Original Article

'The miserable slaves, the degraded serfs': Frederick Douglass, Anglo-Saxonism, and the Mexican War

Annie Abrams

New York University, New York, NY, USA.

Abstract This essay examines Frederick Douglass's use of the term 'Anglo-Saxon' in the contexts of both American slavery and Anglo-American relations. Douglass's critical perspective on the national narrative about Anglo-Saxonism during the Mexican War allowed him to identify loopholes by which he and other black writers could enter the mainstream American timeline of progress. The Romantic Anglo-Saxonism in vogue at the time was already shadowy and open to individual interpretation. Douglass isolated two features of Anglo-Saxonism in this period that were advantageous for his anti-colonialist agenda – literacy, a crucial part of the ideology's imperialism, and the temporality of linear progress. This essay contends that he sought to remove these legacies from exclusively white control.

postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies (2019) 10, 151–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41280-019-00121-3>

On August 16, 1845, Frederick Douglass set sail on the *Cambria* to Liverpool for what would become a two-year tour of the United Kingdom. Following the publication of his *Narrative* earlier that year, he sought to protect himself against his former master's legal right to re-enslave him. The day before Douglass set off, General Zachary Taylor sent a dispatch apprising President Polk of his progress setting up camp in Corpus Christi in anticipation of a

Mexican attack on Texas, a newly annexed American property (Taylor, 1848, 99). As Taylor and his troops prepared to defend American interests to the west, Douglass fled east to protect his own autonomy. Over the next few years, Douglass confronted where America ended, both physically and culturally, and what those limits meant for delineating the nation's identity, his own identity, and the relationship between the two.

For Douglass, as for Polk and Taylor, in this period, America was moving towards fulfilling what journalist John L. O'Sullivan called the country's 'manifest destiny' to 'overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.' The exclusionary nature of this concept is clear in O'Sullivan's evidence for the inevitability of California's statehood: 'Already the advance guard of the irresistible army of Anglo-Saxon emigration has begun to pour down upon it' (O'Sullivan, 1845, 6). The popular myth about American Anglo-Saxons traveling west and into the future celebrated an imbalance of power among people living out a common trajectory at different velocities. As an integrationist, Douglass wanted slaves, their owners, free blacks, and non-slave-owning whites to understand themselves as travelling along the same course, and so engaged with the hegemonic story about the country's destiny despite his abhorrence of its inherent violence. Tracing this engagement exposes a thorny model of dissent in which Douglass simultaneously calls attention to the hypocritical historical narrative of Manifest Destiny while also legitimating the understanding of an appealing Anglo-American temporality at the core of that ideology.

This article reads Douglass's 1840s speeches, published letters, and articles in which he uses the phrase 'Anglo-Saxon,' and considers the term's valences in his writing. Douglass expressed his ambivalence about patriotism by making explicit the instability and vagary surrounding Anglo-Saxonism, one of America's foundational myths about its identity. Douglass's careful attention to the national story about Anglo-Saxons enabled him to understand it as a narrative through which he and other black people living in America could enter the mainstream timeline of progress. In particular, Douglass capitalized on the notions that genealogy had little to do with who could lay claim to Anglo-Saxon identity, and that after the Norman Conquest of England in 1066, the Anglo-Saxons were themselves enslaved. Douglass acknowledged the advantages of what he saw as two key features of contemporary Anglo-Saxonism – participation in print culture and the temporality of linear progress – while wresting those legacies from exclusively white control at a time when Anglo-Saxonism threatened to shut out non-white Americans from aligning their own personal destinies with their nation's. I look to the ways Douglass thought about learning to read, write, and publish as means to combat the metanarrative of Anglo-Saxonism. In the world of print, Douglass found the self-ownership necessary to take this national folktale, make it his own, and reinvent it to include black Americans.

