E. STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXT:

THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The primary purpose of this context is to assist in the identification of places associated with the Underground Railroad that are eligible for National Historic Landmark designation and for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. In 1990, the United States Congress authorized the National Park Service to conduct a study of the resources available nationally for the interpretation of the Underground Railroad. A special resource study published in 1995 determined that there were sufficient resources available and suggested a variety of approaches for commemoration of the Underground Railroad. Operating under the 1990 legislation, the National Park Service has produced educational materials and technical support for researchers. An Underground Railroad Handbook was published in February 1997, followed by “Exploring a Common Past: Researching the Underground Railroad.” This study provides historic context for the development of nominations for the Underground Railroad theme.

Identifying historic properties associated with the Underground Railroad is an extremely varied task. To help the researcher understand the various aspects of the Underground Railroad, this context is divided into sections that focus on a complex but related series of historical activities and geographic regions, referred to generally as the Underground Railroad. The term is capitalized to signal inclusiveness in that larger organizing concept. When used as a descriptive adjective or as a reference to some part of the concept, it is not capitalized.

This context is not exhaustive and it briefly reviews the history of slavery and of North American resistance to slavery, excluding Canada. It evaluates examples of structures, buildings, communities, regions and transportation routes related to fugitives from slavery. These examples do not encompass all the varieties of Underground Railroad activity that were ever enacted; no study could make that claim. However, this study provides a structure into which researchers may fit more information and evidence as it is developed. The report also describes aspects of antislavery activity and slave resistance which are precursors or marginal to the Underground Railroad story but which contribute to its emergence. This context study treats such events, often historically important in their own right, as connected but not central to the Underground Railroad story.

INTRODUCTION

The Underground Railroad refers to the effort -- sometimes spontaneous, sometimes highly organized -- to assist persons held in bondage in North America to escape from slavery. While most runaways began their journey unaided and many completed their self-emancipation without assistance, each decade in which slavery was legal in the United States saw an increase in the public perception of a secretive network and in the number of persons willing to give aid to the runaway. The period under consideration for this study is primarily the 1780s to 1865, with emphasis on the years from 1830 to 1865 when most antislavery advocates abandoned their hope for gradual emancipation and adopted immediate abolition of slavery as their goal. Although divided, the abolitionist movement was successful in expanding the informal network known as the Underground Railroad and in publicizing it.

The term “Underground Railroad” had no meaning to the generations before the first rails and engines of the 1820s, but the retrospective use of the term in this study is made so as to include incidents which have all the characteristics of Underground Railroad activity, but which occurred earlier. These activities foreshadowed and helped to shape the Underground Railroad. While the primary focus will be on the most active period of Underground Railroad activity, it is important to document related events which
contribute to an understanding of this nationally significant, geographically-widespread enterprise. Several aspects of the history of American slavery, as well as categories of sites, not directly related to the Underground Railroad are still central to an understanding of it. Earlier resistance and antislavery actions are the base on which the Underground Railroad was built. Resistance to lifetime servitude began with the first Africans forcibly brought to the Western hemisphere in the 1500s, and resistance continued until the last emancipations in North America. Without this continued resistance, there would have been no need for the extensive legal codes which upheld property rights in human beings or for the brutal intimidation which always existed just beneath the surface of this coercive social system.

Yet, for purposes of identifying historic properties related to the Underground Railroad, an important distinction must be made between the era of the Underground Railroad and those activities which are precursors or simply contemporary to it. Distinctions must be made in levels of significance and not every act of slave resistance or sign of antislavery activity can be included. Nor can every example of the experience of enslavement be connected to the Underground Railroad. But the most distinct and verifiable sites for each of these related events may be joined to a particular Underground Railroad story. Examples may include the town of Ripley, Ohio, in which several buildings and the Ohio River contribute to the story. In another example, the story of Delia Webster and Calvin Fairbarn, who went into Kentucky and brought out Lewis Hayden and his family, crosses state lines and involves farm sites, courthouses, jails, and trails. This story connects Kentucky with Ohio and with Massachusetts, where the Haydens settled. Here the concept of multiple property listings may be particularly useful because a variety of properties within a given area may better reproduce the texture of life, the social tensions, and the economic realities which gave rise to and supported the Underground Railroad.1

The origin of the term “Underground Railroad” cannot be precisely determined. What is known is that both those who aided escapees from slavery, and those who were outraged by loss of slave property, began to refer to runaways as part of an “Underground Railroad” network by the 1830s. The “Underground Railroad” described an activity that was locally organized with no real center and it sometimes existed rather openly in the North, while often just beneath the surface of daily life in the Upper South and certain Southern cities. The Underground Railroad, where it existed, offered local aid to runaway slaves assisting them from one point to another. Farther along, others would take the passenger into their transportation system until the final destination had been reached.2

The rapidity with which the term became commonly used did not mean that incidents of resistance to slavery increased significantly around 1830 or that more attempts were made to escape from bondage. It did mean that more white northerners were prepared to aid runaways and to give some assistance to the northern blacks who had always made it their business to help escapees from slavery. It was on January 1, 1831, that the first issue of William Lloyd Garrison’s newspaper, The Liberator, was published. That event marks the traditional beginning of the era of abolitionist attack on the institution of slavery and of angry and defensive responses from the slaveholding South. The high visibility of the abolitionist attack has perhaps encouraged historians to overemphasize that part of the antislavery movement because the abolitionists left so many printed records.

Other aspects of the Underground Railroad, other than the abolitionist movement, also deserve attention. First, there were probably at least as many attempts at escape from slavery in the North America of the late 1600s and the 1700s, both individual and in groups, as in the 1800s when various forces, from the national Constitution to the local slave patrols, were all aligned to prevent escapes. Second, while primary attention is given to the drama of slave escapes to the free states of the North and to Canada,

---


2 Many sources have described this activity. See the Bibliographic Essay for suggestions on the assessment and use of such sources.
there was also a flow of runaways into Spanish Florida and into Spanish Mexico and the subsequent Mexican Republic. Although the numbers escaping southward and northward across the borders never threatened to destabilize slavery, there were serious consequences for American diplomacy and domestic politics. Indeed, American foreign policy in the antebellum era was often driven by the need to secure national borders and prevent slave escapes. A third factor is that the majority of assistance to runaways came from slaves and free blacks, and the greatest responsibility for providing shelter, financial support and direction to successful runaways came from the organized efforts of northern free blacks.

The importance of the Underground Railroad cannot be measured by the number of attempted or successful escapes from American slavery, but by the manner in which it consistently exposed the grim realities of slavery and -- more important -- refuted the claim that African Americans could not act or organize on their own. Throughout the American colonial era and until the early 1800s, slavery had most frequently been rationalized as a “necessary evil,” perhaps even as benevolent in that it Christianized and civilized the African. But with the end of the slave trade and rise of the Cotton Kingdom, it became clear that another set of theories would have to be developed to justify the continuation of lifetime servitude. In order to promote slavery as a “positive good,” proslavery advocates had to claim, against much evidence, that African Americans were better off in slavery and generally content with their bondage. Runaways refuted this claim by their actions.

The debate in Congress in 1819 and 1820 over whether Missouri should be admitted to the Union as a slave state or a free state made it clear to Northerners and Southerners that the issue of slavery was not going to resolve itself and that slavery was not going to simply evaporate in the American republic. In the 1820s and increasingly in the 1830s, slave-state philosophers began to define slavery as a positive good. They argued that Africans were not capable of caring for themselves, taking initiative, or organizing for the good of the community -- all of which were requirements for citizenship in a republic. The Underground Railroad -- from the first decision to run away through the actions of black-organized Vigilance Committees and churches to the economics of black communities -- was a constant reminder of African American initiative and ability. Its existence and functions showed how self-serving was the racist ideology that was not confined to the South but commonly believed in the North, as well.3

The Underground Railroad gave ample evidence of African American capabilities and gave expression to an African American world view. It provided an opportunity for sympathetic white Americans to play a role in resisting slavery. It also brought together, however uneasily at times, men and women of both races to begin to set aside assumptions about the other race and to work together on issues of mutual concern. At the most dramatic level, the Underground Railroad provided stories of guided escapes from the South, rescues of arrested fugitives in the North, complex communication systems, and individual acts of bravery and suffering. While most of the accounts of secret passageways, sliding wall panels, and hidden rooms will not be verified by historic evidence, there were indeed sufficient dramas to be interpreted and verified.

THE TRANSATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE AND THE EVOLUTION OF SLAVERY IN BRITISH NORTH AMERICA

The circumstances which gave rise to the Underground Railroad were based in the transportation of Africans to North America as part of the Atlantic slave trade. About 12 million Africans were transported across the Atlantic to the Western Hemisphere in the 400 years from 1450 to 1850. Of this number, only about five per cent were brought to British North America and, later, to the United States from Africa, most of them arriving between 1680 and 1810. A small number of Africans went first to the British West Indies and then to North America.4

---


Africans were present while North and South America were explored and expropriated as European colonies (1500s-1700s), but their roles and status varied from Mexico to Brazil to the Carolinas and New Amsterdam. Bonded labor, common both in Europe and Africa, declined in Europe while it became more important in Africa after trade with Europe was established. At the end of the fourteenth century, Europeans, primarily the Portuguese and the Spanish, were exploring the West Coast of Africa, looking both for trade opportunities and trade routes to the East. In their interaction with African merchants they began to export small numbers of slaves to their European homelands. With the exploration and eventual settling of the New World by Europeans, however, the trade in African slaves increased rapidly. Initially, Europeans brought only small numbers of Africans to the New World, yet as the need for labor grew with increased agricultural, mining, mercantile, and other business interests, so too did the number of black slaves, the vast majority of whom were males. Brazil and the Caribbean had the largest number of imports, and for the longest period of time until the 1880s. Although most of the figures for the Atlantic slave trade system are imprecise, it is possible to estimate that Brazil received at least 4 million slaves and the islands of the Caribbean, colonized by the French, Dutch, English, Danish, and Spanish, as well as Spain’s mainland possessions, received at least 5.5 million. The mainland United States as colonies and nation, imported about 450,000 over a 250-year period. Slavery in this country began, then, as one part of a long history of international trade in goods and people both in Europe and in Africa.

Europeans divided the slave trade into three geographic regions -- Upper Guinea, Lower Guinea, and Angola. More than three-fifths of the slaves brought to the Chesapeake were from the Gold Coast or the Bight of Biafra. While many of the Sierra Leonians went to Carolina, they were outnumbered there by Angolans. Senegambians were prominent in both the Carolinas and Louisiana. The presence of these and other enslaved African groups in North America was due primarily to wars and thievery. Rivalries between ethnic and tribal groups, raids by North Africans and local soldiers, and piracy conducted up the many rivers of the African coast, provided the majority of captured Africans.

