time that Black people were being lynched, Europe entered into conflict, and reports of new atrocities in Belgium and Turkey began appearing in the American press. In response to events abroad, James Bryce, Moorfield Storey, and others from the AIL became involved in a new awareness building and humanitarian campaign that would

---

[561] W. E. B. Du Bois, *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920).
[562] "No Mid Ground Friends or Foes," *Philadelphia Tribune*, June 26, 1926, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

again highlight the question of sovereign responsibility, this time a renewed discussion of America's responsibility to the Armenians.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

Return to the Armenians

In December 1914, as war waged in Europe, the Anti-Imperialist League held their 16th Annual Meeting. Moorfield Storey's speech shocked some observers for comparing American foreign policy to Germany's actions in Europe.[563] He stated that American actions in the Philippines could not be defended any more than German actions in Europe, and then proclaimed that "the cause of democracy grows stronger every day that this war lasts, and imperialism is doomed." Moreover, as the war progressed, he began to speak out against American neutrality in the face of German brutality and raising relief funds for Armenians suffering from renewed hostilities in the Ottoman Empire. At this time, he also renewed correspondence with James Bryce about the war atrocities that extended into debates over the League of Nations and the possibility of American protections for Armenians in the post-war world. Because of his connections to the U.S. and American public figures, the British government saw Bryce as an expert on American public opinion. Storey served as one of his critical sources of information.

Bryce and Storey connected through their letters, bringing divergent perspectives shaped by their personal notions of the role of the state, race, and civilization. Tracing the routes of ideas through the lives of these two men and the many groups of individuals with whom they interacted, it is possible to see a shift in understanding of sovereign responsibility over time and across borders. Steeped in principles of good governance and a sense of what constituted a "civilized state"—ideas cultivated during the Armenian massacres in the 1890s—there emerged a sense that a state or empire's claim to sovereignty could not be used as a cover for atrocities

---

[563] "Germany Doomed, Storey Declared," *Boston Daily Globe*, December 8, 1914, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

against its own people. States and empires needed accountability for their actions against their subjects and citizens or for their inability to stop others from committing atrocities. Storey championed this idea during the Philippine-American war, and Bryce was forced to confront the question during the South African war. In the case of Storey, that experience shaped his views of race and equality and drove him to focus on issues of justice at home and internationally. For Bryce, it reaffirmed his support for small states, especially those in his mind more capable of achieving higher stages of advancement. In 1915, these ideas converged as both were faced with the truth of new atrocities.

Moorfield Storey and James Bryce began corresponding early in the new century after Bryce was appointed as Ambassador to the United States.[564] Their letters primarily focused on racial issues and the vagaries of American politics, with Bryce often asking Storey questions about American public opinion. After the start of the war in Europe, their attention turned to European affairs with Bryce asking about the likelihood of the U.S. entering the war. They also frequently discussed emerging claims of German atrocities in Belgium. In December 1914, the British government appointed Bryce to lead a special committee to investigate German actions.[565] The commission presented its report in May 1915, and Bryce wrote to Storey in August, saying "we now feel that we are fighting for civilization and humanity against methods

---

[564] Many of Storey's letters to Bryce are available in the Bryce collection of American Correspondence at the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Bryce's letters to Storey are primarily in the Moorfield Storey collection at the Massachusetts Historical Society.

[565] Wilson notes that the investigation was based on eyewitness reports given to the committee and that the committee did not actually talk to those Belgian witnesses. While the Belgian report was not manufactured or fraudulent, the investigation did not thoroughly inspect some of the claims of atrocities against women and children, which gave fuel to later claims that the stories were British propaganda. Historians argue that there is sufficient evidence that the German government acted outside the bounds of international law in the occupation of Belgium and its treatment of the civilian population. Trevor Wilson, "Lord Bryce's Investigation into Alleged German Atrocities in Belgium, 1914-15," *Journal of Contemporary History* 14, no. 3 (1979): 369.

that would carry the world back to barbarism."[566] Soon, their attention turned to the news of renewed attacks against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

While the Armenian question became less urgent in the new century, it had never disappeared from American attention. In 1900, well after the height of Hamidian massacres, President McKinley sent a fleet to the Mediterranean to force the Ottoman Empire to provide compensation to Americans who lost property during the attacks. In addition, Theodore Roosevelt invoked the Armenian cause when trying to engage the U.S. in other campaigns, such as in Cuba, the Belgian Congo, and the Russian pogroms. British inaction in Armenia and American action in the Philippines became fuel for his second corollary to the Monroe Doctrine that supported American intervention in response to crimes against civilization whether or not the events were in the American sphere.[567]

In the new century, interethnic relations in the Ottoman Empire became increasingly strained. In 1904 an uprising of Armenian nationalists led to the killing of 3,000 to 8,000 Armenians in Sassun as well as forced migration. Although the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 seemed to offer a reprieve for minority groups, an attempted counterrevolution led to renewed violence in 1909 with a series of massacres and riots leading to the death of an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 people, mostly Armenians, and around 2,000 Muslims in reprisal killings.[568] American missionaries, through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), supported the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress following its consolidation of

---

[566] Bryce to Storey, August 7, 1915.
[567] Theodore Roosevelt's humanitarian impulses and protests were primarily focused on atrocities abroad. As Laderman argues, Roosevelt's criticism was focused on actions of central governments rather than the actions of individuals. While he declaimed lynchings in some messages and letters, he made no effort to stop them and in the end supported the structure of Jim Crow through his actions. Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 64–65.
[568] Some scholars estimate as high as 30,000 were killed. Taner Akçam, *A Shameful Act: The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006), 69.

power, but after the Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913, relations deteriorated and anti-Christian sentiment began to rise.

With the start of World War I, the Turkish government attempted to consolidate control over its territory especially in areas along the border with Russia. The Ottoman government believed that the Armenians might side with the Russians in the war because of their common Christian heritage and past Russian support for the Armenians. Several events occurred in quick succession in response. First, the government began removing Armenian soldiers from Ottoman military forces and placing them into segregated labor battalions.[569] Second, on April 19, 1915, a siege broke out in the Armenian-dominated city of Van in response to fears of massacres. The siege became one of the pretexts for deporting the Armenian community out of the Anatolian portion of the Empire. Third, on April 24, 1915, the Ottoman authorities rounded up around 250 Armenian intellectuals, many of whom were later killed. Finally, in May 1915 the government deported entire communities of Armenians out of Anatolia and into the desert of Syria without adequate food, water, or shelter. Many died from starvation. After the war, sporadic attacks occurred into the early 1920s, and most historians date the end of the genocide period with the founding of the Republic of Turkey. By 1923, up to 1.5 million Armenians are believed to have died as a result of the actions of the Turkish state.[570]

---

[569] The Russians made attempts to woo Armenians to their side, and certainly some joined. As Russian troops moved into eastern Turkey, the Turks began to retaliate against Armenians out of fear that they would defect en masse. This is the reason why the Turks removed Armenian soldiers from the Ottoman army. Sir Martin Gilbert, "Twentieth-Century Genocides," in *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, ed. J. M Winter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 13.

[570] The estimates for the numbers of deaths in the deportations and massacres of 1915-1920 vary widely and are shaped by scholarly interpretation of the events. The lowest figure is 200,000 and the highest is 1.5 million. No matter the number, the undeniable result was the removal of the Armenian community as a presence in Anatolia. Ronald Grigor Suny, *Looking toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 114; Gilbert, "Twentieth-Century Genocides," 16–17; Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, xxiii; Ronald Grigor Suny, *"They Can Live in the Desert but Nowhere Else": A History of the Armenian Genocide* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

Acknowledging the success of the Belgian report and Bryce's connections with American missionaries, the British government commissioned Bryce and historian Alfred Toynbee to edit a compilation of eyewitness accounts that would be released as an official Parliamentary Blue Book.[571] As a result, Bryce again became a spokesperson for the Armenian cause in the United States, and he wrote to his American correspondents to encourage involvement. Bryce asked Storey as the former president of the American Bar Association to review the contents of his report and to consider the veracity of the evidence. Bryce described Storey "as a just and unprejudiced mind" who could provide a neutral and presumably legal perspective, thereby giving the report weight.[572] In his supporting letter, Storey wrote that the documentary evidence established "beyond any reasonable doubt the deliberate purpose of the Turkish authorities practically to exterminate the Armenians, and their responsibility for the hideous atrocities which have been perpetrated upon that unhappy people."[573] Storey's letter and comments from other prominent figures combined with the sheer number of eyewitness accounts and Bryce's name persuaded Americans of the veracity of the reports and helped to build momentum for one of the largest American humanitarian relief campaigns with donations in the millions of dollars.[574]