American Anglo-Saxonism

During the same summer that Douglass set sail and Taylor prepared to reshape America's borders, the editors of the July-August issue of *United States Democratic Review* offered excerpts from a prose work of John Greenleaf Whittier's in which he describes military training taking place outside his window in Lowell, MA. While it is surprising to find a Whig's work in this particular magazine, the editors acknowledge Whittier's divisive politics in their headnote, and hope his 'fine intellectual beauty' will be apparent even to 'the maddest mob that ever raged south of the Potomac.' Whittier bitterly remarks on the border dispute with Mexico: 'The bull-dog ferocity of a half intoxicated Anglo-Saxon pushing his blind way against the converging cannon-fire from the Ciudad Rodrigo, commends itself neither to my reason nor my fancy' (Whittier, quoted by J. and H. G. Langley, 1845, 116). This denunciation of the impending Mexican-American War clarifies one commonality among Democrats and Whigs during the summer of 1845 despite the deepening divide between them: both parties understood the conflict along the southwestern border as one between Anglo-Saxons – the direct descendants of medieval English warriors – and Mexicans. These accounts of the conflict in the Southwest are not unique to the *Review* – indeed, they are representative of reports across sources. It will become clear throughout this essay that even Douglass used this paradigm to talk about the relationship between race and progress in America. Whittier dismisses the providential element of Anglo-Saxonism while O'Sullivan reinforces it, but the racialized ideology – and the sense of inevitability inherent to it – is an integral part of the way both understand the War's stakes.

Historians remain conflicted about Polk's motives in pursuing the Mexican war; for the purposes of this article, what matters is not how or why the War happened, but what Douglass thought about these things.¹ While some current historians like Robert Merry would have us believe that slavery had little to do with Polk's aggressive expansionist efforts, Douglass insists in 'Monarchies and Freedom, Republics and Slavery,' one of the last speeches he delivered in the UK, that the War was 'a conspiracy from beginning to end – a most deep and skilfully devised conspiracy – for the purpose of upholding and sustaining one of the darkest and foulest crimes ever committed by man' (Douglass, [1847] 1979, 52). In other words, Douglass argues the War was fought to defend and propagate slavery. He was not alone in this position. Chattel slavery was already in place in Texas when the United States acquired it in 1846, and the admission of a slave state to the Union was highly controversial. Between 1840 and 1850, over the course of its transition from independent republic to state, the slave population of Texas increased from 11,323 to 58,161 (Barr, 1996, 17). The divisiveness and ultimate failure of the Wilmot Proviso, a bill drafted in 1846 by a northern Democrat to prevent the spread of slavery into newly acquired

1 For background on the Mexican War, see Greenberg (2013) and Merry (2009).

territories, demonstrates the clear intersection of issues surrounding the spread of the ‘peculiar institution’ and southern Democrat Polk’s imperialism (Barr, 1996, 17). The relationship between Manifest Destiny – and its corollary, Anglo-Saxonism – and slavery becomes murky in this period, and Anglo-Saxonism is used not only to justify the domination of Mexicans, but also the subjugation of blacks. The Mexican-American War was largely supported by Democrats, Northern and Southern, and opposed by Whigs, roughly the same lines along which slaveholders and antislavery activists fell. Whether or not the spread of slavery was at the root of the Mexican War mattered to Douglass not only because of his deep empathy with the enslaved, but because America was actively defining itself at the same time that he was defining himself in relation to it.

Anglo-Saxonism vs. Anglophilia

Douglass was an Anglophile without subscribing to Anglo-Saxonism, the racialized version of this attachment to England and its traditions. Embracing and celebrating a quasi-English identity without being able to trace English genealogy sounds a lot like Anglo-Saxonism. But for Douglass, Anglophilia was empowering and clarifying while Anglo-Saxonism was violent, degrading, and manipulative. One is an appreciation for or recognition of indebtedness to another country’s cultural and political traditions, and the other is an ideology of racial superiority loosely based on and exploitive of that appreciation. What both mindsets have in common, at least as far as Douglass was concerned, was a belief in what adherents interpret as an English trajectory of progress. While the Anglo-Saxonists supporting the Mexican War understood racial superiority as a necessary component of this progress, by the 1840s Douglass understood progress in the English tradition as a more inclusive growth of freedom and liberty.

Douglass wanted readers of *My Bondage and My Freedom* to think that he engaged with the idea of England long before he visited. In one early mention of the country, he described one of the many culinary luxuries enjoyed by the Lloyds, Douglass’ enslavers. Dairy was ‘supplied by cattle of the best English stock.’ Since Douglass also mentions ‘wines and brandies from France; teas of various flavor from China; and rich, aromatic coffee from Java,’ he seems to be arguing for his own awareness of these sites of origin while he was still enslaved (Douglass, 1855, 109). The impression he gave of himself as a child surrounded by these imports involves a deep curiosity about the world beyond the plantation. After he was ripped from ‘the only home I ever had’ in Tuckahoe and tormented by Aunt Katy at Colonel Lloyd’s, Douglass ‘looked for home elsewhere.’ A windmill on the plantation ‘under the care of Mr. Kinney, a kind hearted old Englishman’ was ‘a source of infinite interest and pleasure’ because

from its top, young slaves could speculate about the origins and destinations of vessels sailing by (Douglass, 1855, 72). All things English had positive, inspiring associations for young Douglass. In a foreshadowing of his later relationship to England and the concept of English pedigree, Douglass suggested that as a child, he understood the ‘fragrant cheese, golden butter, and delicious cream’ derived from Lloyd’s cows as prestigious sources of sustenance that had their origins far from the place he lived. Even if Douglass could not partake of these products in any corporeal way, they nourished his sense that faraway places held possibility and hope in them. And inherent to ‘possibility’ and ‘hope’ was an experience of time that is forward-looking.