Traditionally, the entry of Africans into British North America is dated from the 1619 sale of some 20 blacks from a Dutch ship in Virginia. Although there were undoubtedly other Africans in those regions which later became part of the United States, slavery as it developed in British North America and continued in the American republic, can be traced to what happened in the Chesapeake in the 1600s. For the first few decades, the status of Africans was uncertain. Some were treated as indentured servants and freed after a term of service, often fourteen years. Others were kept on in servitude because their labor was needed, and it was too tempting for aspiring planters not to take advantage of the vulnerable black laborers. By the 1640s, court decisions began to reflect a different standard for Africans than for white servants and to accept the concept of lifetime black servitude. In the 1660s, Virginia decreed that a child followed the status of its mother, thus making lifetime servitude inheritable. A series of court decisions from the 1660s forward locked slavery into place in the Chesapeake and its existence was not questioned in the later development of the Carolinas. Georgia resisted briefly and then accepted the institution.

---


Slave law to the north of the Chesapeake did not differ significantly.\(^9\)

Many blacks who arrived in the New World were familiar with bonded labor. Slavery in Africa, as elsewhere, was not a static institution. European trade rivalries and the European view of North and South America as a site for aggrandizing their power through mineral extraction and staple crop production caused a great escalation in the numbers of Africans enslaved and brought to the Americas. Trade rivalries also caused tremendous changes in the status and functions of the enslaved. The desire and, eventually, the need of West Africans to trade with Europeans in order to gain access to their weapons and other prized goods escalated their involvement in the slave trade to such an extent that they could no longer draw on the reserve of slaves that they traditionally had in their societies.\(^10\)

While there was a general protocol in place in which representatives of trading companies negotiated with African rulers through middlemen, the actual methods of the traders varied greatly. As the trade became more lucrative with greater demand from the New World, more and more slaves were stolen through armed raids. The slave trade also had an immense impact on the developing economies of the New World and the changing economies of Western Europe. It was the foundation for European mercantilism and industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the labor force for colonial agriculture, and a prime force in the growth of the shipbuilding industry.\(^11\)

By the time a body of law regarding slavery was put firmly into place, a number of free blacks who had escaped permanent bondage through indenture, lived throughout the colonies. They married -- other free blacks, slaves, Native Americans, occasionally European servant women -- and raised families. This, in addition to African sailors and free black arrivals from the West Indies, constituted the core of the free black class in the colonies.\(^12\)

Lifetime bondage, or slavery, was firmly and legally established in the British North American colonies by the late 1600s and continued to exist in every colony in some form until the era of the American Revolution. The death rate was lower in tobacco and grain cultivation and natural increase began to offset deaths by 1700, about the time that slavery received its final legal sanctions. The period of greatest importation of slaves into the present-day United States was from approximately 1680 to the Revolutionary War (1776). There were a scattering of bondspeople in New England and, moving southward, the number of slaves increased from New York through Virginia, while a system of plantation slavery similar to that of the Caribbean developed in the eastern part of South Carolina and Georgia. In the Carolinas and Georgia importation began about 1720 and continued until the slave trade became illegal in 1808. There slaves were acquired through the low country ports of Charleston and Savannah or in the other major slave market, the Gulf Coast port of New Orleans. New Orleans, controlled by the French and the Spanish in this period, imported most heavily while the American colonials were at war and continued through the early 1800s as an import market for the rising Cotton Kingdom.\(^13\)

While British North America received few slaves, it was deeply involved in the slave trade, which was dominated after the 1680s by the British Royal African Company. For much of the eighteenth century, Britain’s prosperity was involved with the purchase, capture and export of slaves from western Africa to

---


\(^12\) For the origins of northern free blacks see James O. Horton and Lois Horton, *In Hope of Liberty*, chaps. 1-2. For a Chesapeake example, see T. H. Breen and Steven Innis, “Mynne Owne Ground:’’ Race and Freedom on Virginia’s Eastern Shore, 1640-1676” (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

the European colonies of the Western Hemisphere. Some colonial legislatures (Massachusetts, Virginia, and South Carolina) attempted to tax slave imports, fearing slave insurrection and hoping to encourage European immigration, but found their laws ignored by traders or overturned by royal representatives. By the mid-1700s, voices began to be raised against slavery in moral grounds. Primarily, these were the voices of religious societies. In England and British North America, the Society of Friends (Quakers) began to divest themselves of slaves in the 1750s.\(^\text{14}\)

In many ways, the colonial era presented enslaved Africans with more opportunities to abscond than did the more settled and legally-restrictive American society of the nineteenth century. More runaways before the American Revolution than afterward may have tried, as they did in the Caribbean and South America, to form maroon societies. Large sections of all the colonies were uninhabited by Europeans, and Native Americans were sometimes, although not always, willing to assist fugitives from slavery. In addition, vast tracts of forests and swamps, not yet claimed and settled, offered deep cover for runaways and the colonies were just beginning to organize their legal and law enforcement systems to protect slaveholding. Colonial slaves had often recently arrived from Africa or the Caribbean and had no reason to believe that they could not escape from the system of slavery and start their own community. Since the northern states were not yet “free” states, their only recourse was to cross an international border, pass themselves as free in a new region, or live outside society.

Maroon societies (also marron or cimarron) were bands or communities of fugitive slaves who had succeeded in establishing a society of their own in some geographic area, usually difficult to penetrate, where they could not easily be surprised by soldiers, slave catchers, or their previous owners. Africans enslaved in Spanish New World territories were most likely to run away and form such communities. Maroon societies were of several degrees of stability. At the least stable end were the gangs of runaway men who wandered within a region, hiding together, and who sustained themselves by raids or by prevailing upon their friends and relatives for food. Other societies included both men and women and might have developed a trade relationship with outsiders. Some maroon societies felt themselves safe enough to plant crops and attempt at least a semi-permanent settlement. The threat of maroons emerging from their hiding places to merge with slaves in revolt was another concept that troubled slave owners.

But by the time of the American republic, such refuges were fewer. Further, the North American back country was already inhabited by Native Americans who sometimes accepted Africans into their communities, sometimes kept them in slavery, and sometimes returned them to their masters. Even the colonial era maroon societies were neither as large nor as long-lasting as those in the West Indies or Brazil. Maroon societies in North America were most likely to flourish on the borders between English/American and Spanish territories. Thus Florida and the Texas-Mexico border had several active communities, as did Louisiana, before its acquisition by the United States. The Great Dismal Swamp, Okefenokee, and other sites were also briefly home to bands of runaways, some of whom left after a period and others who planned to stay on and stay out of sight. Their success was modest but, given the constraints, admirable.\(^\text{15}\)


\(^{15}\) Richard Price, ed., \textit{Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas} (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997) contained only one reference to maroons in North America. That article was a reprint of a well-known 1939 essay by Herbert Aptheker, “Maroons Within the Present Limits of the United States,” which listed fifty such societies over time. Yet Peter Hinks in \textit{To Awaken My Afflicted Brethren: David Walker and the Problem of Antebellum Slave Resistance} (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 1997), 40-46, uses court records and current scholarship to describe maroon camps in eastern North Carolina and Virginia that flourished between the 1760s and the 1820s. But Michael Mullin, \textit{Africa in America: Slave Acculturation and Resistance in the American South and the British Caribbean, 1736-1831}, (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992), and Kenneth Porter, “Negroes on the Southern Frontier, 1670-1763,” \textit{Journal of Negro History} 33 (January 1948): 53-78 both contend that, although maroon attempts were plentiful, they were not permitted to exist for very long.
Escapes into Spanish Florida were among the earliest successful attempts at freedom and community, beginning near the end of the 1600s and concluding only with Andrew Jackson’s march into Florida to eradicate the “Negro forts.” In 1738, the Spanish governor of Florida offered freedom to British colonial slaves who escaped to St. Augustine. While Spain had long been part of the international slave trade and had used slave labor throughout its colonies, that nation disputed British claims to Georgia and South Carolina and wanted to keep those colonies as disrupted as possible. Encouraging runaways was a good way to do it. After the edict, slaves ran away in groups and singly to Saint Augustine and nearby Florida villages. Georgia advised its citizens to keep a sharp lookout for runaways from South Carolina on their way to Florida and scout boats patrolled the water routes near the Georgia-Florida border. Many of the Florida villages consisted of the remnants of Southeastern Indian tribes, gathered together for survival, who became known as Seminoles.  

The southern colonies had much larger slave populations and began to develop the slave patrols and punitive legislation that came to characterize the slave south. All blacks were required to carry a pass or ticket if they left their plantation or work place. Punishments for runaway slaves were severe and included whipping, mutilation, branding with an “R,” sale to the West Indies, and sometimes death. If a group of slaves ran away together, as was common in the colonial era, several of the group would be put to death upon recapture. Those who aided or encouraged runaways were also punished with fines, imprisonment and, occasionally, death. South Carolina fined anyone who apprehended a runaway and neglected to inflict a whipping.

The organization and function of southern militias was closely tied to preventing slave rebellions and runaways and slave patrols usually had a militia officer as their leader. Even during the American Revolution, scarce military resources had to be expended in patrolling roads, rivers, and seaports to prevent slaves from escaping to the British army and navy. From the beginning of American slavery, runaways were the most troublesome, expensive, and legally vexing aspect of that economic system. Colonial fugitives from slavery came from varied backgrounds and had a wide range of experiences. The following descriptions of eighteenth-century runaways and of a rumored insurrection, suggests some of the complexity of colonial slavery:

This rumor of insurrection came some fifty years after the actual Stono Rebellion and indicates how very long and lingering were the effects of armed slave resistance.

Charleston, 8th August 1787
Colonel Arnaldus Vanderhorst,
Berkley County Militia

Sir,
Having received information that a party of runaway negro men, many of whom are armed, are become very troublesome and dangerous to the plantations in the vicinity of Stono, and it being represented that they are too numerous to be quelled by the usual parties of patrol, you will be pleased to order a command from your regiment of such part of the militia of the neighborhood as you may judge sufficient effectually to apprehend or disperse such slaves as fall within the above description.

Thomas Pinckney

---


BROUGHT to the WORKHOUSE, IN CHARLES-TOWN
May 14, 1754 A new negro man, speaks no English, a little scarified on the temples, with smooth skin and thick beard, has a white cloth jacket and breeches.18

***

STOLEN, Stray’d, or Run-away, on the 12th from Dr. John Finney in New-Castle, a Negro Woman, named Betty, aged about 18 years, of small Stature, round Face, has been about a Month in this country, speaks veryd little English, has had one Child; Had on, the Body of an old Gingham Gown, and an ozenbrigs Petticoat. She is supposed to have been taken from hence by an Oyster-Shallop, Benj. Taylor Master, bound for Philadelphia, and may be sold on some Part of the River.

Whoever brings her to the Subscriber in New-Castle, and discovers the Person who carried her off, shall have Forty Shillings Reward, and reasonable Charges, paid by John Finney
New-Castle, Sept. 15, 1740 19

***

Kingstown, Queen Ann’s County, September 10, 1759

RUN away the 8th of this Instant, a Negroe Man, named Caesar, he has both his Legs cut off, and walks on his Knees, may pretend that he was Cook of a Vessel, as he has been much used on board of Ships; he was seen by New-Castle on Saturday last. Whoever secures the said Negroe in any Goal or Work-house, shall receive Twenty Shillings Reward, paid by me, SARAH MASSEY.
N. B. He has been a Ferry man at Chester Town, Queen Ann’s County, for many years.20

Throughout the colonial period and until 1819, slaves escaped from the lower south into East and West Florida. While the famous “Negro Fort,” once the British Fort Gadsden, was taken by American troops in 1816, it was not until 1819 that the United States made a bold play to take all of East Florida. In that year, Congress attempted to put a stop to slave runaways and Indian raids across the Florida border by sending Andrew Jackson to make war on the encampments and communities of Africans and Native Americans. Jackson went farther and claimed all of Florida for the United States. Spain was not strong enough to reclaim Florida and the descendants of many fugitives moved on to Cuba or retreated into the swamps.