Connecting through pre-existing networks of reformers, relief organizations began asking leading figures for support and many joined. In October 1915, Storey became the Chairman of

---

[571] James Bryce and Arnold Toynbee, *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1916), https://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/1915/bryce/a00tc.htm.
[572] James Bryce to Moorfield Storey, October 15, 1915, Box 2, Folder 1915, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[573] "Letter from Mr. Moorfield Storey, Ex-President of the American Bar Association, to Viscount Bryce," in *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1916), https://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/1915/bryce/a01.htm#Storey.
[574] James L. Barton, *Story of Near East Relief* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015011396317;view=1up;seq=11; Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 107. Tusan notes that the report helped build American support, but it was not used to prosecute the Ottoman authorities after the war. Instead, the British allowed the Turkish authorities to try their own in domestic courts. Michelle Tusan, "James Bryce's Blue Book as Evidence," *Journal of Levantine Studies* 5, no. 2 (Winter 2015): 45.

the New England Committee for Armenian Relief with the purpose of raising relief funds and sharing information.[575] The American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR) asked Lucia Ames Mead, Charles Aked, and others to serve as members of its speakers bureau.[576] Aked, who had moved from Great Britain to the U.S. after his work with Ida B. Wells, participated in a tour of the western states in 1917, calling for relief funds.[577] Lucia Mead's speeches and newspaper editorials, especially after the war, incorporated calls for the disarmament of Turkey as an alternative to official American protection of Armenians.[578] One solicitation letter to Mead asked her to join the Massachusetts committee, which had "the approval and support of such representative men and women as Mr. Moorfield Storey."[579] They had established themselves through their work in earlier causes as people who would speak out about international issues. Mead and Aked are not the figures usually associated with Armenian agitation, like American Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, but they were active both in their local communities and nationally through lecture circuits and editorials in smaller papers.

One of the primary questions during and after the war and written into President Wilson's Fourteen Points was what should happen with the Ottoman Empire and how to protect its minorities. Point XII noted that "the Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of

---

[575] "Appeal for Armenians," *Boston Daily Globe*, October 26, 1915, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[576] American Committee for Armenian & Syrian Relief to Lucia Ames Mead, June 13, 1918, Lucia A. Mead Correspondence, 1903-1919, Box DG 021 Edwin D. and Lucia Ames Mead, microfilm reel 78.3, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, PA, http://swarthmore.edu/library/peace/DG001-025/dg021.htm.
[577] "Dr. Aked Will Tell of Bible Land Need," *Tulsa Daily World*, October 20, 1917, Chronicling America.
[578] Lucia Ames Mead, "Were Turkey Disarmed," *The Miami News*, September 17, 1919, Newspapers.com.
[579] Mead. The Armenian National Union of America to Lucia Ames Mead, July 2, 1919, Lucia A. Mead Correspondence, 1903-1919, Box DG 021 Edwin D. and Lucia Ames Mead, microfilm reel 78.3, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, PA.

autonomous development."[580] With the close of the war and the opening of the peace conference, this question became a secondary concern but stayed on the agenda. The Prime Minister of South Africa Jan Smuts lobbied for a mandate system for the new nations that would be governed jointly by the European powers and the United States. Many British leaders, including James Bryce, supported the U.S.'s adoption of the Armenian mandate as a way to ensure America's continued involvement in Europe, to equalize the burden of responsibility, and to guarantee a future Anglo-American alliance.[581] To justify American involvement, they pointed to its large missionary presence and the ability of the missionaries to spread good governance principles in Turkey.[582] President Wilson also commissioned two fact-finding missions to Turkey, the King-Crane Commission and the military-focused Harbord Commission, both of which advocated for some form of neutral third party intervention to prevent further conflict in the area.[583] During the peace talks, President Wilson agreed to accept a mandate for Armenia and Constantinople if the Senate approved the action. Upon his return to the U.S., Wilson deprioritized the mandate question in his effort to win ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and the League Covenant. After the failure of negotiations between the President and the U.S. Senate over the ratification of the Treaty, American acceptance of a mandate became challenging. The U.S. was not a member of the newly formed League, and disagreements remained between Wilson and Senate leaders over the best approach for the Armenians and the Ottoman Empire. In May 1920, the Senate overwhelmingly spurned an American mandate. By July 1922, all hope for outside

---

[580] "President Woodrow Wilson's 14 Points," National Archive & Records Administration, January 8, 1918, https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/president-woodrow-wilsons-14-points.
[581] For discussions of the mandate negotiations and debates see, Lloyd E. Ambrosius, "Wilsonian Diplomacy and Armenia: The Limits of Power and Ideology," in *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, ed. J. M Winter (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*.
[582] Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 145.
[583] Balakian, *The Burning Tigris*, 349–58.

protection of minorities in Turkey ended with the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne in which Turkey promised to protect its minorities but no mechanisms for outside pressure were included.[584]

During the debate over the League of Nations and the related mandates, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and other isolationists gained American attention. Their efforts helped to build public support for the isolationist cause. However, the debate was more nuanced than a simple dichotomy of isolation versus intervention. While the British government had strategic motives for American involvement, many American supporters of the mandate considered it a humanitarian duty to take on the role. Wilson even considered the U.S.'s involvement as "a progressive alternative to European imperialism."[585] For these supporters, American success in the Philippines demonstrated that the U.S. could successfully take the lead in an Armenian mandate. Moreover, Charlie Laderman argues that both Roosevelt and Wilson attempted to widen the field of responsibility for the U.S. to include minorities being persecuted in other countries and that they "extended the parameters of debate on the purpose of American power and the nature of national interest."[586] In contrast, the anti-imperialists, especially Storey, saw the American record in the Philippines and Wilson's record in the Caribbean and Central America as the exact reasons the U.S. should not take the mandate. Storey expressed this perspective multiple times in letters to James Bryce.

The balance between the U.S.'s role in the international order and its duties at home

---

[584] *The Crisis* published an editorial during the negotiations over the Lausanne Treaty. The editorial called Europe's demand for minority protections the height of hypocrisy, saying "Imagine England with its centuries of Irish history and America with its lynching asking Turkey to promise them to be good to Armenians!" "The Turk," *The Crisis*, September 1922, 201, Internet Archive.
[585] Charlie Laderman, "Sharing the Burden? The American Solution to the Armenian Question, 1918-1920," *Diplomatic History* 40, no. 4 (September 1, 2016): 666, https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhv036.
[586] Laderman, *Sharing the Burden*, 207.

became a common refrain throughout the rest of their correspondence. In letters to Bryce, Storey spoke out against the American mandate because of the U.S.'s own deplorable track record at home and abroad. In March 1919, Storey maintained that the Monroe Doctrine had become a "fetish" that "is treated as a fortification against interference with us by European nations behind which we can carry on aggression against all our weaker neighbors."[587] He highlighted intervention in the Philippines, Wilson's war on Mexico, the overthrow of governments in Haiti and Santo Domingo, and actions in Nicaragua. Regarding a mandate for Armenia, he noted that the U.S. could send advisors, but a full mandate would be problematic, maintaining that "although we start with the most benevolent purposes, such as we have professed in the case of the Philippine Islands, I am very sure that there will be as many American exploiters as there would be French." Rather than the U.S. taking responsibility, he asserted that the new governments should be under joint protection of the League of Nations. Unlike the isolationist arguments against the mandates, Storey thought the U.S. had proven itself irresponsible regarding the interests of any persons perceived as weaker or inferior.

From 1916 and until his death in 1922, Bryce wrote to Storey asking for his insights into American public opinion, while Storey used Bryce's information to garner support for the Armenians and condemnation of the Germans. In one speech for the New England Committee, Storey read a telegram from Bryce about the atrocities saying that the U.S. had the moral authority to aid the refugees.[588] He noted that "the reputation of the American people for generosity is on trial." Furthermore, "no Nation has ever made such profit on the sufferings of

---

[587] Moorfield Storey to James Bryce, March 14, 1919, USA 10, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University.
[588] "Urges Aid for War-Stricken Refugees," *Boston Daily Globe*, October 23, 1916, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

others as we are making, and it is our duty to give all the help we can." As the U.S. headed into the war, the Anti-Imperialist League became a venue for Storey's views on German actions as informed by Bryce. At the annual AIL meeting in December 1917, Storey was quoted saying that the war was an attempt to protect smaller nations from German aggression. He declared that "small nations … should have the right to govern themselves according to their ideals."[589] Moreover, the League adopted a resolution proclaiming that in addition to the democratization of the world through allied victory, there needed to be a "full democratization of the Negro Americans in the United States."[590] The same arguments entered much of Storey's writing and speeches even outside of AIL meetings. In one address, called the "Obedience to the Law", Storey recalled "the hideous cruelties which the Germans have practiced upon their enemies, by the slaughter of the Armenians by the Turks, by the pogroms in Russia and Poland against the Jews."[591] At the same time, the U.S. was not without fault as twelve million of its citizens were prevented from exercising their rights. He ended his speech saying that the only way to avoid such lawlessness was to "do justice to every citizen and offer every one an equal opportunity."[592]

In the end, the U.S. and the European governments did little to protect the Armenians beyond providing relief to those who were displaced. In 1919, the Ottoman government held court-martial trials of some accused perpetrators, and the main organizers were found guilty of the massacres. All escaped prosecution, however, and after the declaration of the Republic of Turkey under Mustafa Kemal, they were pardoned. Moreover, the hypocrisy of agitation for

---

[589] "Anti-Imperialist League in Session," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 17, 1917, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[590] "German Peace Ideas Criticized," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 18, 1917.
[591] Moorfield Storey, *Obedience to the Law. An Address at the Opening of Petigru College in Columbia, South Carolina* (Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1919), 13, HathiTrust, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100339393.
[592] Storey, 20.