The stake in the future that is an implicit part of the way hope shapes one’s experience of time was tamped down by slaveowners, who denied slaves a sense of progress. In Lloyd Pratt’s reading of Henry Louis Gates, Jr.’s ‘The Literature of the Slave’ (an essay about Douglass’s manipulations of his ‘blank past’), Pratt takes issue with Gates’s emphasis on absence and argues for a reconsideration of Douglass’ sense of his relationship to chronology. Pratt writes, ‘the world Douglass inhabits is not a temporal desert. Rather, slaveholders try to deprive Douglass of linear progressive time and replace it with laboring time. In doing so, they introduce a compound experience of time that marries a ‘premodern’ to a ‘modern’ formation’ (Pratt, 2016, 165). For Douglass, then, time was not cleanly linear from the start, and therefore subject to interruptions and blanknesses like a dashed line. Rather, the broader temporal landscape was one of progress from which the slaves were excluded; while the world beyond the plantation moved forward, slaves watched as they moved in repetitive cycles of time. Douglass emphasized the slave’s estrangement from American culture as a sort of temporal segregation when he wrote, ‘In its isolation, seclusion, and self-reliant independence, Col. Lloyd’s plantation resembled what the Baronial domains were during the middle ages in Europe. Grim, cold, and unapproachable by all genial influences from communities without, there it stands; full three hundred years behind the age’ (Douglass, 1855, 64). The British imports of the Lloyd plantation helped Douglass to imagine an ideal ‘home elsewhere,’ where time worked differently.

Learning to read enforced Douglass’s sense of England as a place where his experience of time could be different. A few years after leaving the Lloyd plantation for the Aulds’ residence in Baltimore, England transformed in *My Bondage and My Freedom* from one of many source points for a cosmopolitan diet to an explicit source of personal identity. Douglass was about thirteen when he had saved enough of his earnings to buy a copy of Caleb Bingham’s *The Columbian Orator*, an anthology of speeches, dialogues, and dramatic excerpts designed to instruct schoolchildren in the art of oratory. Any positive impression of England left on Douglass – or the readers of *My Bondage and My Freedom* – by Lloyd’s dairy cows must have been buttressed by this collection. Douglass made clear that from his first reading of *The Columbian Orator* he understood

the liberality espoused by Englishmen Pitt, Fox, and Sheridan in that work as comprising an English cultural heritage to which he was heir. In these speeches, the politicians defend the rights of the disenfranchised on the basis of, as Pitt puts it, ‘that security and independence, which is the original birthright of an Englishman’ (Pitt, 1817, 120). Douglass reports that he devoured these ‘choice documents,’ and read them ‘over and over again, with an interest that was ever increasing, because it was ever gaining in intelligence’ (Douglass, 1855, 158). Again, English exports – this time, speeches – afforded growth to Douglass’s sense of what was possible beyond the confines of his master’s residence. The book continually empowered and sustained him. He wrote, ‘With a book of this kind in my hand, my own human nature, and the facts of my experience, to help me, I was equal to a contest with the religious advocates of slavery’ (Douglass, 1855, 159). The totemic book authorized Douglass; the customs and values expressed by Englishmen like Pitt, Fox, and Sheridan on oppression are equally powerful as those set down in the Book used by the ‘religious advocates of slavery’ against whom he contended as an activist after his enslavement. In other words, the idea of England and its political and cultural legacies was empowering.