EARLY ANTISLAVERY

The early antislavery movement includes the early abolition societies (1780s-1812) which were present in almost every state, and the religious antislavery movement which began to be significant in the mid-1700s. It also includes free blacks who made political and practical economic efforts to encourage emancipations, to end the slave trade, and, ultimately, to abolish slavery in the new American Republic. The early antislavery movement and early resistance to slavery in the British colonies (1600s-1700s), are precursors of the Underground Railroad. An example of the latter would be African American war-

18 Charleston, South Carolina Gazette, May 21-28, 1754, quoted in Windley, Profile of Runaway Slaves in Virginia and South Carolina, 123.
related efforts to leave the United States during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, to sue for freedom on the basis of military service, and to organize slave rebellions as in the Stono Rebellion (1739), Gabriel’s Conspiracy (1800), and that of Denmark Vesey (1823). A context for early antislavery and resistance also encompasses examples of slave and free black life in the eighteenth and nineteenth century in order to understand the everyday experiences from which slaves became runaways.

There are several intertwined strands to the early stages of the North American antislavery movement. In the British North American colonies, sentiment against slavery developed slowly throughout the years between 1680 and 1770 when the number of Africans arriving in the colonies was at its highest and the importance of bonded labor to the colonial economy was growing. In the eighteenth century, the period of most intense slave trading and slave transportation to North America, antislavery activity focused on ending the slave trade. The ascendance of Enlightenment philosophy in mid-eighteenth century France, spreading rapidly to England and to England’s colonies, emphasized the innate capacities of each person and the limitless progress available to humanity through scientific study and rational thought. It was, in this manifestation, frequently used as a rebuke to slaveholders and to nations involved in the slave trade because its central premise was that each human and each society was capable of progress, however defined. Enlightenment philosophy was important in the development of American Revolutionary theory and the subsequent rhetoric of “the rights of man.”

Another eighteenth-century strand, which also emphasized the dignity and decision-making capacity of each human, was the rise of evangelical religion. Beginning in the 1730s, a style of emotional preaching and a theology of direct and personal experience of God contributed to the waning power of state-sponsored denominations. The Great Awakenings, as these religious belief systems were styled, called into question the morality of slavery. The Society of Friends (Quakers) in England was the first religious denomination to question the morality of human bondage and they came slowly, over a period of several generations in the eighteenth century, to view slavery as incompatible with membership in the Friends. Quakers began to divest themselves of slaves in the 1750s and those who found they could not do it left the Society of Friends. By the nineteenth century, Southern Quakers had begun to move west to escape the culture of slavery. Both those Quakers who remained in the South and those who moved to the Midwestern states often took responsibility for aiding ex-slaves and acquired a deserved reputation for assistance to runaways.

As the authority of the Church of England in the South and the Congregational (Puritan) Church in the North diminished, dispersed, and disappeared, breakaway or independent factions of Presbyterians and, more frequently Baptists, and Methodists in the 1780s and 1790s, attracted African American converts in the North and South. Although this did not mean true equality of condition in these denominations, it did create a moral language of antislavery and a philosophical underpinning for resistance.

A third strand was the rise of benevolent societies in England and America, made possible by a rising standard of living which created a middle class with the time and money necessary to do good works. Ironically, much of that prosperity was based on slave labor. Benevolence was concerned with assisting the most powerless members of society, and among those, were persons held in bondage in England’s


colonies. Abolition societies in England sparked abolition societies in the new United States. For some three decades after the American Revolution, it appeared possible that slavery might gradually be ended, even though the Constitution and the Fugitive Slave Act of 1793 had guaranteed the rights of slave property to slaveholders.25

When British North America severed ties with England, the slave trade between West Africa, the British West Indies, and North America was also officially severed, but colonial American merchant shipping was prepared to expand its role and replace the British. At the same time, in the Revolutionary Era, the public debate in favor of liberty from England strengthened arguments against the slave trade and human bondage. When legal codes were changed during the American Revolution, both the Continental Congresses and the individual states took the opportunity to condemn and restrict the slave trade. Reasons for condemning the slave trade varied. It was increasingly attacked as a moral evil by religious and benevolent societies; parts of the south feared slave insurrection if the numbers of Africans grew to be much greater than the white population; it appeared that the enslaved population could sustain itself and increase in numbers without significant importations. To end the slave trade, however, was not necessarily to favor an end to slavery – on this subject the colonies divided.

The American Revolution (1775-1783) and the subsequent adoption of the Constitution (1787) challenged slavery in at least two ways. First, the rhetoric and ideology of the American patriots especially as embodied in the Declaration of Independence, scorned slavery and affirmed human rights and dignity, a line of argument dangerous to the continued enslavement of Africans which was not lost upon them. Second, the Revolutionary battles themselves were fundamentally contradictory on the subject of slavery. Although nearly 5,000 African Americans ultimately served in the American Revolutionary forces, both the British and the American military were distinctly unenthusiastic about the prospect of African American soldiers at the beginning of the war, fearing an encouragement to slave insurrection. But military necessity prevailed and all states but South Carolina and Georgia eventually enlisted blacks. In addition to those who enlisted as soldiers or sailors, others served as cooks, guides, spies, laborers, and body servants. Slaves who served in the latter capacities were to be freed, although some were tricked out of their freedom.26

Although the British governor of Virginia, Lord Dunmore, offered freedom to slaves who joined the British Army, the result of that call to arms was less than what African Americans hoped for. Dunmore’s Act of 1774 was more a political and military tactic than a humanitarian act. Some 800 African American men enlisted in an Ethiopian Regiment and 300 took part in a battle but when Dunmore and his forces left Virginia, the 2,000 African Americans who contrived to leave with them received little help from the British. Those who gave aid to or served with the British or ran to the British lines during the war, sometimes called “Black Loyalists,” had varied fates. Some shipped out to the Maritime Provinces of Canada (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick) near the conclusion of the Revolution. A number who went to Canada went to Sierra Leone, some were claimed by Loyalist slaveholders while others were sold in the British West Indies, and yet others were abandoned to find their own fates. Many of the runaways found new homes and remained undetected.27


Since the Americans had argued for natural rights in the Declaration of Independence, there was some sentiment for ending the slave trade although less political will for ending it. Ultimately, the Constitution did not follow up on the implications for “liberty” offered in the Declaration of Independence. The Constitutional compromise of 1787 put an end to the slave trade by 1808, but the Constitution and the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 confirmed the rights of slaveholders to their property. Section 2, Article 4 of the Constitution referred to slavery without naming it when it said, “No person held to service or labour in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due.”

After the American Revolution, Abolition Societies were formed in every part of the United States. The American antislavery movement was modeled on the English antislavery movement from the adoption of the Constitution (1787) until the 1820s. English reformers, led by Quakers, evangelicals and certain politicians, had organized in 1787 to abolish English participation in the international slave trade. The British reformers ended the slave trade by 1807 and ended slavery by 1833, with compensation to owners. The Americans followed the British example of advocating gradual and compensated abolition of slavery. But it was the activities of American free blacks and the resistance to slavery of American slaves that provided antislavery with its most tireless workers and its best reason for persisting.

American antislavery ultimately differed from the English experience in that it had one great strength and one great difficulty not found in England. Its strength lay in the fact the American Revolution supplied a ready made set of legal arguments against slavery. Human bondage denied the very rights of man for which the Revolution had been fought. This contradiction was felt very keenly for almost two generations after the Revolution and was as important as the belief that slavery violated God’s law. The difficulty was that slavery was legal in the United States and much of the new nation’s economy depended on slave labor. The early societies could not overcome the indifference of much of the public and the success of proslavery forces in Congressional debates. Although they met yearly from 1794 to 1806 and experienced some success in promoting emancipation legislation in the North and laws to make manumission easier in the South, they lost membership and purpose as the price of slaves rose.28

The American Revolution did provide for a significant growth in the free black community. Not only were some slaves freed for their service to the American forces, but many more were manumitted when Southern state legislatures made emancipation easier for masters and when northern legislatures began a process of gradual emancipation for their states. The era from the Revolution to the War of 1812, was the period of greatest opportunity to end a slavery which was neither entirely pervasive nor yet an economic imperative. A reaction to these and related efforts to encourage emancipation set in even before the War of 1812, perhaps because the price of slaves increased as cotton production proved profitable on the Southern frontier.29

The sectional rift in Congress over whether slavery should be extended into the territories divided North and South as their economies developed in apparently different directions. How deep the cultural differences were is still not certain, but it did become clear to all Americans that slavery would not simply fade away through individual emancipations and local legislation. Southern states passed laws which required newly-emancipated blacks to leave the state. Southern whites were uneasy with the presence of free blacks among a large slave population, believing that if slaves could not see free blacks, they could not imagine them. Still, even with restrictions on manumissions, the free black population grew nationally through natural increase and, in the South, some slaves were able to earn money and purchase their freedom.

Especially in urban areas, slaves picked up work for which they earned cash. Laborers might sell newspapers or sweep floors in a factory at night. Those who swept the floors in a tobacco factory were permitted to use the bits and pieces of tobacco their broom found to make a plug of tobacco. Liberally sprinkled with licorice to cover the dusty taste such plugs sold well. Enslaved artisans, such as blacksmiths, plasterers, or barbers, could work their free time for pay. Few Southerners attempted to keep slaves out of the cash economy because their work was greatly needed.

In some parts of the north, the end of legal slaveholding came with the adoption of new state constitutions. Court challenges to slavery in 1780s Massachusetts brought an ambiguous end to bondage by judicial interpretation of the state Bill of Rights accompanying the adoption of a new state constitution in 1783. The Vermont constitution of 1777 specifically outlawed slavery while in New Hampshire an assumption that the 1783 Constitution and Bill of Rights freed slaves was maintained in the law, although some persons remained in slavery through at least the 1790s.

Laws for the gradual abolition of slavery were passed by the state legislatures in Pennsylvania in the 1780s, in Rhode Island and Connecticut in 1784, and in New York in 1799. Connecticut adopted a gradual abolition law in 1784 and, in 1797, repealed the entire colonial slave code. When Connecticut enacted total abolition in 1848, there were still a few aged slaves, born before the first gradual emancipation act. Gradual abolition could take a long time; it could mean that infants and children served to age thirty or that old persons remained in bondage if it appeared that they would have to be supported by the state. New York was the first state to pass a law for the total abolition of slavery. In 1817, New York adopted an amendment to its original act of gradual emancipation and freed all blacks born before July 4, 1799, as of July 4, 1827. It provided for the retroactive and uncompensated emancipation of approximately ten thousand slaves who had not been emancipated by the earlier scheme of gradual emancipation. Newport, Rhode Island’s prosperity was tied to slave trade shipping and its citizens generally opposed antislavery. Their influence on the colonial and Revolutionary legislatures gave advocates of abolition, who were primarily Quakers, difficulty. Public sentiment was sufficient as the Revolution ended in 1783 to pass a gradual abolition plan that compensated slaveholders and did not significantly interfere with the slave trade.