Armenians while American citizens lived in fear at home was not lost on the leadership of the NAACP. As described previously, W.E.B. Du Bois often compared concerns for Armenians to the lack of concern for lynching at home. In *Darkwater*, he decried "can you imagine the United States protesting against Turkish atrocities in Armenia, while the Turks are silent about mobs in Chicago and St. Louis." Moreover, he launched a damning criticism of American hypocrisy, saying "what is the black man but America's Belgium."[593] Storey believed that the U.S. had a role to play, but also knew that the country was not adhering to its responsibilities at home or in the world.

Ideas about Sovereign Responsibility and the Rise of the American Empire

The writings and speeches of James Bryce and Moorfield Storey were steeped in ideas about good governance accentuated with similar commitments to liberal ideas—the respect for property, progress, and law based on Christian principles. As their responses to the various events described in this dissertation attest, their viewpoints also diverged. Bryce was firmly rooted in his liberal principles within a belief in Anglo-American supremacy. Those closer in kind to the Anglo-American identity, such as the Boers and the Armenians, would be more successful with self-government. People from non-white races presented a different challenge as they could be assimilated only so much. Bryce acknowledged that racial prejudice impacted the ability for people of other races to achieve political or social equality, but he believed neither that minds could be changed nor that legal interventions would be effective. Bryce was not alone in his view; this fundamental idea about racial difference drove much of the humanitarian and interventionist impulses and decisions about to whom the state had most responsibility.

Moorfield Storey on the other hand moved from the notion of good governance to an idea

[593] Du Bois, *Darkwater*, 40.

of equality before the law. The color of skin or the civilization from which a person came mattered less than equality of humanity. He still firmly believed in law and private property, which is why he adamantly opposed labor strikes as a tactic, but he argued that the law should treat everyone the same. In the end, his views shifted to the assumption that if the law did not or could not treat people the same, then a government had the duty to intervene. This idea drove his conviction in the power of the law to protect rights both domestically and internationally.

By following Bryce, Storey, and others as they navigated these events, it is possible to see these shifts in their perspectives. Calls for American or British intervention to protect civilians during the Armenian massacres were steeped in ideas about what constituted good governance and civilized communities as well as who belonged in the category of "civilized". Through these calls, it is possible to see a shift toward an idea that governments have a responsibility to assist in the protection of other human beings, especially if those people are ruled by a state deemed outside the bounds of good governance. Sovereignty no longer should be a cover for atrocities, and "barbaric" empires should no longer be allowed to exist.

Furthermore, the U.S. entered into the Spanish-American war under the guise of a humanitarian action using similar rhetoric against the Spanish as was used against the Ottomans; for many Americans it was penance for not helping the Armenians more. When faced with the possibility of occupying the Philippines, many believed that they were still operating in a humanitarian manner by bringing good governance to the Filipinos until they were ready for self-government. While administration supporters used the language of humanitarian intervention to justify their actions, others resisted that argument, saying that the U.S. was not acting from a basis of protection. Instead, it was violating its own principle of the consent of the governed. Moreover, if anything, American soldiers were committing their own atrocities. The AIL began

pointing to the racial rhetoric used to justify the intervention, arguing that the U.S. was acting outside the bounds of civilization in its treatment of people deemed "inferior." Even if the Filipinos were not American citizens, the U.S. had a duty to treat them in a responsible manner.

As with the Filipinos, the South African case demonstrated that sovereign responsibility was not only for people under a government's direct care but extended to those being oppressed by other empires. Some, such as George Russell and the Liberal Forwards, used the example of the Armenian massacres as a mirror for British hypocrisy in their actions toward the Boers. Britain had failed in its dealing with the Armenians; now with the Boers they were acting more like the Ottomans in their barbarity. Across the Atlantic, American anti-imperialists compared American exploits to the actions of the British in South Africa, honing their arguments about the role of empire and the protection of civilians. While some Americans pointed to the British empire as a model for the U.S.'s new empire, anti-imperialists such as the Meads highlighted questions of justice in response to a perceived unjust intervention against smaller sovereign states and the heavy-handed use of imperial power against civilians in concentration camps.

Moreover, the lessons learned from the earlier imperial endeavors shaped domestic political campaigns against lynching. The Meads, Storey, and others emphasized the hypocrisy of America's declared humanitarian impulses abroad while ignoring the lynching of citizens at home. Despite the structure of the federal system and efforts to separate national citizenship from state citizenship rights, they argued that the national government still had a responsibility to act. Their efforts helped to push back, albeit slowly, against attempts to weaken the 14th amendment and set the foundations for future civil rights legislation under a reinvigorated 14th amendment. Furthermore, these actions were not only impactful at home; when lynch mobs killed African American citizens and the federal government claimed an inability to intervene, the United States

could no longer call itself a model for the world.

This hypocrisy along with American actions in the Philippines and the example of Great Britain's treatment of small nations shaped Moorfield Storey's interpretation of the Armenian genocide. While something needed to be done to help those suffering, the American mandate was out of the question. Storey believed that the United States had already proven itself incapable of dealing well with small nations and "weaker" peoples through its prior actions.

The primary framework for examining these cases is the interplay between domestic, international, and transnational forces. Rather than using a lens that gives primacy to one field of action, this work demonstrates that they are mutually constitutive. Understanding the development of the idea of sovereign responsibility requires examining domestic influences and how they shape views about international events. For example, the idea of good governance, while typically associated with the Mugwumps focused on municipal reform, was an essential basis for many of the arguments being made regarding the Ottoman Empire, the Philippines, South Africa, American inaction on lynching, and the Armenian genocide. By using a lens that encompasses domestic, transnational, and international levels, it is possible to have a better understanding of the development of ideas and changes in ideas about sovereign responsibility and the role of the state in protecting civilians.

Moreover, studying transnational forces requires the use of a network approach to trace the spread of ideas across these fields of action. International events help to configure transnational networks that then shape the boundaries for individual interpretation of one's own society. This work demonstrates that reformers were talking to each other through a transnational and trans-Atlantic network with ties that were sometimes loose or contentious but were shaped by and shaping the interpretations of the rise of the American imperial state. To fully understand

the route of the idea of sovereign responsibility within humanitarian and human rights history, a transnational perspective is necessary.

Furthermore, civilizational and racial understandings permeate arguments about sovereign responsibility because they shaped who was considered worthy of help and who was ignored. As W.E.B. Du Bois wrote in the *Crisis* and others reiterated, the U.S. ignored its own atrocities while creating campaigns for those abroad. A 1917 response to President Woodrow Wilson in the *Crisis* typified that perspective: "all shame to that silent man in the White House who wants Home Rule for Ireland, Freedom for Poles, and Justice for Armenians, but has no word for the 3,000 American citizens lynched North and South."[594] Moorfield Storey agreed. Good governance was a starting point; states also needed to abide by the principles of justice and equality for all people both at home and abroad no matter their civilization or their race.

The writings and speeches of Moorfield Storey, James Bryce, as well as the Meads, Ida B. Wells, W.E.B. Du Bois, Anna Julia Cooper, and many others shaped ideas about the role of the state in relation to its people during the rise of America's international empire. None of them approached the question in the exact same way. Storey took a legalistic perspective with a focus on justice and equality before the law while Bryce's training shaped his historical approach to thinking about contemporary problems. Despite these differences the question of sovereign responsibility provided an overarching frame of reference as the U.S. grappled both with its own domestic questions and as its influence and power began to spread. In some cases, the idea of sovereign responsibility was turned inward to criticize a person's own government and other times outward to criticize the actions of other governments. The turn of the century was not the "origin" of the idea of sovereign responsibility. As Luke Ganville demonstrates, that idea has a

---

[594] "Roosevelt," *The Crisis*, August 1917, 164, Modernist Journals Project, https://modjourn.org/journal/crisis/.

longer lineage.[595] Instead, this dissertation delineates a few of the routes that the idea took during a crucial moment as the old empires began to crumble and the United States grew into an overseas empire. Moreover, reformers and anti-imperialists believed that the federal government had a role to protect its own people; the structure of federalism could not serve as cover for atrocities at home. Moving through these transnational intellectual and reform movements, the ideas that limits on state sovereignty exist and that states have a responsibility to protect were interwoven with the other dominant ideas at the time about race, civilization, and imperialism.