Douglass’s Anglophilia stopped being theoretical and became practical in his account of the formative trip to England. Despite the harrowing actual circumstances of Douglass’s sojourn to the United Kingdom – he was escaping re-enslavement in America – in *My Bondage and My Freedom*, he cast his trip abroad as a source of empowerment, not disability. In a chapter called ‘Black Anglophilia,’ Elisa Tamarkin describes Douglass’ participation in an unexpected trend among escaped slaves, ‘a rather curious form of individual liberty – the right to stylize oneself as reformed by British manners, and enriched by British ways while insisting that these privileges are American’ (Tamarkin, 2007, 457). Indeed, as Tamarkin points out, when Douglass describes his trip to Great Britain in *My Bondage and My Freedom*, he explained, ‘A rude, uncultivated fugitive slave was driven, by stern necessity, to that country to which young American gentlemen go to increase their stock of knowledge, to seek pleasure, to have their rough, democratic manners softened by contact with English aristocratic refinement’ (Douglass, 1855, 365). Douglass capitalized on this experience to express similarity between his own intellectual development and the aspirations of his imagined audience of converts to abolitionism, despite their differences of circumstance.

Douglass retells the story of Anglo-Saxons in America

Douglass’ trip to Britain left him with the impression that America was a web of narratives constantly being retold. In his ‘Farewell to the British People,’ Douglass said, ‘The fact is, the whole system, the entire network of American

society, is one great falsehood, from beginning to end.' Later in the same speech, he said, 'We are a nation of inconsistencies; completely made up of inconsistencies' (Douglass, [1847] 1950, 1:209). Given Douglass' sense of America as a composite of stories, it is unsurprising that upon his return to the United States, imbued with a new sense of agency, he would become one of the nation's most famous and controversial storytellers as editor of *The North Star*.

He dedicated himself to addressing the nation's 'inconsistencies.' In the third issue of the paper, Douglass published an article titled 'The War with Mexico,' in which he explained his anti-War stance. This is the first time Douglass mentioned Anglo-Saxons in the paper, and he did so four times over the space of a column and a half. First, he wrote, 'Mexico seems a doomed victim to Anglo Saxon cupidity and love of dominion' (Douglass, 1848a). So by the second mention, in which 'Anglo Saxon blood!' is one of many cries in favor of the Mexican War, the reader's empathy is diminished (Douglass, 1848a). The third time Douglass mentioned Saxons in this article, he mocked Anglo-Saxonism explicitly when he wrote, 'The main argument in favor of the war was the meanness and wickedness of the Mexican people [...] that the cup of Mexican iniquity was full; and that God was now making use of the Anglo Saxon race as a rod to chastise them!' (Douglass, 1848a). By this point in the article, Douglass has clearly established that the war is one between Saxons and Mexicans. In his final mention of Saxons, he flipped Anglo-Saxonism on its head when he wrote that the Mexican people have been 'reduced to a condition little better than that endured by the Saxons when vanquished by their Norman invaders; but, so sure as there is a God of justice, we shall not go unpunished; the penalty is certain; we cannot escape; a terrible retribution awaits us' (Douglass, 1848a). For Douglass, the violence of Anglo-Saxonism was hypocritical because its adherents ignore the pain of their own past victimization. Though Douglass distances himself from Saxons in the rest of the article, he was bound up in the retribution that awaits 'us,' not 'them.' This is the first in a series of instances in which Douglass binds himself up with the temporality of the 'Anglo-Saxons,' and in so doing, exploits Anglo-Saxonism to suit his goal of inspiring an end to the war. Throughout the article, Douglass continually clarified and sharpened the definition of 'Anglo-Saxon,' and in this last mention, the hypocrisy of Americans' current usage crystallizes.

Because of the discrepancy between the facts of English history and the American exceptionalism upon which Anglo-Saxonism was purportedly built, Douglass had difficulty parsing his sense of America's temporality, and his own personal timeline, from the Anglo-Saxonism that drove the War. He wrote in 'Expatriation,' published in *The North Star*, 22 December, 1848, that 'The haughty Norman once looked down upon the degraded and subjected Anglo-Saxon as an inferior species of the race of man. The Americans now look down upon the Mexicans as an inferior species of the race of man; and so, we suppose, it will ever be with successful tyrants' (Douglass, 1848c). Douglass manipulated convention and asked his readers to reconsider what Anglo-Saxon history really taught America about assumptions of

racial superiority. His level of remove from 'The Americans' mentioned here makes it seem as though Douglass understood himself as an observer and not a participant in the nation's propagandistic manipulations of history.