Not all northern states were quick to abolish slavery. New Jersey did not adopt an abolition act until 1846. At that time there were 700 slaves in the state, half over fifty-five years old. An apprenticeship system, designed to make masters pay for the upkeep of aged slaves, also kept blacks in involuntary servitude in New Jersey. In the 1860 census there were still eighteen. They were either liberated by death or through the passage of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution in 1865 which freed all those remaining in slavery.

The War of 1812 saw black enlistment in the American navy and two free-black companies in the famous Battle of New Orleans. Again, thousands of slaves escaped to the British lines, but the British made little military use of them. Perhaps the most important outcome of the War of 1812, relative to runaways, was the occupation by African Americans and Native Americans of a “Negro Fort” at Prospect Bluff in Florida. Some of those who sought sanctuary in Florida had fought for the British in the War of 1812 and, when the British left, occupied the former Fort Gadsden. It was a visible base from which to harass slave holders and it did not last long. In July 1816, U.S. troops destroyed the fort and killed or enslaved the inhabitants.

In addition to the debate in the northern states over an end to slavery, the Confederation Congress in 1787...
passed the Northwest Ordinance which prohibited the introduction of slaves into the territory west of the Ohio River which had once been claimed by Virginia. This area, which became the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, was permanently free. The belief that slavery was a moral evil and the hope, held widely in the north and south during the early Republic that somehow the slavery issue might resolve itself as the American economy changed and as slaveholders were persuaded of the evils of slavery, disappeared after the bitter Congressional fight over the admission of Missouri to the Union as a slave state in 1820. It was, as Thomas Jefferson claimed, “a firebell in the night.”

Jefferson had heard the firebell twenty years earlier when as President of the United States he learned of the details of a slave insurrection in his native Virginia. In the summer of 1800, a young man named Gabriel, owned by Thomas Prosser, Jr., was frequently seen in the city of Richmond, the capital of Virginia, and the surrounding countryside, talking to fellow slaves after church services, at taverns and Sunday barbecues, at a blacksmith’s forge or where the fishermen clustered along the James River. As an artisan, a blacksmith, he had considerable freedom of movement and few whites who saw him troubled their minds with thoughts of Gabriel except, perhaps, to remember the stir when he bit off part of a white man’s ear in a fight the year before.

Yet on an August Sunday, after a violent thunderstorm on Saturday night, the citizens of Richmond began to hear rumors of a slave insurrection which had been halted at the last possible moment. Virginia Governor James Monroe received reports that Gabriel, his brother, Solomon, and numerous other young slave men and free blacks had organized a wide-ranging conspiracy and planned a revolt to take over the city of Richmond and free the slaves.

Gabriel planned to mount his own revolution for the freedom of enslaved Africans. He expected to negotiate with whites and even to end the revolution peacefully, if white Richmonders would recognize black claims. That unlikely premise was never to be tested. Gabriel’s plot was disclosed by two slaves to their master at the same time that the swollen creeks outside Richmond on Saturday night halted his advance toward the city. Over the next few days, most of the conspirators were arrested, although Gabriel stayed hidden on a commercial vessel in the James River for ten days, apparently protected by its white captain until betrayed by a slave on board.

The trials of the conspirators revealed their view of slavery. One described a piece of silk he intended to purchase on which to inscribe “death or Liberty” and noted that they planned to kill all whites except “Quakers, Methodists, and French people.” While the conspirators saw their actions as an extension of the Age of Revolution, white Virginians saw the nightmare of slave insurrection, recently acted out in Haiti, now at their doorstep. The response of Virginia was to hang many including Gabriel, and transport others to the West Indies for sale. Throughout the trials Gabriel divulged nothing. Earlier he had reportedly said that if the white people agreed to their freedom, then they would hoist a white flag and he would dine and drink with the merchants of the city on the day when it should be agreed to.

Jefferson and his fellow Virginia revolutionaries were deeply and permanently disturbed by Gabriel’s rebellion. The fear of insurrection now hung over the South even as the North ended slavery. The results of this division would be seen after 1820.

---

THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD IN AMERICAN HISTORY 1820-1860

OVERVIEW: THE QUESTION OF NUMBERS, ROUTES, LIKELY RUNAWAYS

It is difficult to determine the number of attempted escapes from slavery each year. Most historians, calculating through various systems, feel that one thousand successful escapees per year is not an exaggeration and that the figure may be calculated to be as high as 1,500. This does not count those who were captured before they reached free land or those who hid out for a time in southern swamps and mountains. Nor does it take into account those runaways who were seeking family still enslaved in the South or attempting to negotiate better conditions from the master. These latter persons seldom escaped to a life of freedom, but satisfied more immediate needs. Some runaways passed as free in Southern cities and could not be counted as having found “free land.”

Runaways came from all conditions, ages, and of both sexes but were more likely to be young males (18-35) who did not yet have a wife and who lived in a state with a border crossing to free land. Frequently, they worked in towns and cities and were familiar with the passage of ships on the docks, the times of coaches, and the flat boats that carried goods to and from the interior. The most common Underground Railroad route was likely to be an established route between one town and another with the fugitive in disguise or hiding under the cargo of a wagon, a flat boat, or a ship. Disguise was more necessary for travel in coaches and railroad trains.

Many runaways traveled alone and didn’t seek aid until they believed themselves to be near or beyond a border to free land. If helped in the south, they were likely to be aided by other slaves and by free blacks. The Southern states developed an elaborate network of surveillance, chase and capture of runaways. It was important to avoid slave patrols, local law officers, suspicious farmers, hostile dogs, even bloodhounds, by not traveling on a known route or calling attention to oneself. Southern jails were full of blacks picked up on suspicion of being runaways and the jailers expected a reward when the “master” (who may or may not have been one) picked them up.

Those who attempted to reach the North became more aware of some organized assistance from black and white abolitionists and other sympathizers as the decades passed. Especially after 1830, when black and white abolitionists began to despair of moral suasion, there followed a commitment to abolitionism, the formation of predominantly-black vigilance committees, and support for what came to be called the “Underground Railroad.”

Many scholars and researchers have estimated that about 100,000 persons successfully escaped slavery between 1790 and 1860. Advertisements for runaway slaves and descriptions of those picked up by the police often indicated whether the fugitive was trying to reach freedom or to stay, hidden, in the area. Examples of those suspected of staying in the region included Mandeville, a seventeen year-old with a limp, who “has lately been seen in Manchester [Virginia], and I have reason to believe has been secreted by his grandmother, old Critty, who is well known in that place” and Gerrard, a twenty year-old man who “has always lived near the Alexandria Ferry, on the Maryland side, and as his Parents are now living there, it is expected he is lurking about the Town of Alexandria or the City of Washington.”

The years between the end of the American Revolution (1783), and the end of the Civil War (1865), are the years in which the United States was a slave-holding independent nation. If the frequent claim of 100,000 successful runaways prior to the Civil War is valid, then that means that, at a minimum, the eighty years between the Revolution and the Civil War produced approximately 1,200 successful runaways per year. We may be sure that the numbers were not the same each year as individual opportunity varied at all times. The secrecy which necessarily surrounded slave runaways means that we

lack evidence of many escapes which for various reasons, went unrecorded in the North or the South. While census estimates indicate an average of 1,000 successful runaways per year, it is reasonable, given the secretive nature of the enterprise, to increase that number by half to 1,500. This number is in harmony with other scholarly estimates of 1,500 persons running to freedom during the late antebellum years.38

As an example of how the number of runaways has been assessed, here is one scholar’s view:

"Relatively few [slaves] escaped permanently... The federal census of 1850 recorded the escapes to free territory of only 1,010 slaves. In 1860, the number was 803. They came principally from the border states. An organization of Quakers and antislavery people in the border states and in the North aided some slaves to escape to Canada; however, their assistance has been vastly exaggerated in the legend of the Underground Railroad. The more valuable aid given to escaping slaves was by free Negroes and fellow slaves... They hid the fugitives in the daytime and gave directions to them."39

Although it is not clear whether the percentage of slave escapes, based on a rising slave population, changed much from decade to decade, it was more difficult to elude patrols and slave catchers in the settled eastern United States after 1820. The Underground Railroad gradually became a more elaborate system as a response to the fact that slavery was by then illegal above the Mason-Dixon Line and above 36 degrees/30 minutes in the western territories. The lines were more clearly drawn between slaveholding and non-slaveholding territory and the direction for fugitives was clearer.

THE CHURCHES AND THE QUESTION OF SLAVERY

The new American nation was predominantly composed of Protestant denominations. The evangelical revivals of the 1780s and 1790s converted thousands of black and white Americans to the Methodist and Baptist denominations. Evangelicals saw themselves as a people apart and rejected fancy dress, ornamental speech, and worldly amusements. They valued repentance and grace. The more established Protestant sects, such as the Presbyterians, Episcopal (Church of England) and Congregational Churches found it necessary to compete with evangelicalism by adopting more emotional sermons and a more personalized religion of the heart.

For a brief period in the 1780s and 1790s, Baptist and Methodist conferences declared themselves to be antislavery. In this period, a number of slaves were freed by their masters for motives which appeared to mix revolutionary principles of liberty with religious principles. But, by the early nineteenth century, both groups had retreated from their positions and their yearly conferences made the ownership of slaves an issue of individual conscience. Soon a divergence over slavery began between Northern and Southern churches of the same denomination. In the 1840s, denominations began to divide into separate Northern and Southern branches. Southern theologians began to develop a proslavery argument while Northern churches often, but not always, became at least nominally antislavery.40

The first African American churches in North America emerged in the 1750s, two on plantations in Virginia and Georgia and one in Williamsburg, Virginia. Black preachers and exhorters were not uncommon among the “brothers” and “sisters” of the early congregations that had both black and white

members, but white leadership began to prevail by the early nineteenth century. Black Christians believed in a very present God who was acting in their lives and would watch over them, as He had watched over the ancient Israelites in bondage in Egypt. Black religion also centered more on collective celebration than did white religion. Communal dances, often called “ring shouts,” camp meetings, revivals, the secretive brush arbor meetings, and the more public general conferences, all helped to develop a sense of African American identity and destiny well-suited to aid runaways from slavery.41

In the North, the growth of separate black churches was abetted by the less-than-equal status endured by black members. The most important move away from integrated religious services happened when Richard Allen and other blacks left the segregated seating of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia in 1792 to found Mother Bethel, the first African Methodist Episcopal Church and the forerunner of many independent black churches in the Northern states. The independent black churches in the north became the center of abolitionist and Underground Railroad activity.42