The "unprecedented crisis of national sovereignty" after World War I created a new moment that included the fall of the old Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires, the rise of new states, and the assertion of individual rights throughout Europe, all of which helped to redefine the boundaries of absolute sovereignty.[596] Conversations about the role of the state took place well before the outbreak of hostilities and in relation to both domestic and international events. The brutal war helped to coalesce those voices to an extent in both humanitarian efforts and the creation of new international organizations. Following World War II and in response to the Holocaust, ideas about the limitations of sovereignty and sovereign responsibility became foundations for the basic principles of the human rights regime embodied in the International Bill of Human Rights.[597]

In addition, the "erosion of sovereignty" is the foundation for the development of the

---

[595] Glanville, *Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect*.
[596] Cabanes demonstrates how this dynamic impacted the research of international legal scholars in the post-WWI period. I argue that these questions did not just emerge as a result of the war, however. The war helped to highlight discourses already being used in various circles. Cabanes, *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918–1924*, 13.
[597] This includes the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 1976 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the 1976 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. United Nations, "The International Bill of Human Rights" (United Nations), accessed October 20, 2022, https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/Compilation1.1en.pdf.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and its codification in 2005 at the UN World Summit.[598] While many including UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan pointed to a shifting notion of sovereignty as a new phenomenon in the 1990s, the rethinking of sovereignty has a long genealogy connected to international and domestic debates about intervention and rights that took place at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.[599] As the members of the transatlantic reform networks demanded government accountability, they began to chip away at the assumption of state control to instead view sovereignty as conditional and sovereignty as responsibility.[600]

The genealogy of sovereign responsibility is also fraught with connections to ideas about imperialism, race, civilization, and good governance. Over the years the global human rights regime has confirmed a double standard for strong nations in which they are able to remain relatively free of criticism for violations. Moreover, as the history of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has revealed, military intervention for the protection of fundamental human rights has its dangers. Kofi Annan noted this tension in 1999 in response to the U.S.-led NATO intervention in Kosovo arguing that although the world could not stand aside "when gross and systematic violations of human rights are taking place," those interventions needed to be based in "legitimate and universal principles."[601] The UN's first invocation of R2P was in 2011 through Resolution 1973 that authorized the military intervention in Libya, a functioning state, to stop abuses against its civilians. When the intervention resulted in regime change and later after UN

---

[598] Deng used the phrases "erosion of sovereignty" a decade before Responsibility to Protect was coined. He argued that there was a "new" idea about sovereignty as responsibility. Deng, "Frontiers of Sovereignty," 260.
[599] For arguments situating the new thinking of sovereignty in the 1990s, see Deng, "Frontiers of Sovereignty"; Annan, "Two Concepts of Sovereignty"; Weiss, "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas." For a more historicized approach, see the articles in the special issue edited by Rotmann, Kurtz, and Brockmeier, "Major Powers and the Contested Evolution of a Responsibility to Protect."
[600] Deng situates this shift in the historical rise of "demands for democratic values, institutions, and practices," but does not examine the specifics of that history. Deng, "Frontiers of Sovereignty," 263.
[601] Annan, "Two Concepts of Sovereignty."

inaction in the Syrian War, many observers proclaimed the death of R2P.[602] Instead of a death knell, however, debates over R2P have continued to grapple with the question of the place of UN authority over the use of military intervention in the protection of civilians as opposed to other non-military measures.[603] This debate still tends to assume the contested nature of sovereignty, but the focus is on what recourses the international community could and should take in response to mass atrocities committed by a state. Moreover, as scholars note that attempts to frame the doctrine in universal terms are not entirely successful as the idea "is widely seen as Western in nature and origin."[604] Examining the Responsibility to Protect doctrine without considering its connection to questions of empire, race, and civilization, is only seeing half of the picture.

Looking Forward

Seth Low, a New York City reformer and one of Bryce's correspondents, wrote after the announcement of Bryce's appointment as Ambassador to the U.S. that "Mr. Bryce illustrates the statesmanship that looks ahead, as well as that which studies the past."[605] He admired Bryce's ability to ground his observations about contemporary problems within historical contexts. Because of his observations of the past and present, Bryce was often cited in mass media as a leading commentator on American life. When Bryce stepped down as Ambassador in 1913, the *Independent* wrote of him: "There is no Englishman whom we love more or could be more sorry

---

[602] Brockmeier et. al maintain that the debate is more complex simply whether R2P is dead as a principle. For an overview of these debates, see Sarah Brockmeier, Oliver Stuenkel, and Marcos Tourinho, "The Impact of the Libya Intervention Debates on Norms of Protection," *Global Society* 30, no. 1 (January 2016): 113–33, https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2015.1094029.

[603] Rotmann et. al. note that many in the Global South view any weakening of the UN's exclusive authority over the use of force through delegation of action, such as in Libya, as an empowerment of the stronger states to invade the weak. As they note, "the memory of imperialism was never distant." Rotmann, Kurtz, and Brockmeier, "Major Powers and the Contested Evolution of a Responsibility to Protect," 363.

[604] Rotmann, Kurtz, and Brockmeier, 369.

[605] Seth Low, "James Bryce: Ambassador," *The Independent*, March 7, 1907, ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

to lose from our shores than Ambassador Bryce. We are ready to believe that we are a decent country and a decent people because James Bryce says so." He firmly believed in the strength of American institutions and the abilities of the American people, particularly their belief in a civic duty to help improve its institutions.[606]

In addition to observing the U.S., Bryce was a strong advocate for the integrity of small nations. In one of his later pamphlets, *Neutral Nations and the War,* Bryce argued that strong nations had a duty to protect weaker ones. In the face of German aggression against Belgium, he asked "has the State … no morality, no responsibility?", lamenting the turn to state power during the war. He proclaimed that no country should impose its system on another: "No race, not even Teutonic or the Anglo-Saxon, is entitled to claim the leadership of humanity."[607] Bryce believed in the truth of a civilizational hierarchy; ultimately, however, strong states had an obligation to protect the weaker. Bryce never reconciled these views to comprehend fully the treatment of Black Americans in the United States. Nevertheless, more than any other thinker during his time, Bryce saw himself as a voice for the small nations struggling against the Old Empires in the late 19th century and new ones emerging from the wreckage after the Great War.

Moorfield Storey was united with Bryce in his belief that citizens had a duty to participate in public life. Both argued for the participation of the "professional men," those represented in Bryce's correspondence, as necessary for the functioning of those institutions.[608] Storey represented this most clearly in his first publication, "Politics as a Duty and as a Career."[609] As such, he attempted to live out this conviction through his actions. Despite his

---

[606] "Ambassador Bryce," *The Independent*, May 1, 1913, ProQuest American Periodicals Series II.
[607] James Bryce, *Neutral Nations and the War* (New York: The Macmillan company, 1914), 12.
[608] Morton Keller, "James Bryce and America," *The Wilson Quarterly (1976-)* 12, no. 4 (1988): 94.
[609] Storey, *Politics as a Duty and as a Career.*

stature in the movement at the time, histories of the anti-imperialists in the Progressive Era often give Storey a cursory mention as a protegee of Charles Sumner and as the first NAACP President. They provide limited explanations for that progression. His biographer, William Hixson, attempts to explain Storey's path by arguing that Storey's anti-imperialist leanings came from reform and abolitionist influences firmly rooted in Lincoln's declaration, "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent."[610] He maintains that Storey's "heart had always been in the nineteenth century."[611] Certainly Storey had a strong understanding of his roots as evidenced by an incomplete draft of his autobiography where he wrote: "I was born of whig parents tinged with anti-slavery views, and was a Republican at the outset, but in entire sympathy with Charles Sumner."[612] At the same time, Storey was neither stuck in the past nor influenced only by his mentor. His letters with Bryce and others demonstrate an independence of thought and a recognition of racial prejudice as a root of America's ills. In a letter to Bryce, he wrote "I sometimes think that my country will not be satisfied until they make the text read 'Suffer little white children to come unto me.'" He closed the letter musing that maybe "the mixture of races is the best remedy for many human ills."[613] While still steeped in racial thinking, these statements and his actions demonstrate a person pushing against the prevailing notions of the 19th century and looking toward a different future based in justice.