And yet, Douglass understood himself as a participant in 'their' future. At the War's end, Douglass wrote an editorial for *The North Star* that began by distinguishing his paper from the others celebrating peace. He wrote in 'Peace! Peace! Peace!', 'We are such an exception to the great mass of our fellow country-men [...] that we find it difficult to unite with them at this time, in their general exultation' (Douglass, 1848b). The pronoun here is clear – 'we' are 'an exception,' apart from 'the great mass.' And yet, by the end of his statement, Douglass put himself back in the company of the War's perpetrators by entreating his readers to 'crave pardon for our crimes at the hands of a God whose mercy endureth forever' (Douglass, 1848b). The 'we' apart at the beginning of the piece becomes part of the national 'our' by the end of it. Douglass was consistent in expressing that his destiny was contingent on American Anglo-Saxonism even while he refused to participate in the ideology's manipulations of history. As he wrote in 'The Destiny of Colored Americans,' an article published in *The North Star*, 16 November, 1849, 'We deem it a settled point that the destiny of the colored man is bound up with that of the white people of this country; be the destiny of the latter what it may' (Douglass, 1849).

Douglass capitalized on Anglo-Saxonism to show that the true heirs to the Saxon legacy as a conquered people were not only Mexican, as in the examples above, but also black. In Douglass's view, blacks had even more of a claim on Anglo-Saxon cultural inheritance than Mexicans did, given their common enslavement. For Douglass, black Americans could understand Anglo-Saxon England as a point of origin. By invoking medieval English history and challenging white members of his audience to think of themselves as oppressive Normans rather than Anglo-Saxons, Douglass participated in vaunting historical Saxons while he called for an end to the Anglo-Saxonist sense of racial superiority. In this model, the Anglo-Saxon legacy of freedom could be more widely accessible. In *America's England*, Christopher Hanlon writes, 'Tapping the transatlantic genealogies that had circulated through his national culture since at least 1850, Douglass assumes his white northeastern audience to regard themselves as the descendants of those Saxon serfs, and plumbs that habit of identification for its further implications' (Hanlon, 2013, 44). These transatlantic genealogies date back further than 1850; locating their origins at that time ignores the influence of the Mexican War, which fueled Douglass' interest in exploiting them. Reports from *The North Star* on two different speeches given by Douglass, one under the title of 'New England Anti-Slavery Convention,' on 16 June, 1848, and another under the title of 'Frederick Douglass' Lecture,' from 26 January, 1849, include references to his slave-as-Saxon metaphors. During the first speech, the audience was reminded that once the Anglo-Saxon race in England was subject to Norman conquerors, 'though they now claimed

superiority to all others, and the right to plunder and enslave them all.² During the second occasion, ‘when he reminded his Anglo-Saxon hearers that the proud Norman once trod upon the necks of their ancestors, the Saxon slave, it was clear that the mental power of a fugitive slave held sway over several hundred half emancipated American republicans’ (Anonymous, 1849). According to these reports, Douglass maintained sympathy with medieval Saxons while asking nineteenth-century American Saxons to reconsider the implications of their identification with the ancient race.

While other abolitionists explicitly questioned the validity of the Anglo-Saxon origin myth in an effort to condemn the sense of inevitable racial domination that was tangled up in War rhetoric, Douglass pointed out that American slaves were more like ancient Saxons than were their white masters. Douglass’ attention to Anglo-Saxonism enabled him to make a case – rare and artful, even among abolitionists – for the susceptible nature of slaveowners’ power over the enslaved. On 16 February, 1849, *The North Star* republished an article called ‘Ethnology,’ written by white Northern abolitionist James Russell Lowell and originally published in Child’s *Anti-Slavery Standard*. Lowell wrote, ‘Nations, like individuals, when they have risen in the social scale, go immediately to the herald’s office for a coat of arms and a pedigree [...] We are obliged to content ourselves with vague assertions of our Anglo-Saxon descent, the truth being that the settlers of New England – and of those very few, can lay any probable claim to such an origin’ (Lowell, 1849). In Lowell’s view, white Americans took ownership of Anglo-Saxon history in an attempt to legitimate their current situation. Douglass was less interested in truths that disproved myths about American whiteness than in using the history of non-race-based oppression to support the idea that the white and black races were more similar than commonly believed among Anglo-Saxonists. In his ‘First of August Address at Canandaigua’ (1847), he said:

Who were the fathers of our present haughty oppressors in this land? They were, until within the last four centuries, the miserable slaves, the degraded serfs, of Norman nobles. They were subjected to every species of brutality which their fiendish oppressors could invent. They were regarded as an inferior race – unfit to be trusted with their own rights. They were not even allowed to walk on the public highway, and travel from town without written permission from their owners. They could not hold any property whatever, but were themselves property, bought and sold. They were not permitted to give testimony in courts of law. They were punished for crimes, which, if committed by their haughty masters, were not deemed worthy of punishment at all. They were not allowed to marry without the consent of their owners. They were subjected to the lash, and might even be murdered with impunity by their cruel masters. (Douglass, [1847] 1952, 5:55)