The black church was usually the political and social center of any black community, and its ministers, at least in the North, were both political and spiritual leaders. In the South, it was more difficult for the free blacks and slaves who formed the black churches to escape white surveillance. Southern laws prohibited blacks from gathering for any purpose and forbade preaching without a white presence or, often, an appointed white minister for the urban black churches. Despite these restrictions, southern urban churches, such as Charleston, Richmond, Baltimore and Washington, D.C., were well-organized to aid their black members through burial societies, fraternal orders, women’s organizations and other groups. Occasionally southern black churches found themselves, accidentally or purposely, aiding a fugitive, but this was an activity that had to be undertaken with extreme caution.43

In the antebellum decades, the northern black churches aided runaways by providing food, clothing, shelter and information. Escapees from slavery sought out black churches if they wanted to stay and seek employment in a northern city. They sought out the churches if they needed concealment and a form of sanctuary before moving on. And they sought out the churches when they were in need. Black churches were the best-organized black institution to aid fugitives and did the majority of the day-to-day assistance. Despite the surveillance of suspicious whites, black churches in the north and south managed to stay in touch with each other. They exchanged members, wrote letters of recommendation, and sometimes passed along news of escaped members and their methods of escape.44

CROSSING INTERNATIONAL BORDERS: COLONIES AND FUGITIVES

African Americans who took part in the colonization schemes to Africa and Haiti were seldom fugitive slaves. They were free blacks or manumitted slaves freed to embark for Liberia, or they were those who cast their lot with the British and went first to Canada. From Canada, African Americans embarked to Sierra Leone in the 1790s and to Haiti in the 1820s. Canada and Mexico were more likely to be the desired cross-border destinations for fugitives, and Canada especially received many. Michael Wayne, using the manuscript census, has estimated 20,000 African Americans, primarily in western Ontario, in
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the decade before the Civil War.\textsuperscript{45}

When the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour in America was established in the Hall of Congress near Christmas, 1816, it was looked upon with suspicion by most free blacks. It was the fear that African colonization might become federal policy that motivated free blacks to search for white allies and encouraged blacks to hold conventions at which they began to organize nationally and denounce colonization. Most free blacks rejected the colony in Liberia which the American Colonization Society founded in 1821.

Still, there were African Americans who were attracted to Liberia as a place where they could establish their own government, develop trade and commerce, and send missionaries. In the first decade of its existence, the 1820s, Liberia received about three thousand African Americans who were predominantly free and traveling in family groups. After the early 1830s, more of the emigrants to Liberia were manumitted slaves, still in family groups, but often freed to be sent to Liberia. By the time of the Civil War, over 13,000 African Americans had immigrated to Liberia. In 1847, Liberia became a republic and operated under a constitution which both modeled the American Constitution and mocked it for its treatment of black Americans.\textsuperscript{46}

Unlike other emigration from the United States, Liberia brought up strong emotions among those who defended it and those who attacked it. David Walker’s \textit{Appeal to the Colored Citizens}, strongly opposed African colonization and called it “a plan got up, by a gang of slaveholders to select the free people of colour from among the slaves, that our more miserable brethren may be better secured in ignorance and wretchedness, to work their farms and dig their mines, and thus go on enriching the Christians with their blood and groans. What our brethren could have been thinking about, who have left their native land and home and gone away to Africa, I am unable to say.”\textsuperscript{47} Bishop Richard Allen of the African Methodist Episcopal Church contended, “This land which we have watered with our tears and our blood, is now our \textit{mother country}, and we are well satisfied to stay where wisdom abounds and the gospel is free.”\textsuperscript{48}

Lott Cary, a slave who had earned enough money to buy his liberty and had then taken his family to Liberia, wrote from Liberia in response to such arguments. Referring to Bishop Allen’s pronouncement from Philadelphia, Cary asks:

“What is the condition of the people of color in that city? O! I don’t allude to the Reverend Richard Allen ...or any of those one of a thousand upon whom fortune has smild. -But to that numerous hosts of chimney sweepers -- wood sawyers and cart drawers who stand in the streets from morning until evening and durst not return to their homes, lest they find Grim death waiting for them with all the horrors of Starvation and the resistless influence of the Frigid Zone. I would ask every candid thinking man how this class of people can be worsted by emegrating to the West Indies, or to the western coast of Africa.”\textsuperscript{49}

Fugitives from slavery who left the territorial boundaries of the United States for Canada or Mexico often did so from port cities or towns, and houses along international borders. While the western territories of the mid-nineteenth-century United States had fewer dramatic escapes and much less of an Underground Railroad presence, the escapes from slavery in such territories as Kansas and Texas had major diplomatic
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implications for the nation. The questions of slavery in the territories and slavery in the Mexican province of Texas, divided the nation.

Before 1836, the Mexican border with the United States was Louisiana, Arkansas territory, and the Indian lands of Oklahoma. As one of Spain’s New World colonies, slavery was legally protected in Mexico. Still, there was little slavery in the underpopulated province of Texas until, at almost the same time that Mexicans rose in revolt against Spanish domination (1819), American slaveholders moved into Texas and began to carve out plantations with slave labor. The newly-independent Mexicans wanted Texas to be settled, but they did not want American slavery to be a permanent part of their new nation. The Mexican legislature agreed in 1827 that, after the adoption of its constitution, no one would be born a slave on Mexican soil. American efforts to get around this by registering their slaves as indentured servants ultimately failed. This tension over slavery was a primary cause for American Texans to seek independence from Mexico and establish the Republic of Texas (1836-1848).50

Benjamin Lundy, the antislavery agent who managed to visit so many slave-based societies in the United States, traveled in Texas between 1830 and 1835 and concluded that Texas independence was:

“a settled design, among the slaveholders of the country (with land speculators and slave traders), to wrest the large and valuable territory of Texas from the Mexican Republic, in order to re-establish the SYSTEM of SLAVERY; to open a vast and profitable SLAVE-MARKET therein; and, ultimately, to annex it to the United States.”51

Although the chief cotton-growing and slave-holding section of the Republic of Texas was in East Texas, some slaves brought into the region from Arkansas, Missouri, Alabama, or Tennessee still managed to leave Texas bondage for Mexican freedom. From the 1830s through the Civil War, Texans complained of slave escapes and of the existence of communities of slaves and Indians just across the border in Mexico. The editor of the San Antonio Ledger complained in 1852 that the area across the Rio Grande “has long been regarded by the Texas slave as his El Dorado for accumulation, his utopia for political rights, and his Paradise for happiness.”52 As many as five thousand slaves may have crossed the southwestern border in the three decades between 1836 and 1865. In addition, a small but steady number of bondsmen attempted escape on vessels using the Gulf of Mexico. Some runaways sought out an accommodating Indian tribe or lived for long periods in a swamp or thicket, emerging only to acquire supplies. Occasionally, runaways headed not for Mexico but for their former homes where their families were.53

Fugitives had to avoid slave patrols and Texas Rangers, but could often expect assistance from the small Mexican communities in Southwest Texas. After they crossed the Rio Grande border, there were settlements of fugitive slaves, free blacks, and Indians among whom they might live. Benjamin Lundy’s travel account describes in some detail these border towns and some of the African Americans who had settled in them.54 The Mexican government believed that runaways weakened slavery and that these border communities helped prevent further American expansion into Mexico, and they refused to agree to a treaty for the extradition of slaves.

There are reported examples of Indian slaveholders permitted to enter Mexico, with their slaves. The
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Seminole chief, Wildcat, on a long pilgrimage from Florida to Oklahoma to Coahuila and Zaragossa, entered Mexico in 1849 with Seminoles, slaves, and free blacks. The circumstances under which Africans lived with Native Americans varied greatly over time and place. Ex-slave Henry Bibb expressed a common, but not universal, sentiment when he said he believed the Indian form of slavery to be less harsh. “And I found this difference between negro slavery among the Indians, and the same thing among the white slaveholders of the South. The Indians allow their slaves enough to eat and wear. They have no overseers to whip nor drive them. If a slave offends his master, he sometimes, in the heat of passion, undertakes to chastise him; but it is as often the case as otherwise, that the slave gets the better of the fight and even flogs his master; for which there is no law to punish him; but when the fight is over that is the last of it. So far as religious instruction is concerned, they have it on terms of equality, the bond and the free; they have no respect of persons, they have neither slave laws nor negro pews. Neither do they separate husbands and wives, nor parents and children. All things considered, if I must be a slave, I had by far, rather be a slave to an Indian, than to a white man, from the experience I have had with both.”

The apparently natural limits to the Cotton Kingdom, assistance from indigenous Mexicans and Indians, the proximity of sea-going vessels, and the relative ease with which slaves might slip into Mexico made some observers hopeful that slavery might not maintain its grip on Texas. Frederick Law Olmsted noted that the long border with Mexico “will go far to prevent this from becoming a great enslaved planting country.” Nevertheless, Texas, which declared itself a slave-holding republic in 1836, continued to import slaves and to identify with the interests of the slaveholding South through secession and the Civil War.

The hard-traveling Benjamin Lundy, an antislavery Quaker who began as a colonizationist and became an abolitionist, also visited Canada to observe conditions for free blacks and fugitives from slavery and wrote:

“During the latter part of 1829, and the first part of 1830, a colony of several thousand coloured people, mostly from Ohio, was established in Upper Canada, the immediate occasion being the enforcement, in Ohio, of an old law, which was intended to restrain the settlement of emancipated slaves in that State. It appears . . . that this event excited a strong feeling in Canada, at that time, and the House of Assembly of that Province passed resolutions expressive of its aversion to the settlement, and requested the Governor to apply to the British Parliament, for the future prohibition of such emigration. The application proved unsuccessful, and Canada remained open to coloured settlers.”

The first influx of blacks in flight from American slavery began in 1783 when 3500 “Black Loyalists” were granted land in the Maritime Provinces. Although free, they experienced rejection from many Canadians and had difficulty in farming. Some 1,100 left for the newly-formed British colony of Sierra Leone in 1791. Another 3,000 refugees from the Chesapeake area made their way to Canada with British forces during the War of 1812. Again, racial exclusion and lack of opportunity made some seek a new home in Trinidad. At approximately the same time, African Americans began to investigate Haiti as a site for colonization. Encouraged by the Haitian government, several thousand emigrants relocated there in the 1820s. But clashes, cultural and political, between the Americans and the Haitians meant that many people returned. An emigration scheme in the 1850s met the same fate.

---


In the era of the Underground Railroad, most fugitives from slavery settled in the area known as Canada West, not far from the American border and near towns such as Toronto, Windsor, Niagara and St. Catherine’s. This was an era of utopian experiments in town planning in North America and several were attempted in Canada for African Americans. These included Wilberforce (1829-1836), Dawn (1843-1868), Elgin (1850-1873) and the Refugee Home Society, established near Amherstberg (1850s-1876). Recent research has shown that many slave refugees did not settle in planned communities, or even in the larger towns, but were spread thinly throughout villages and farming regions.\(^59\)

SLAVE REVOLTS AND THE ABOLITIONIST ERA

“Abolitionist” had different meanings at different times in American history. When state societies, such as the Pennsylvania Abolition Society and the Virginia Abolition Society, were formed in the 1780s, their purpose was to abolish slavery through public legislative action and private manumission. Yet they imagined that emancipation leading to the abolition of slavery would be gradual, perhaps taking a generation. Abolitionist societies faded and antislavery lost energy in the early 1800s, but it was revived by Congressional political debates on the future of the American territories and by the voices and actions of both free and enslaved blacks, especially in their response to the American Colonization Society in the 1820s.