Over time, he turned from primarily domestic matters to consider international events and America's place in the world. After his rise to public attention through his work with the Anti-

---

[610] Hixson, *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition*, 202.
[611] Hixson, 190.
[612] Moorfield Storey, "Political Career" (n.d.), Box 5, Speeches/Writings n.d. #21 Autobiography, Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA.
[613] Moorfield Storey to James Bryce, February 25, 1913, USA 10, microfilm, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914, Archives of Viscount James Bryce, Bodleian Library, Oxford University.

Imperialist League, Storey became involved in a variety of causes, cautioning against American actions in Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua. After his death in 1929, Oswald Villard wrote that Storey's grave should say "he was a friend of all oppressed."[614] Kelly Miller later wrote that Storey was the "lineal descendant both by blood and spirit" of the old Republican ethos that stood for the black man, recalling his appearances before the Supreme Court to argue for equality before the law.[615] Storey's last message to the NAACP's annual conference typified his overarching optimism in the possibility of progress: "Be of good cheer, my friends, stand together, fight on in the courts and in public meetings. Look back on what we have won since 1865 and look forward with fresh courage to the future with assured faith that victory awaits us."[616]

Storey was an optimist, as he noted himself in many of his letters. He believed that the United States could live up to its claims of moral superiority if it adhered to the principles established in the founding documents as standards to which the U.S. should aspire. At the same time, the United States was neither stuck in that imagined past nor controlled by its failures. The adoption of the Reconstruction amendments proved that the country could learn from the past to create a more just future. Storey believed that Americans needed to recognize when the country had failed in its duties, both to the international community and to its own citizens. This was the burden and responsibility of sovereignty, to strive continuously to do better.

Over a hundred years passed before the United States created a federal law to prosecute those participating in a lynch mob. After years of fighting for the U.S. to recognize its own

---

[614] "Moorfield Storey," *The Nation* 129, no. 3357 (November 6, 1929): 511.
[615] Kelly Miller, "Kelly Miller Says: Honor Thy Benefactors," *Philadelphia Tribune*, April 17, 1930, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
[616] "Negro Voters' Rights Upheld," *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 23, 1927, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

sovereign responsibility to protect, the Emmett Till Antilynching Act signed into law by President Joe Biden in 2022 provides some measure of recourse for the victims and families of those killed or seriously harmed by violence. While the law itself does not recognize the historical weight of lynching in America and its systemic use against black men, women, and children, it is, as Storey would agree, but one step in a direction towards justice.

This dissertation traces the historical genealogy of the idea of sovereign responsibility as it developed within specific contexts and the ways that those events shaped the normative, legal, and intellectual lenses that people used to evaluate state action. By understanding the context and how people changed their ideas, shifted their perspectives, or interpreted their worlds within the existing limitations of knowledge, historians can chart the connection between events of 1898, the development of the human rights regime in 1944, and its further codification in both domestic and international law in the later 20th century. The actions of American anti-imperialists and the intellectual debates in which they engaged with their counterparts and colleagues across the pond helped to build the structure on which later domestic and international law could sit. Fundamentally, this structure served as a basis on which ideas about limits on state sovereignty continued to grow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Archival and Manuscript Collections Consulted

Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.
Papers of James, Viscount Bryce, and Bryce family papers, 1826-1958, Letters from Bryce to American correspondents, 1881-1914

Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, DC.
Moorfield Storey papers, 1876-1929

Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA
Moorfield Storey Papers, 1848-1935

National Archive & Records Administration, Washington, DC.
Records of the U.S. House of Representatives, Record Group 233

ProQuest History Vault: Papers of the NAACP
Papers of the NAACP, Part 01: Meetings of the Board of Directors, Records of Annual Conferences, Major Speeches, and Special Reports
Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series A: Anti-Lynching Investigative Files, 1912-1953
Papers of the NAACP, Part 07: The Anti-Lynching Campaign, 1912-1955, Series B: Anti-Lynching Legislative and Publicity Files, 1916-1955

Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA
Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, 1899-1919
Edwin D. and Lucia Ames Mead Papers, 1876-1938

U.S. Newspapers & Periodicals

The Arena
Boston Advance
Boston Daily Globe
Boston Evening Transcript
The Chicago Defender
The Christian Science Monitor
Chicago Tribune
The Colored American
Congregationalist
The Crisis
The Cyclopedic Review of Current History

The Des Moines Leader
Grand Rapids Herald
Harrisburg Telegraph
The Hartford Courant.
The Independent
Indiana State Journal
The Interior
The Kearney Daily Hub
Los Angeles Times
Lowell Daily Citizen and News
The Miami News
The Missionary Herald
The Nation
New York Age
New York Evangelist
New York Observer and Chronicle
The New York Times
New-York Tribune
The Open Court
The Outlook
Parsons Weekly Blade
Philadelphia Tribune
The Sun
The Tacoma Daily Ledger
Tulsa Daily World
The Washington Post
Weekly Republican
Zion's Herald

Non-U.S. Newspapers & Periodicals

Aberdeen Weekly Journal (Aberdeen, Scotland, UK)
The Argus (Melbourne, Australia)
The Daily News (London, UK)
Fraternity: The Official Organ of the Society for the Recognition of the Brotherhood (London, UK)
The Globe (Toronto, Canada)
The Guardian (Manchester, UK)
The Times (London, UK)

Published Primary Sources

Affairs in the Philippine Islands. [Part 1]. 57th Cong., 1902. ProQuest Congressional.

"Anti-Imperialism. Speeches at the Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston," June 15, 1898. https://web.archive.org/web/20140227011841/http://www.antiimperialist.com/.

Anti-Imperialist League. "Address to the People of the United States." Boston, November 19, 1898. https://web.archive.org/web/20071009174631/http://www.antiimperialist.com/webroot/1647.html.

———. "First Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Now the New England Anti-Imperialist League." Annual Report. Boston, November 25, 1899. Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

———. "In the Name of Liberty: Anti-Imperialist Meeting, Tremont Temple, April 4, 1899: Protest against the Philippine Policy." Boston, April 4, 1899. https://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupid?key=ha100190119.

———. "Report of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League," December 3, 1906. CDG-A. Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

———. "Report of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League," November 30, 1909. CDG-A. Anti-Imperialist League Collected Records, Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA.

———. *The Chicago Liberty Meeting*. Library Tracts 1. Chicago: Central Anti-Imperialist League, 1899. https://web.archive.org/web/20071009174631/http://www.antiimperialist.com/.

Bryce, James. "British Experience in the Government of Colonies." *The Century Magazine*, March 1899. HathiTrust.

———. "Impressions of South Africa, Part 1." *The Century Magazine*, May 1896. HathiTrust.

———. "Impressions of South Africa, Part 2." *The Century Magazine*, June 1896. HathiTrust.

———. "Impressions of South Africa, Part 3." *The Century Magazine*, July 1896. HathiTrust.

———. "Some Thoughts on the Policy of the United States." *Harper's Magazine*, September 1898. HathiTrust.

———. “The Armenian Question.” *The Century Magazine* 50, no. 1 (November 1895): 151–54. HathiTrust.

———. “The Essential Unity of Great Britain and America.” *Atlantic Monthly*, July 1898. HathiTrust.

———. “The Historical Causes of the Present War in South Africa.” *The North American Review*, December 1899. ProQuest American Periodicals.

———. “Thoughts on the Negro Problem.” *The North American Review*, December 1891. JSTOR.

———. *Neutral Nations and the War*. New York: The Macmillan company, 1914. HathiTrust.

———. *The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind*. The Romanes Lecture. 1902. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.

Bryce, James, and Arnold Toynbee. *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916*. London: His Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1916. https://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/1915/bryce/a00tc.htm.

Carnegie, Andrew. “The South African Question.” *The North American Review* 169, no. 517 (1899): 798–804. JSTOR.

Cleveland, Grover. “December 4, 1893: First Annual Message (Second Term),” December 4, 1893. Miller Center. https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-4-1893-first-annual-message-second-term.

Committee on the Philippines. U.S. Senate. *American Imperialism and the Philippine Insurrection; Testimony Taken from Hearings on Affairs in the Philippine Islands before the Senate Committee on the Philippines, 1902*. Edited by Henry F. Graff. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1969. Internet Archive. https://archive.org/details/americanimperial00henr/page/n3/mode/1up.

Cooper, Anna Julia. “The Ethics of the Negro Question Speech by Anna Julia Cooper.” Speech, September 5, 1902. Addresses, A. J. Cooper Manuscripts. Digital Howard, Howard University, Washington DC. https://dh.howard.edu/ajc_addresses/19.