It is both customary and convenient to date abolitionism from the first issue of William Lloyd Garrison’s *The Liberator*, published in Boston on January 1, 1831. Garrison began as a gradual emancipationist, sympathetic to African colonization, but was persuaded by black friends to “immediatism” which meant the immediate and uncompensated emancipation of all slaves. Beginning in the early 1830s, this became the new definition of abolitionism.

In the same year that Garrison began his newspaper, an event occurred which electrified the south and made the southern reaction to abolitionism even more hostile and suspicious than what would have been inevitable. The fear of slave revolts hung over the slaveholding sections of the United States, especially where the black population was equal to or more numerous than the white population and that fear controlled much of daily life in those regions. Slave patrols and armed militia stopped blacks and demanded passes. Free blacks had to carry their papers with them at most times. In the colonial era and through the Revolutionary age, many whites were not surprised by runaways or conspiracies. They expected slaves to revolt if they were given the opportunity and they tried to limit the opportunities. Later, in the 19th century, the comforting belief grew among whites that enslaved blacks would not resist their condition if not encouraged to do so. Southern whites then passed laws to prevent enslaved blacks from learning to read and write or to hear black preachers without a white present.

Despite the persistent fear of rebellion in the American South and historic evidence for several dozen conspiracies, only a few slave rebellions reached the point of enactment. For example, in 1712 slaves and Indians began an insurrection in New York City setting fires and murdering whites; in 1739 slaves led the Stono Rebellion in South Carolina; in 1811 slaves rebelled on a Louisiana sugar plantation; and in 1831 Nat Turner’s revolt occurred in Virginia. However, most were betrayed while they were still plots. Typically, slaves fashioned what weapons they could from tools made into swords and scythes, and acquired a few guns. Thus armed, they went from household to household scattering and murdering whites, until a larger and better-armed force of militia or other military force caught up to them.\(^60\)

Nat Turner’s Revolt followed this pattern and was the most destructive of all three. On Sunday evening,
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August 21, 1831, Turner and five other slaves began a rebellion that started with the murder of Turner’s master’s family. As they traveled through the farm neighborhoods of Southampton County, Virginia, they grew in numbers to nearly sixty and left behind at least 57 whites -- men, women, and children -- dead. After several days, Turner’s band was hunted down and destroyed, although Nat escaped and hid for some weeks before being found.

In his confession, dictated to Thomas Gray, Turner said that his revolt was not the result of harsh treatment, but was divine retribution for the many injustices which whites had committed on blacks. Although the Governor of Virginia quickly blamed “Yankees” in general and the Garrisonian abolitionists in particular, black preachers, and soft-hearted women who taught blacks to read the Bible, he also admitted that there was no way to truly prevent slave revolts. There were only two alternatives. One was to emancipate all the slaves and the other was to exert more control over their actions in an effort to quash all independent thought and action. Virginia, and the South, chose the option of maintaining slavery and attempting to control and justify it.61

Nat Turner’s rebellion showed the North the level of anger among slaves, showed the South its vulnerability and marked the beginning of a period in which slave escapes and rebellions received financial and legal support from sympathetic northerners. A well-known example occurred in 1839. In the heat and darkness of a June night, several hundred captured Africans spilled out onto the shores of Cuba from a Portuguese slave ship. There, hurried transactions took place and small groups of Africans were hastened away to other ships. Fifty-three of the captives were forced onto the Amistad. They had been bought by two Spaniards and were being transported to a nearby plantation.

When the slave trade was outlawed by Britain and the United States in 1808, it diminished but it did not end. By 1820, it simply became more secretive and developed sleek ships for rapid transport across the Atlantic. An illegal but profitable business such as this attracted pirates and adventurers from all nations who docked their cargo most frequently in Cuba for transport in smaller numbers to other sites. The British Navy patrolled the Caribbean waters and the African coast almost alone until the 1840s when the United States Navy entered the Atlantic in search of slave vessels. Even so, American courts were known to be lenient on pirates. It was in this environment that the mutiny on the Amistad took place, a few days after leaving the Cuban beach. The Africans freed themselves from their irons and, led by Singbe Pieh, or Joseph Cinque, demanded that the Spaniards who had purchased them sail back to Africa. The Spaniards, however, cruised up the American coast until forced to anchor and seek supplies - they were captured by an American ship off Long Island and towed to New London, Connecticut.

Their trial in the Connecticut courts attracted national attention. The Spaniards claimed that the Africans were their legal property and should be tried for murder. The Africans won support from American abolitionists who raised funds for their defense and sympathy from much of the American public. Their case was tried in January 1840 in a U.S. District Court which ruled that the Africans had been illegally captured and sold and thus had a right to rebel. On the other hand, the judge determined that a slave to the ship’s Captain had to be returned to Cuba, thus upholding the institution of slavery.

The U.S. Government was not prepared for this verdict. President Martin Van Buren had argued for the Africans to be returned to Spanish territory. A ship was waiting to return them to Cuba before an appeal was possible but it was the U.S. Government that was forced to appeal. While awaiting trial, the captives were taught by members of the First Church of Christ, Congregational, in Farmington, Connecticut, and many were housed in a building raised by Austin Williams in Farmington. Both of these buildings are now National Historic Landmarks. Some months later, John Quincy Adams defended the Africans before the Supreme Court. Despite a preponderance of Southerners on the Court, that body upheld the lower
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court ruling. The Africans were freed and money was raised to return them to Africa. Antonio, the ship captain's slave, was spirited away to Africa by abolitionists. In November 1841 the remaining thirty-five Africans left the port of New York for Sierra Leone. The Amistad mutiny had demonstrated again the resistance of Africans to slavery and the deep divisions in American society.62

THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD IN OPERATION

It has often been noted that the Underground Railroad was neither “underground” nor a “railroad.” In its period of greatest activity, from 1830 to 1861, its activities encompassed individual decisions to flee from American slavery, individual acts of support or betrayal, and loosely-organized networks of assistance. The farther north one moved the more apparent and public the aid to fugitives became. The closer to the slave states, the more clandestine was the activity. “Helping the fugitive” was a subject that fascinated Americans. Many people who did not consider themselves abolitionists aided fugitives from spontaneous impulse, perhaps thinking of the Biblical pronouncement that aid to the “least of these” was aid to the divine. No maps with arrows pointing out trails, no favored river or sea routes could encompass the individual and unpredictable acts of assistance. Nor do such routes factor in betrayals or exhaustion. Indeed, the fact that there were no predetermined trails was the chief reason for much success. No trail could have remained secret for very long.63

While occasional stories were recounted of people who had walked from Texas, Mississippi, or Alabama to Iowa, Indiana, or Ohio, most of the fugitives came from the Upper South and were young men in good health. Most of those located east of the Appalachian Mountains tended to go directly north by land or water to Pennsylvania, New York, and the Boston area. Those on the other side of the mountains had to cross the Ohio River to leave Virginia, Kentucky, or Tennessee. Slaves from Arkansas and Texas might cross the contested areas of Missouri and Kansas to bear east for aid in Indiana or Illinois. This schematic is suggestive of the routes taken by fugitives, but does not encompass all the possibilities.

While routes will generally remain unclear, it is useful to check the descriptions of escape methods found in William Still’s The Underground Railroad64 in which fugitives who met with him in Philadelphia related how they arrived there.65 His extensive research notebooks are available at the Ohio Historical Society and Houghton Library, Harvard University. Another tactic is to use the compiled accounts of runaway slave notices edited and published in book form. These compilations are far from complete, and reading the advertisements for runaway slaves published in southern newspapers, especially Upper South newspapers, would aid research for a particular area above the Mason-Dixon Line. Quite often, the masters of fugitive slaves knew with some accuracy the direction in which runaways were headed and described their likely means of escape in the advertisement. Boatmen were very frequently cautioned in those advertisements against aiding runaways and many slaves did, indeed, escape by water.66 The memoirs of men such as Frederick Douglass and William Wells Brown, black abolitionists once held in bondage, as well as women such as Harriet Jacobs who escaped slavery usually describe their life after slavery and the role they played in the Underground Railroad.
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63 See Larry Gara, The Liberty Line: The Legend of the Underground Railroad (1961; repr., Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1996), for a discussion of the logical inconsistencies in those parts of the legend which speak of hundreds of fugitives using the same trails and hiding places again and again.
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It is an artificial distinction to separate northern aid to fugitives from southern aid and assistance. Of necessity, the two stories will always overlap because information flowed both ways. Black churches on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line were involved and most southern and northern black benevolent and self-improvement associations participated in at least passing information. While middle-class blacks did fund-raising and organizational work, working-class blacks were more likely to take part in rescues or to hide fugitives.

THE NORTH: ANTISLAVERY SOCIETIES AND VIGILANCE COMMITTEES

The age of active and organized antislavery societies began in the early 1830s. In 1832, the New England Anti-Slavery Society was formed and, within five years, it had several hundred local chapters primarily in Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio. In New York, Lewis and Arthur Tappan dominated the society and in Ohio, Theodore Dwight Weld was a charismatic and confrontational leader. In late 1833, black abolitionists and the man they had converted from African colonizationism, William Lloyd Garrison, formed the American Anti-Slavery Society which had, as associate members, interracial female antislavery societies in Philadelphia and Boston. This Society also grew quickly and had almost a quarter of a million members by 1838.

The very diversity of the American Anti-slavery Society made it somewhat suspect among more respectable and conventionally religious antislavery advocates. Some members were as radical in their thinking about other structures of society as they were about the institution of slavery. Some, like Parker Pillsbury and Abby Kelley and her husband, Stephen S. Foster, were disruptive and confrontational in their practice of moral suasion for abolition. The American Anti-Slavery Society also contained Angelina and Sarah Grimke, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton who did not accept women’s “appointed sphere” and lectured to audiences of mixed men and women.67 Strains developed between those who sought an end to slavery through political tactics and those who wanted to expand the issue to other forms of rights, including women’s rights. This Society divided at its 1840 convention when a woman, Abby Kelley, was elected to a committee and those who conceived of the Society as a more focused political pressure group, using ballots, petitions, and postal campaigns, left. Most of these people affiliated with the newly-organized American and Foreign Antislavery Society which, in turn, supported the newly-formed Liberty Party which first ran candidates in 1840.

Garrison’s followers retained control of the much-reduced American Anti-Slavery Society and, seeing the deep involvement of the federal government in slavery from the Constitution onward, advocated the dissolution of the Union as the only means of withdrawing Northern support from slavery and forcing emancipation. Most of the Garrisonians were pacifists who rejected all violent means of ending slavery. They were as suspicious of organized religion as they were of government and they explored utopian communities and women’s rights for the next two decades. They were “non-resisters” who did not participate in politics, not even to vote under what they believed to be a fatally-flawed constitution.

Religiously motivated abolitionists constituted a much larger group and were organized loosely into the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society from 1840 until the mid-1850s. Political abolitionists were closely aligned with the church-based group and were themselves divided into three regional factions. The most radical of these political abolitionists, who urged political action against slavery, was the faction
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organized around Gerrit Smith in upstate New York. They argued that the United States Constitution, properly interpreted, prohibited slavery in the states and that the federal government had the power to abolish slavery in the South. Another political faction, centered in Cincinnati, was part of the Liberty Party and then the Free Soil Party, both third-party movements designed to force the major parties to end slavery. The third political group was Boston-area abolitionists who could not support Garrison. Most of the political abolitionists found their way into the new Republican Party, organized in 1854.68

Black abolitionists, who had sought white allies, sometimes felt that they were kept on the margins of the movement they had sustained and promoted for many years. In addition, black and white abolitionists differed over tactics and they divided over issues of concrete and practical change through politics and direct action. These divisions did not run neatly along racial lines, but white abolitionists had, more frequently, come to abolitionism through benevolence and saw antislavery as part of a larger human reform movement, while blacks saw the fight for an end to slavery as the first priority.

Increasingly, free blacks had their own meetings and read newspapers published by African Americans, such as Samuel Cornish’s *Colored American* and Frederick Douglass’s *Paper*. The argument over which set of abolitionist tactics was more productive sometimes obscures the fact that the abolitionist movement, with all its divisions, was extremely effective. It did much to bring the nation to a confrontation over slavery within thirty years.69

Not all abolitionists favored encouraging fugitive slaves. Some believed that fugitives would always be a minor issue in the greater struggle for emancipation of slavery. They disapproved of money raised for escaped slaves and believed the money might better go to political action. Still, even those who were not enthusiastic about the Underground Railroad were almost always willing to help when they encountered a fugitive. This impulse to help was heightened by the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850. Now white abolitionists and the white population in general saw runaways struggle to escape police and slave catchers. Due to this climate more turned to aiding runaways.

In the meantime, those who developed vigilance committees to prevent the kidnapping of northern free blacks (and the re-enslavement of successful runaways) learned to turn the Fugitive Slave Law to their own end by widely disseminating the stories of fugitive slaves and the Underground Railroad. Certain fugitive stories, those of Box Brown, William and Ellen Craft, Harriet Tubman, and Frederick Douglass, among others, became nationally famous. Free blacks played the most central role in aiding fugitives and in the protection of free blacks likely to be kidnapped and sold in the South. Vigilance committees were organized in most northern cities, the first in New York City in 1835, by both black and white abolitionists. The majority of vigilance committees were dominated by African Americans who supplied fugitives with lodging, clothing, and small sums of money. They assisted runaways in establishing a new home, finding work, and perhaps connecting with family members.

In 1837, Philadelphia abolitionists of both races organized a vigilance committee, and a Female Vigilant Association was convened the next year. The relationship between the two was very close. Black officers of the Vigilance Committee were James McCrummell, president, Jacob C. White, secretary, and James Needham, treasurer. Two of the Female Association’s four officers -- Elizabeth White and Sarah McCrummell -- were spouses of the men. After an anti-black riot in Philadelphia in 1842, the vigilance committee slowly lost central direction and it was reorganized in 1852 as the General vigilance committee. This group devoted itself to support of the Underground Railroad and elected William Still as its chairman. Under his active leadership, Philadelphia became a mecca for fugitive slaves and many
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69 Ripley, *Witness for Freedom*, 11-17. Frederick Douglass was the most famous of the antebellum black newspaper editors, but he was far from the only one. Black newspapers included the *Colored American, Freedom’s Journal, the North Star, Frederick Douglass’s Paper*, and the *Weekly Advocate*.
famous cases, such as that of “Box” Brown and William and Ellen Craft, passed through his office.

David Ruggles was the energetic secretary of the New York Committee of Vigilance for five years, meeting ships at the dock to look for runaways or those still enslaved, and the corresponding secretary of the New York State Vigilance Committee was Charles B. Ray, a black publisher. Prominent in the state of New York were John W. Jones in Elmina, New York; David and Philip Roderick in Williamsport, Pennsylvania; Stephen Meyers in Rochester; William Wells Brown in Buffalo; Lewis Hayden, Peter Howard, and Robert Morris in Boston; and J. W. Loguen in Syracuse.70

Still’s “Autograph Manuscript Journal of Fugitive Slaves Who Passed Through Station No. 2 of the Underground Railroad, Philadelphia, December 25, 1852-February 22, 1857” (the original is in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania) was the core document for his 1872 book. To it he added notes on oral narratives, letters to him from the field, and contemporary pamphlets. His records indicate that the committee assisted about 100 fugitives a year in the 1850s, the majority of them young men from Virginia and Maryland.

The Boston Vigilance Committee was founded in late 1842 as a result of the failed escape of slave John Torrence who was a stowaway from New Bern, North Carolina, and was not permitted to debark in Boston. Most of Boston’s leading black and white abolitionists were on the committee. The records of the committee indicate that many black women and black workers, who were not committee members, aided escapees and were reimbursed for their expenses. The avowed commitment of the vigilance committee, influenced by the Garrisonians, to use only “legal, peaceful, and Christian methods and none other” came hard up against the Supreme Court decision in Prigg vs. Pennsylvania (1842) that the free states could not legislate to deprive a slaveowner of his property. This invalidated the North’s Personal Liberty Laws and, in Boston, caused blacks to form the New England Freedom Association with the goal of continuing to aid fugitives, despite some loss of legal status.

In that same year, George Latimer, a slave in Norfolk, escaped to Boston with his family. His owner, James B. Gray, followed him and had him jailed. The entire state, and especially Boston, was in an uproar over Latimer and the implications of the Prigg decision. While Latimer’s freedom was purchased, a more far-reaching effect was the passage of a Massachusetts Personal Liberty Law in 1843 which set the state at odds with the United States Supreme Court and drew the lines between north and south even tighter.

Nonresistance in Boston grew weaker, as a philosophy, when the Fugitive Slave Law went into effect. Shadrach Minkins, a runaway from Norfolk to Boston, was arrested and then rescued from a Boston courtroom. In 1854, an unsuccessful attempt to rescue fugitive Anthony Burns from a court hearing left both those willing to fight and the nonresisters frustrated. Garrisonians moved closer to disunionism, burning the Fugitive Slave Law, the Burns court decision, and the U.S. Constitution on the Fourth of July, 1854. In 1851, blacks in Christiana, Pennsylvania, shot to death a federal Marshall who was attempting to seize a suspected runaway.71

Many smaller towns in Pennsylvania held free black communities. It is virtually impossible to trace with any precision the routes that runaway slaves took overland to reach free states in the northeast. Legend and tradition, while insufficient evidence in of themselves, can often be signposts to suggest where digging for further information may be most profitable. Legend holds that Columbia, Pennsylvania, a town settled by free blacks from Virginia and located twenty miles north of the Maryland border on the east bank of the Susquehanna River, was a prime source of aid to runaway slaves. Christiana and York,

70 Foner, History of Black Americans, 481.
Pennsylvania, which were located relatively close to the Maryland border, were renowned as transit points for fugitives. William C. Goodridge, a black barber in York, was reputed to have sent many fugitives on to William Still. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania was another legendary site. Other approaches to Philadelphia were described as: crossing the Susquehanna above Havre de Grace, Maryland and northeast to Phoenixville; from Baltimore to West Chester and Phoenixville; and through Delaware to Philadelphia. Leaving Philadelphia, a frequently used passage to Canada was reputed to have been from Philadelphia to Harrisburg, by foot or canal boat to Williamsport, Canton, and Alba, Pennsylvania, then through Elmira, Watkins Glen, Canandaigua, Rochester, Buffalo, and Niagara Falls, New York, then to St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada. Fugitives often traveled by the local railroads, such as the Williamsport and Elmira or the Northern Central.\(^{72}\)

Black abolitionists in these and other Pennsylvania and New York towns included David and Philip Rodrick in Williamsport, John W. Jones in Elmira, New York, Reverend Henry Highland Garnett in Troy, and Frederick Douglass in Rochester. William Wells Brown moved to Buffalo in 1834 and began to aid runaways crossing the Great Lakes to Canada. Because he worked on lake steamers, he was able to aid fugitives waiting for passage from Cleveland and Detroit, as well as Buffalo.\(^{73}\) Of the regular participation of these men in the Underground Railroad there can be no doubt, and yet there are still others.

**THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD IN THE SOUTH**

The Underground Railroad in the South was extremely cautious and careful, but it existed. It existed in the port cities of the Atlantic Coast and in the Appalachian mountains of the southern interior. It existed among certain church denominations -- black Baptist, Quaker -- and, as has been noted, it existed informally where the American South met borders with Mexico or Florida before its forced purchase by the United States.

As might be expected, and as slaveholders and southern newspaper editors did expect, most of the aid to runaways in the south was given by free blacks and slaves. When the successful runaway Anthony Burns was kidnapped in Boston and returned to Richmond, he kept writing materials hidden while he was in jail. Six times he wrapped a letter around a rock and threw it out the jail window when he saw a black man passing. Every time the letter was mailed and reached its destination.\(^{74}\) This was an example of the unplanned aid to fugitives which made the Underground Railroad both hard to define and hard to control.

There were also some southern whites who aided fugitive slaves. Their activities are much more shrouded in darkness than those of the white northerners who came south and assisted fugitives. As early as the 1790s, there are accounts of whites who encouraged slave revolts in Virginia and the slave, Gabriel, who planned a wide conspiracy in Virginia in 1800, hid out for ten days on the river vessel of a white man and was betrayed by a black boatman.\(^{75}\) Such activity, in the south, brought severe punishment and even death. Particularly in the Upper South states, persons such as Thomas Garrett of Delaware worked with Harriet Tubman and others in Underground Railroad activities.\(^{76}\) The New Castle, Delaware, court

\(^{72}\) Stewart, *History of Black Americans*, 482.


house where Garrett was brought to trial is on the National Register. Sarah and Angelina Grimke left South Carolina for Philadelphia because of their antislavery views. There, they participated in the Underground Railroad.