Cutler, James Elbert. *Lynch-Law: An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States.* New York: Longmans, Green, and co., 1905. HathiTrust.

Du Bois, W. E. B. *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Gladstone, William. *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*. London: John Murray, 1876. Gale Nineteenth Century Collections Online.

Hoar, George. *Petition for Suspension of Hostilities in Philippine Islands*. 57th Cong., 1902. ProQuest Congressional.

Hobhouse, Emily. *The Brunt of the War, and Where It Fell*. Methuen & Company, 1902.

Kirakosi͡an, A. Dzh. *The Armenian Massacres, 1894-1896: U.S. Media Testimony*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004.

"Letter from Mr. Moorfield Storey, Ex-President of the American Bar Association, to Viscount Bryce." In *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-1916*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1916. https://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/1915/bryce/a01.htm#Storey.

Mead, Edwin D. "Editor's Table." *New England Magazine* 23, no. 3 (November 1900): 346-352. HathiTrust.

———. "Editor's Table - The Peace Movement in Boston." *New England Magazine* 20, no. 2 (April 1899): 253–59. HathiTrust.

———. "Editor's Table - War in South Africa." *New England Magazine*, 22, no. 3 (May 1900): 369-380. HathiTrust.

———. "More Earnest Work for the World's Peace ..." In *Report of the Third Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration*. Mohonk Lake, N.Y: Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1902. HathiTrust.

———. "On Lawlessness." *New England Magazine* 17, no. 2 (October 1897): 252-259. HathiTrust.

———. "Patriotism in Peace and War." *New England Magazine* 18, no. 3 (May 1898): 385-392. HathiTrust.

———. "The Expansion of England." *National Geographic Magazine*, July 1900. HathiTrust.

———. *The Present Crisis*. Anti-Imperialist Leaflet 17. Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1899. HathiTrust

Mead, Lucia Ames. "Address of Miss Lucia T. Ames." In *Report of the Third Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.* Mohonk Lake, N.Y.: Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, 1902. HathiTrust.

Miller, Kelly. *The Effect of Imperialism upon the Negro Race. Ably Set out by a Colored Man.* Anti-Imperialist Broadside 11. Boston, Mass: Anti-Imperialist League, 1900. https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.07900600/.

National Liberal Federation. “Proceedings in Connection with the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the National Liberal Federation.” Proceedings. Norwich, England, March 1897. Google Books.

Pillsbury, Albert E. “A Brief Inquiry into a Federal Remedy for Lynching.” *Harvard Law Review* 15, no. 9 (May 1902): 707–13. https://doi.org/10.2307/1323748.

National Archive & Records Administration. “President Woodrow Wilson’s 14 Points,” January 8, 1918. https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/president-woodrow-wilsons-14-points.

Russell, George. “Armenia and the Forward Movement.” *The Contemporary Review*, January 1, 1897. ProQuest British Periodicals.

———. “An UnChristian Christmas.” *The Speaker: The Liberal Review*, December 23, 1899. Gale Nineteenth Century Collections Online Archive.

Smith, Edwin Burritt. *Republic or Empire, with Glimpses of “Criminal Aggression.”* Liberty Tracts 9. Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900. HathiTrust.

———. *The Chinese of the United States*. Chicago, 1887. HathiTrust.

Stead, W. T. “A Chance for the Small States.” *The Review of Reviews.* 24 (July 1, 1901): 9–10.

———. *If Christ Came to Chicago. A Plea for the Union of All Who Love in the Service of All Who Suffer*. Chicago: Laird & Lee, 1894.

Stevenson, Adlai E., B. R. Tillman, Edward M. Shepard, Richard Croker, Erving Winslow, Charles Emory Smith, G. F. Hoar, et al. “Bryan or McKinley? The Present Duty of American Citizens.” *The North American Review* 171, no. 527 (1900): 433–516.

Storey, Moorfield. *Abraham Lincoln: An Address Delivered at the Shawmut Congregational Church in Boston on February 14, 1909*. Boston: G. H. Ellis co., printers, 1909. HathiTrust.

———. “Government of Cities.” *New England Magazine* 6 (June 1892): 432–41.

———. *Is It Right?* Liberty Tracts 8. Chicago, Ill.: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900. HathiTrust.

———. “Lawlessness.” *The American Lawyer*, July 1905. ProQuest American Periodical Series III.

———. *Negro Suffrage Is Not a Failure: An Address before the New England Suffrage Conference March 30, 1903*. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1903. HathiTrust.

———. “Nothing to Excuse Our Intervention.” *Advocate of Peace* 60, no. 5 (May 1898): 112–14.

———. *Obedience to the Law. An Address at the Opening of Petigru College in Columbia, South Carolina*. Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1919. HathiTrust.

———. *Our New Departure*. Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1901. Internet Archive.

———. *Politics as a Duty and as a Career.* Questions of the Day, no. LVIII. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1889. HathiTrust.

———. *Problems of To-Day*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920. HathiTrust.

———. *Secretary Root’s Record: “Marked Severities” in Philippine Warfare*. Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1902. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=philamer;idno=AKL0070.0001.001.

———. *The Negro Question: An Address Delivered before the Wisconsin Bar Association.* 1918. HathiTrust.

———. *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies? The Annual Address before the Bar Association of South Carolina, Delivered in Columbia, January 16, 1903*. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis co., printers, 1903. HathiTrust.

National Archives. “The Constitution: Amendments 11-27,” November 4, 2015. https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/amendments-11-27.

Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918. New York: Negro Universities Press; NAACP, 1919. Hein Online.

Tourgee, Albion. “A Bystander’s Notes.” *The Daily Inter Ocean*, July 28, 1894. Gale Nineteenth Century U.S. Newspapers.

———. “That Lynching.” *Cleveland Gazette*, March 3, 1894. Readex: African American Newspapers.

“Treaty between Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia, and Turkey for the Settlement of Affairs in the East: Signed at Berlin, July 13, 1878.” *The American Journal of International Law* 2 (October 1908): 401–24.

Twain, Mark. “To the Person Sitting in Darkness.” *The North American Review*, February 1901. ProQuest American Periodical Series II.

U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. “Antilynching Bill,” April 20, 1922. Report Number 837; Serial Set 7951 S.rp.837. ProQuest Congressional.

Wells-Barnett, Ida B. *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020.

Work, Monroe Nathan. *Negro Year Book*. Tuskegee: Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, 1912. HathiTrust.

Secondary Sources

Akçam, Taner. *A Shameful Act: The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006.

Ambrosius, Lloyd E. "Wilsonian Diplomacy and Armenia: The Limits of Power and Ideology." In *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, edited by J. M Winter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Anderson, Stuart. "Racial Anglo-Saxonism and the American Response to the Boer War." *Diplomatic History* 2, no. 3 (June 1978): 219–36.

Annan, Kofi. "Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization." United Nations, September 20, 1999. A/54/PV.4. UN Digital Library. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/403253?ln=en.

———. "Two Concepts of Sovereignty." *The Economist*, September 18, 1999. Gale Business Insights: Global.

Auld, John W. "The Liberal Pro-Boers." *Journal of British Studies* 14, no. 2 (1975): 78–101.

Balakian, Peter. *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response*. New York, NY: Perennial, 2003.

Ballantyne, Tony. *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Barnett, Michael. *The Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Barton, James L. *Story of Near East Relief*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015011396317;view=1up;seq=11.

Bass, Gary Jonathan. *Freedom's Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Beisner, Robert L. *Twelve against Empire; the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Bellamy, Alex J. "Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit." *Ethics & International Affairs* 20, no. 2 (June 2006): 143–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00012.x.

Bernstein, Michael A. "Introduction: The Puzzle of the 1930s and Chapter 1: Long-Term Economic Growth." In *The Great Depression: Delayed Recovery and Economic Change in America, 1929-1939*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Bhroiméil, Üna Ní. "The South African War, Empire and the Irish World, 1899-1902." In *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire, c.1857-1921*, edited by Simon James Potter. Dublin: Four Courts, 2004.

Bradshaw, Katherine A. "The Misunderstood Public Opinion of James Bryce." *Journalism History* 28, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 16–25.

Brockmeier, Sarah, Oliver Stuenkel, and Marcos Tourinho. "The Impact of the Libya Intervention Debates on Norms of Protection." *Global Society* 30, no. 1 (January 2016): 113–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2015.1094029.

Burns, Adam. "Without Due Process: Albert E. Pillsbury and the Hoar Anti-Lynching Bill." *American Nineteenth Century History* 11, no. 2 (June 2010): 233–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2010.481875.

Buxton Historical Society. "Jerome R. Riley," 2022. https://buxtonmuseum.com/history/PEOPLE/riley-jerome.html.

Cabanes, Bruno. *The Great War and the Origins of Humanitarianism, 1918–1924*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Chopra, Jarat, and Thomas G. Weiss. "Sovereignty Is No Longer Sacrosanct: Codifying Humanitarian Intervention." *Ethics & International Affairs* 6 (March 1992): 95–117. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.1992.tb00545.x.

Cmiel, Kenneth. "The Recent History of Human Rights." *American Historical Review* 109, no. 1 (2004): 117–35.

Cohen, Nancy. *The Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Craig, John M. *Lucia Ames Mead (1856-1936) and the American Peace Movement*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1990.

Crosbie, Barry. “Ireland, Colonial Science, and the Geographical Construction of British Rule in India, c. 1820–1870.” *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 04 (2009): 963–87.

Cullinane, Michael. *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

———. “Transatlantic Dimensions of the American Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1899-1909.” *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 8, no. 4 (December 2010): 301–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/14794012.2010.522324.

Curti, Merle. *American Philanthropy Abroad: A History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1963.

Darwin, John. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Davey, Arthur. *The British Pro-Boers, 1877-1902*. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1978.

Deng, Francis M. “Frontiers of Sovereignty: A Framework of Protection, Assistance, and Development for the Internally Displaced.” *Leiden Journal of International Law* 8, no. 2 (1995): 249–86. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156500003320.

Dutton, David. *A History of the Liberal Party Since 1900*. British Studies Series. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Elliott, Mark. *Color-Blind Justice: Albion Tourgée and the Quest for Racial Equality from the Civil War to Plessy v. Ferguson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Equal Justice Initiative. *Lynching in America: Confronting the Legacy of Racial Terror*. Equal Justice Initiative, 2017. https://eji.org/wp-content/uploads/2005/11/lynching-in-america-3d-ed-110121.pdf.

Evans, Gareth, and Mohamed Sahnoun. “The Responsibility to Protect.” *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 6 (2002): 99–110. https://doi.org/10.2307/20033347.

Feimster, Crystal. *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Fisher, John. *That Miss Hobhouse.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1971.

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*, 2014.

Forth, Aidan. *Barbed-Wire Imperialism: Britain’s Empire of Camps, 1876-1903*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2017.

Francis, Megan Ming. *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Galbraith, John S. "The Pamphlet Campaign on the Boer War." *The Journal of Modern History* 24, no. 2 (1952): 111–26.

Gatewood, Willard B. "Black Americans and the Boer War, 1899-1902." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (Spring 1976): 226–44.

———. "Black Americans and the Quest for Empire, 1898-1903." *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 4 (1972): 545–66. https://doi.org/10.2307/2206149.

Gerber, David A. "Lynching and Law and Order: Origin and Passage of the Ohio Anti-Lynching Law of 1896." *Ohio History* 83 (1974): 33–50.

Gilbert, Sir Martin. "Twentieth-Century Genocides." In *America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915*, edited by J. M Winter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Gill, Rebecca, and Cornelis Muller. "The Limits of Agency: Emily Hobhouse's International Activism and the Politics of Suffering." *Safundi* 19, no. 1 (January 2, 2018): 16–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2018.1404744.

Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Glanville, Luke. *Sharing Responsibility: The History and Future of Protection from Atrocities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021.

———. *Sovereignty and the Responsibility to Protect: A New History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. "Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: The 2009 General Assembly Debate: An Assessment," August 2009. https://www.globalr2p.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2009-UNGA-Debate-Summary.pdf.

Haass, Richard. "World Order 2.0." *Foreign Affairs* 96, no. 1 (February 2017): 2–9.

Harrington, Fred H. "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 22, no. 2 (1935): 211–30. https://doi.org/10.2307/1898467.

Heyningen, Elizabeth Van. *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War*. Aukland Park, South Africa: Jacana Media, 2013.

———. “The Concentration Camps of the South African (Anglo-Boer) War, 1900–1902.” *History Compass* 7, no. 1 (2009): 22–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00562.x.

Hirshfield, Claire. “Blacks, Boers, and Britons: The Antiwar Movement in England and the ‘Native Issue,’ 1899-1902.” *Peace & Change* 8, no. 4 (October 1982): 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0130.1982.tb00472.x.

———. “Liberal Women’s Organizations and the War against the Boers, 1899-1902.” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 14, no. 1 (1982): 27–49. https://doi.org/10.2307/4048484.

Hixson, William B. *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

———. “Moorfield Storey and the Defense of the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill.” *The New England Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1969): 65. https://doi.org/10.2307/363500.

———. “Moorfield Storey and the Struggle for Equality.” *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (December 1968): 533. https://doi.org/10.2307/1891012.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007.

Hyslop, Jonathan. “The Invention of the Concentration Camp: Cuba, Southern Africa and the Philippines, 1896–1907.” *South African Historical Journal* 63, no. 2 (June 2011): 251–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582473.2011.567359.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect: The Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.* Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001.

Iriye, Akira. *The Human Rights Revolution: An International History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.

Judd, Denis, and Keith Terrance Surridge. *The Boer War: A History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2013.

Justesen, Benjamin R. *Broken Brotherhood: The Rise and Fall of the National Afro-American Council*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Karcher, Carolyn L. "Ida B. Wells and Her Allies against Lynching." *Comparative American Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 2005): 131–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477570005052526.

———. "The White 'Bystander' and the Black Journalist 'Abroad': Albion W. Tourgée and Ida B. Wells as Allies Against Lynching." *Prospects* 29 (January 2005): 85–119. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0361233300001708.

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

Keller, Morton. "James Bryce and America." *The Wilson Quarterly (1976-)* 12, no. 4 (1988): 86–95.

Kellogg, Charles Flint. *NAACP: A History of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

Keohane, Robert. *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Kessler, S. V. "The Black Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War." *Historia* 44, no. 1 (1999): 110–47.

Kinzer, Stephen. *The True Flag: Theodore Roosevelt, Mark Twain, and the Birth of American Empire*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 2017.

Koss, Stephen. *The Anatomy of an Anti-War Movement: The Pro-Boers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Koven, Seth. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Laderman, Charlie. "Sharing the Burden? The American Solution to the Armenian Question, 1918-1920." *Diplomatic History* 40, no. 4 (September 1, 2016): 664–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhv036.

———. *Sharing the Burden: The Armenian Question, Humanitarian Intervention, and Anglo-American Visions of Global Order*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Laidlaw, Zoë. *Colonial Connections 1815-45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government*. Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 2005.

Lanzar-Carpio, Maria C. “The Anti-Imperialist League.” University of Michigan, 1928. https://web.archive.org/web/20120507214342/http://www.antiimperialist.com/webroot/AILdocuments/Carpio(index).html.

Lester, Alan. “Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire.” *History Compass* 4, no. 1 (January 1, 2006): 124–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2005.00189.x.

———. *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain*. London; New York: Routledge, 2001.

Lester, Alan, and Fae Dussart. *Colonization and the Origins of Humanitarian Governance: Protecting Aborigines across the Nineteenth-Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Lewis, David L. *W.E.B. Du Bois*. New York: H. Holt, 1993.

Lowry, Donal. *The South African War Reappraised*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Luker, Ralph E. *The Social Gospel in Black and White: American Racial Reform, 1885-1912*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Mader, Jodie Noelle. “Patriotic Dissent: The Pro-Boer/Anti-War Movement in the South African War, 1899–1902.” Ph.D., University of Kentucky, 2008. ProQuest Dissertations.

Matikkala, Mira. *Empire and Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in Late-Victorian Britain*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.

May, Ernest R. *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay*. Chicago: Imprint Publications, 1991.

Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2012.

———. *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

McPherson, James M. *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975.

McWhirter, Cameron. *Red Summer: The Summer of 1919 and the Awakening of Black America*. New York, N.Y.: Henry Holt & Co., 2011.

Mongalo, B. E., and Pisani Kobus Du. “Victims of a White Man’s War: Blacks in Concentration Camps during the South African War (1899-1902).” *Historia* 44, no. 1 (May 1999): 148–82. https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC37937.

Morgan, Kenneth O. “Lloyd George, Keir Hardie and the Importance of the ‘Pro-Boers.’” *South African Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (November 1, 1999): 290–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582479908671895.

Moyn, Samuel. *Human Rights and the Uses of History*. London: Verso, 2014.

———. “The End of Human Rights History.” *Past & Present* 233, no. 1 (November 2016): 307-322. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtw038.

———. *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.

Mulanax, Richard B. *The Boer War in American Politics and Diplomacy*. Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1994.

Murphy, Erin L. *No Middle Ground: Anti-Imperialists and Ethical Witnessing during the Philippine-American War*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2020.