“Elizabeth Barnes, who worked for a ship captain at Portsmouth, Virginia, hid slaves on vessels sailing for Boston and New Bedford. New Yorkers Edward Smith and Isaac Gansey of the schooner Robert Centre were charged by Virginia Governor Thomas W. Gilmer with having abducted slave Isaac, and $300 was offered for their delivery to the jailer at Norfolk.”77

The examples of northern abolitionists who went south and then, either impulsively or with calculation, encouraged and abetted runaways, received more public notice than did the work of white southerners. “In the summer of 1844, abolitionist Jonathan Walker, a Harwick, Massachusetts, sea captain, carpenter, and mechanic, took four fugitive slaves aboard his ship in Pensacola, Florida, with the intention of transporting them to freedom in the Bahamas.” The ship was intercepted on the Florida Gulf Coast and Walker captured and taken to Key West, then Pensacola where he was indicted for enticing and stealing slaves. He was branded with the letters “S.S.” for slave stealer, fined, imprisoned and even pilloried for an hour.78

Charles Turner Torrey, a Massachusetts Congregational minister, was an example of an abolitionist who broke with Garrison over the “woman question,” but who found himself reconciled to both when Garrison publicized his imprisonment in Baltimore. Torrey was among the founders of the Boston Vigilance Committee in 1841, and in 1843 moved to Baltimore to enter business and to aid fugitives. Two years later he was arrested and sentenced to six years hard labor. After slightly more than a year in prison, Torrey died there of tuberculosis. Even if he had been released, the state of Virginia stood ready to extradite him for aiding the escape of John Webb and his two children from Winchester, Virginia. Emily Webb, the wife, was a free woman of color and the daughter of a white man named Carr. She was attempting to purchase the freedom of her family when she learned they were to be sold south, prompting her to ask for Torrey’s help.79

Another well-known example of abolitionist activity in the South was the case of the ship the Pearl, which attempted to leave Washington City in April 1848, with seventy-seven slaves who were to leave the ship as free persons when it docked in New York. Betrayed by an offended black man, the Pearl was seized and its captain, Daniel Drayton, and owner, Sayres, were arrested and tried in Washington. The trial lasted six weeks in the summer of 1848 and Drayton was sentenced to prison while Sayres paid a fine of $10,000. Drayton, whose release was gained in April 1853 by black Boston lawyer Robert Morris after serving four years, committed suicide in New Bedford in 1857. Leonard Grimes, born to free parents in Leesburg, Virginia, became a hackman in Washington, D.C., and part of a large group of African Americans both free and fugitive, who had grown up in the South and were intimately acquainted with its geography and many of its people. These residents of Washington were well positioned to aid runaways -- and they did so. Grimes was apprehended by the local authorities on one of his trips to Virginia while attempting to transport a free black man and his slave family out of the state. He served two years in the Virginia penitentiary. After his release, he moved north and became the minister of the Twelfth Baptist Church in Boston where he and his congregation continued to aid fugitives.

The most famous African American on the eastern seaboard for daring rescues was Harriet Tubman, once Araminta Ross. Born about 1820 to Benjamin Ross and Harriet Green, slaves in Dorchester County, Maryland, she was one of eleven children born to the couple. At the age of five she was hired out as a
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domestic servant and at thirteen, was struck in the head with a lead weight when she intervened between her owner and an escaping slave. For the rest of her life she suffered from sudden blackouts.

In her early twenties (1844), she married a free black man, John Tubman, who lived in a neighboring plantation. After the death of her master in 1847 she was in danger of being sold away from her spouse and her extended family. This uncertain position was often the precipitating cause of running away, and Harriet Tubman escaped north to Philadelphia in 1849 without her husband who did not want to join her. Two years later she returned to Maryland for him but he had remarried.

Tubman’s escape came just before the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 which made it easier for slaveholders to recapture fugitives or to hire “slavecatchers” to do it for them. Tubman became active in the Underground Railroad through her alliance with Philadelphia’s abolitionists and the city’s black vigilance committee. Tubman’s contribution was as unique, straightforward and yet as complex as her life. Disguising herself and often carrying a rifle, Tubman returned to the South approximately fifteen times to guide groups of runaways, many of them her relatives. She returned to Baltimore in December 1850 for her sister and her sister’s two children after the sister’s free black husband had ferried them from Cambridge, Maryland, to Baltimore. Even after Maryland plantation owners offered a bounty for her capture, she continued to venture into Maryland. She was more cautious at the other end of the trek toward freedom and settled in Canada with others she had aided. She felt it was safe to leave her aged parents in Auburn, New York. Tubman worked frequently with Thomas Garrett, a Quaker businessman in Wilmington, Delaware, who in turn, worked with the Pennsylvania State Antislavery Society and the Philadelphia Antislavery Society.

When the last Southern state left the Union in 1861, Tubman returned to the United States and served the Union Army as a scout, spy, and nurse in the South. Later she supported her parents by farming and she remarried to a Civil War veteran. She received a little money from a book published in 1869, Scenes in the Life of Harriet Tubman, written for her and published by her old abolitionist friends, but never received a pension for her Civil War services. Tubman supported women’s suffrage and understood that the end of slavery was only one step toward citizenship. In her own life, she did not limit her antislavery activities to those considered acceptable for women and in taking on dangerous rescue attempts, she sent a message that black women should not simply aspire to be nineteenth-century ladies once free. In addition to her membership in women’s organizations, she worked in her local community to establish schools and a home for the aged. In 1903, she gave twenty-five acres to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church to build the Harriet Tubman Home for Indigent and Aged Negroes. At her death in 1913, at the age of 93, the National Association of Colored Women paid for her funeral and tombstone.

Tubman was a legend among African Americans even before the Civil War and her fame was justified. Quite possibly, she was the best known African American woman of the nineteenth century, and her reluctance to talk about her role in the Underground Railroad only added to the aura that surrounded her. Although her name was widely recognized among all Americans, it was the oral tradition of the African American community that kept many details alive until researchers sought out her story.80

THE TRANSMONTANE REGION FROM THE APPALACHIANS TO THE MISSISSIPPI

Attention to the celebrated abolitionists of the North and the successful runaways from the southeastern states should not keep attention from the equally active antislavery and Underground Railroad activities
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in the region across the Appalachian Mountains. The Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi River was a vast border crossing and many states were involved. Western Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri supplied runaways who sought to reach Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa. Then, perhaps, they proceeded to Michigan, Wisconsin, or to Ontario, Canada. Kansas, the scene of pitched battles between proslavery and antislavery forces, was almost a separate category.

Kentucky provided some of the most dramatic escapes and attempts at escape, including several accounts that were credited with inspiring Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin or, Life Among the Lowly*, especially the story of Eliza crossing the frozen Ohio River. (See the page 3 reference to recent books about Delia Webster, Calvin Fairbank, and John P. Parker operating in the same area). Kentucky had for some time an active abolitionist press and outspoken antislavery advocates. One scholar has estimated that approximately 300 slaves per year escaped from Kentucky, based on claims for stolen slave property. This does not count those who were retrieved by slave catchers and returned to the state.  

Levi Coffin, celebrated as the “president of the Underground Railroad,” left North Carolina and settled in Newport, Indiana, in 1826, where he noted that “fugitives often passed through that place and generally stopped among the colored people.” Coffin later continued his activities in Cincinnati and James G. Birney, while in Cincinnati, observed that: “such matters are almost uniformly managed by the colored people. I know nothing of them generally till they are past.”

The town of Ripley, Ohio, once nearly the rival of Cincinnati in prosperity was at least the equal of Cincinnati in Underground Railroad activity. The most active and prominent persons giving aid to fugitives were John Parker and John Rankin and they were assisted by various other families in the community, although by no means was this an antislavery town. In Cincinnati, Levi Coffin was a diligent assister of runaways. The town of Oberlin, with Oberlin College as its abolitionist center, was the site of a famous rescue of a recaptured fugitive and was legitimately well-known as a haven for Underground Railroad activities.

**CONTRABANDS, SOLDIERS AND EMANCIPATION**

The decade of the 1850s was a dispiriting time for African Americans seeking freedom through the law or through a more personal form of self-liberation -- running away. After the Mexican American War (1848), events compounded upon themselves. The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 strengthened the original Act of 1793 and made it legal for slaveholders to pursue runaways into states where slavery was illegal. As a result, professional slave catchers seized black men and women, often on the street or at their work place, and hastened them south after giving evidence that this person was indeed a fugitive slave to a local justice of the peace or court. Such evidence as the unsavory slave catchers had was often flimsy or false and while the South won the legal victory, the Abolitionist cause won a larger victory when Northerners saw blacks struggling to escape from their captors. Many Northerners acquired a new understanding of the slave condition and a greater sympathy for the campaign to end slavery in the United States.

Still, the national government seemed to reflect the Southern view throughout the decade, partly through fear of Southern defection from the Union and partly from the central role of Southern politicians in national politics. In 1854, the Kansas-Nebraska Act revived the concept of “popular sovereignty,”
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meaning that settlers in those territories were free to determine their form of government. Free soil and abolitionist settlers were drawn to Kansas leading to a state of guerilla warfare with proslavery settlers. Kansas became known as bleeding Kansas and John Brown received his first national attention.

In 1857, Supreme Court Justice Roger B. Taney declared in the case of *Dred Scott v. Sandford* that blacks had no rights which the white man was bound to observe. This meant that the status of free blacks was determined by the individual states and the federal government could not guarantee otherwise. John Brown’s 1859 raid on Harper’s Ferry was a desperate attempt to inspire slaves to rebellion because all other avenues to national manumission seemed closed.

As the nation approached the Civil War, there was a free black population of substance in every state. In the North, many were active in antislavery, African American churches, and in self-help societies. Even southern free blacks were organized into churches and societies, although their public presentation on all issues was extremely careful not to offend. The existence of this class of people raised every question about liberty and citizenship that the U.S. government in the period hoped fervently to ignore.85

In this atmosphere, the Civil War began as a war to save the Union from the ever-expanding contradictions inherent in a nation “half slave, half free.” But no sooner had Union troops appeared in the Border States, on the islands off the Atlantic Coast, and in the lower Mississippi Valley, that thousands of blacks took the opportunity of liberating themselves by absconding to the Yankee camps. An initial impulse to send them back to their masters was soon squelched. The runaways became “contraband,” or confiscated property of war. Many of them quickly found work within the Union lines and members of their families began to join them. At the same time, Northern blacks who sought to form companies and join the Army were initially rebuffed.

The Confederacy was also quick to see the advantages of non-enlisted black labor. Free blacks were conscripted to dig fortifications for the southern army and to labor on roads and in mines. Slaves accompanied their masters to army camp and acted as cooks, grooms, and personal attendants. Early in the war, slaveholders hired out their slaves to the army but when slaves availed themselves of the chance to change sides, the same slaveholders and others decided to send their slaves to interior plantations far away from the battles.

This enormous upheaval and movement of the black population within the South created unprecedented opportunities for self-liberation which took place on an unprecedented scale even before the federal government acknowledged the reality. In July 1862, after the disastrous Peninsula Campaign, President Lincoln issued the Second Confiscation Act stating that the Union could “employ . . . persons of African descent . . . for the suppression of the rebellion.” Five regiments of black infantry were formed in the Union-held Sea Islands of South Carolina and Georgia (August 1862). The entry of African American units into the Union Army and the encampment of thousands of “contrabands” in and near the Union Army constituted a de facto emancipation even before the Emancipation Proclamation was announced after the battle of Antietam in October 1862, or went into effect on the first of January 1863.

After that date, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island began to recruit free black men from all over the North who congregated in Readville, Massachusetts, where they became part of the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts Colored Regiment. This unit proved itself in a deadly assault on Fort Wagner near Charleston, South Carolina, on July 1863. But this celebrated group was only a small part of the total number of almost 200,000 African Americans who served in the Civil War. Of these forces, approximately 37,000 came from the northern free states, 42,000 came from the border slaveholding states of Delaware, Maryland, Missouri and Kentucky with half of those being from Kentucky. Tennessee provided 20,000 black soldiers, Louisiana 24,000, Mississippi 18,000, while the other states of

the Confederacy provided 40,000.\textsuperscript{86}

The war to save the Union inevitably became the war to free the slaves, not just to secure African Americans soldiers, weaken the Confederacy, and acquire the approval of Europe, especially Britain, but also because African Americans themselves used every opportunity to demonstrate that once slavery’s chain was cracked, it would never be repaired.