———. “Women’s Anti-Imperialism, ‘The White Man’s Burden,’ and the Philippine-American War: Theorizing Masculinist Ambivalence in Protest.” *Gender and Society* 23, no. 2 (2009): 244–70.

Owen, Nicholas. *The British Left and India: Metropolitan Anti-Imperialism, 1885-1947*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Paterson, Thomas G. *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism*. New York: Crowell, 1973.

Patterson, David S. *Toward a Warless World: The Travail of the American Peace Movement, 1887-1914*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Patterson, James T. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*. Oxford History of the US. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Pearson, Susan J. *The Rights of the Defenseless: Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Pennybacker, Susan D. “The Universal Races Congress, London Political Culture, and Imperial Dissent, 1900-1939.” *Radical History Review*, no. 92 (Spring 2005): 103–17. https://doi.org/10.1215/01636545-2005-92-103.

Potter, Simon. *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire, c.1857-1921*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2004.

Riedi, Eliza. “The Women Pro-Boers: Gender, Peace and the Critique of Empire in the South African War.” *Historical Research* 86, no. 231 (February 2013): 92–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2281.2012.00612.x.

Rodogno, Davide. *Against Massacre Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914: The Emergence of a European Concept and International Practice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Rotmann, Philipp, Gerrit Kurtz, and Sarah Brockmeier. “Major Powers and the Contested Evolution of a Responsibility to Protect.” *Conflict, Security & Development* 14, no. 4 (August 8, 2014): 355–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2014.930592.

Schirmer, Daniel. *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co.; distributed by General Learning Press, 1972.

Seaman, John T. *A Citizen of the World: The Life of James Bryce*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2006.

Seguin, Charles, and Sabrina Nardin. “The Lynching of Italians and the Rise of Antilynching Politics in the United States.” *Social Science History* 46, no. 1 (2022): 65–91. https://doi.org/10.1017/ssh.2021.43.

Sellers, I. “The Pro-Boer Movement in Liverpool.” *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* 12, no. 1 (January 1959): 69–84.

Silkey, Sarah L. *Black Woman Reformer: Ida B. Wells, Lynching, & Transatlantic Activism*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2015.

———. “Redirecting the Tide of White Imperialism: The Impact of Ida B. Wells’s Transatlantic Antilynching Campaign on British Conceptions of American Race Relations.” In *Women Shaping the South: Creating and Confronting Change*, edited by Judith N. McArthur and Angela Boswell. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2006.

Šimonović, Ivan. “The Responsibility to Protect.” *UN Chronicle*, December 2016. https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/responsibility-protect.

Slap, Andrew L. *The Doom of Reconstruction: The Liberal Republicans in the Civil War Era*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.

Smith, Iain R., and Andreas Stucki. “The Colonial Development of Concentration Camps (1868–1902).” *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 39, no. 3 (September 1, 2011): 417–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2011.598746.

Smith, Thomas E. *Emancipation without Equality: Pan-African Activism and the Global Color Line*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2018.

Spies, S. B. *Methods of Barbarism?: Roberts and Kitchener and Civilians in the Boer Republics, January 1900-May 1902*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau, 1977.

Stanley, Liz. "'A Strange Thing Is Memory': Emily Hobhouse, Memory Work, Moral Life and the 'Concentration System.'" *South African Historical Journal* 52, no. 1 (January 2005): 60–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582470509464864.

Steinberg, Oded Y. "The Confirmation of the Worst Fears: James Bryce, British Diplomacy and the Armenian Massacres of 1894-1896." *Études Arméniennes Contemporaines*, no. 11 (October 15, 2018): 15–39.

Strauss, Charles T. "God Save the Boer: Irish American Catholics and the South African War, 1899-1902." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 26, no. 4 (2008): 1–26.

Sullivan, Patricia. *Lift Every Voice: The NAACP and the Making of the Civil Rights Movement*. New York, N.Y.: New Press, 2009.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. *Looking toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

———. *"They Can Live in the Desert but Nowhere Else": A History of the Armenian Genocide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Sutton, Jennifer Ann. "The Empire Question: How the South African War, 1899-1902, Shaped Americans' Reactions to U.S. Imperialism." Dissertation, Washington University in St. Louis, 2012. ProQuest Dissertations.

Thornbrough, Emma Lou. "The National Afro-American League, 1887-1908." *The Journal of Southern History* 27, no. 4 (1961): 494–512. https://doi.org/10.2307/2204311.

Tolnay, Stewart Emory, and E. M. Beck. *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Tompkins, E. Berkeley. *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

———. "The Old Guard: A Study of the Anti-Imperialist Leadership." *The Historian* 30, no. 3 (1968): 366–88.

Tulloch, Hugh. *James Bryce's American Commonwealth: The Anglo-American Background*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1988.

Tusan, Michelle. "'Crimes against Humanity': Human Rights, the British Empire, and the Origins of the Response to the Armenian Genocide." *American Historical Review* 119, no. 1 (February 1, 2014): 47–77. https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/119.1.47.

———. “James Bryce’s Blue Book as Evidence.” *Journal of Levantine Studies* 5, no. 2 (Winter 2015): 16.

———. *Smyrna’s Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide, and the Birth of the Middle East*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012.

———. *The British Empire and the Armenian Genocide: Humanitarianism and Imperial Politics from Gladstone to Churchill*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2017.

Tyrrell, Ian R. *Reforming the World the Creation of America’s Moral Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Uhlman, James Todd. “Dispatching Anglo-Saxonism: Whiteness and the Crises of American Racial Identity in Richard Harding Davis’s Reports on the Boer War.” *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 19, no. 1 (January 2020): 19–47. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781419000434.

United Nations. “The International Bill of Human Rights.” United Nations. Accessed October 20, 2022. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/Compilation1.1en.pdf.

United Nations General Assembly. “2005 World Summit Outcome.” United Nations, 2005. A/RES/60/1. UN Digital Library. https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_60_1.pdf.

United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG). “Implementing the Responsibility to Protect. Report of the Secretary-General,” January 12, 2009. UN Doc. A/63/677.

Vernon, James. *Hunger: A Modern History*. London, England: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Waldrep, Christopher. *The Many Faces of Judge Lynch: Extralegal Violence and Punishment in America*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

———. “War of Words: The Controversy over the Definition of Lynching, 1899-1940.” *The Journal of Southern History* 66, no. 1 (February 2000): 75. https://doi.org/10.2307/2587438.

Walther, Karine V. *Sacred Interests: The United States and the Islamic World, 1821-1921*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Ware, Vron. *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History*. London: Verso, 1992.

Warwick, Peter. *Black People and the South African War 1899–1902*. African Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511523908.

Watenpaugh, Keith David. *Bread from Stones: The Middle East and the Making of Modern Humanitarianism*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015.

Weber, Eric. "National Crimes and Southern Horrors: Trans-Atlantic Conversations about Race, Empire, and Civilization, 1880-1900," 2011. https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/5037.

Wedin, Carolyn. *Inheritors of the Spirit: Mary White Ovington and the Founding of the NAACP*. New York: Wiley, 1998.

Weiss, Thomas G. "The Politics of Humanitarian Ideas." *Security Dialogue* 31, no. 1 (March 2000): 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010600031001002.

Weitz, Eric D. *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Welch, Richard E. "American Atrocities in the Philippines: The Indictment and the Response." *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 2 (1974): 233–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/3637551.

———. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

White, Richard. *The Republic for Which It Stands: The United States during Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Wilson, Ann Marie. "In the Name of God, Civilization, and Humanity: The United States and the Armenian Massacres of the 1890s." *Le Mouvement Social* 227, no. 1 (May 29, 2009): 27–44.

Wilson, Trevor. "Lord Bryce's Investigation into Alleged German Atrocities in Belgium, 1914-15." *Journal of Contemporary History* 14, no. 3 (1979): 369.

Wood, Amy Louise. *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940*. Chapel Hill: Univ of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Woods, G. S., and H. C. G. Matthew. "Clayden, Peter William (1827–1902)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32439.

Zangrando, Robert L. *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909-1950*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980.

Zimmerman, James A. “Who Were the Anti-Imperialists and the Expansionists of 1898 and 1899? A Chicago Perspective.” *Pacific Historical Review* 46, no. 4 (November 1, 1977): 589–601.

Zwick, Jim. *Confronting Imperialism: Essays on Mark Twain and the Anti-Imperialist League*. West Conshohocken, Pa.: Infinity Pub., 2007.

———. “The Anti-Imperialist Movement, 1898-1921.” In *Whose America?: The War of 1898 and the Battles to Define the Nation*, edited by Virginia Marie Bouvier, 171–92. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001.