2 While it might seem strange for Douglass to have offered this reminder at the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, it is important to bear in mind how far-reaching Anglo-Saxonism was. In James McCune Smith’s introduction to *My Bondage and My Freedom*, he writes about Anglo-Saxonism’s presence even among the most die-hard New England abolitionists: In the society, moreover, of Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, William Lloyd Garrison, and other men of earnest faith and refined culture, Mr. Douglass enjoyed the high advantage of their assistance and counsel in the labor of self-culture, to which he now addressed himself with wonted energy. Yet, these gentlemen, although proud of Frederick Douglass, failed to fathom, and bring out to the light of day, the highest qualities of his mind; the force of their own education stood in their own way: they did not delve into the mind of a colored man for capacities which the pride of race led them to believe to be restricted to their own Saxon blood.

Importantly, in the same speech, Douglass theorized about the importance of marking anniversaries (appropriately, given the occasion of the speech, the emancipation of the British West Indies). He said, ‘The sentiment that leads us to celebrate noble deeds, to mark and commemorate great events in the world’s progress, is natural and universal. [...] It is the power which makes the present generation the proprietors of the wisdom and experience of bygone ages. It makes the good of the past, the property of the present’ (Douglass, [1847] 1952, 5:54). By figuring history in this way, Douglass made Anglo-Saxon history his property – it belonged to him just as much as anyone else, contra Lowell’s perception of Anglo-Saxonism, and Smith’s elision over the facts of Anglo-Saxon history. And yet, while Douglass claimed ownership of this history, he still ended this portion of his speech by alluding to the ‘profitable comparison’ that might be drawn between historical Anglo-Saxon and black American slaves. To say that these enslaved populations are comparable is to posit the latter as similar to the former not only in terms of oppression, but also in terms of progress and chronology.

Conclusion

Ultimately, Douglass’s eye for chinks in the national story about Anglo-Saxons during the Mexican War allowed him to spot loopholes by which he and other black writers could enter the mainstream American timeline of progress. As I previously discussed, the Romantic Anglo-Saxonism in vogue was already shadowy and open to individual interpretation.³ Douglass acknowledged the advantages of two features of Anglo-Saxonism in this period key for an anti-colonialist – literacy, a crucial part of the ideology’s imperialism, and the temporality of linear progress – while removing those legacies from exclusively white control. Invoking the past was one way to show the potential blacks held in moving from slave to free temporality.

³ See especially Horsman (1986) and Frederickson (1971).

About the Author

Annie Abrams teaches English at the Bronx High School of Science. She holds a doctorate in American literature from New York University. Her current writing and research concerns the history and purpose of English education in America (Email: annie.abrams@gmail.com).

References

- Anonymous. 1849. Frederick Douglass's Lecture. *The North Star*, 26 January.
- Barr, A. 1996. *Black Texans: A History of African Americans in Texas, 1528–1995*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Douglass, F. [1847] 1950. Farewell Speech to the British People. In *My Life and Writings*, Vol. 1, ed. P. Foner. New York: International Publishers.
- Douglass, F. [1847] 1952. First of August Address at Canandaigua. In *My Life and Writings*, Vol. 5, ed. P. Foner. New York: International Publishers.
- Douglass, F. [1847] 1979. Monarchies and Freedom, Republics and Slavery: An Address Delivered in Bristol, England, April 1, 1847. In *The Frederick Douglass Papers: Series One – Speeches, Debates, and Interviews*, vol. 2, eds. J. Blassingame, et al. New Haven: Yale University Press. Vol. II.
- Douglass, F. 1848a. The War with Mexico. *The North Star*, 21 January.
- Douglass, F. 1848b. Peace! Peace! Peace! *The North Star*, 17 March.
- Douglass, F. 1848c. Expatriation. *The North Star*, 22 December.
- Douglass, F. 1849. The Destiny of Colored Americans. *The North Star*, 18 November.
- Douglass, F. 1855. *My Bondage and My Freedom*. New York and Auburn: Miller, Orton, & Mulligan.
- Frederickson, G. M. 1971. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914*. New York: Harper.
- Greenberg, A. 2013. *A Wicked War: Polk, Clay, Lincoln, and the 1846 U.S. Invasion*. New York: Vintage.
- Hanlon, C. 2013. *America's England*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Horsman, R. 1986. *Race and Manifest Destiny*. New Haven, CT: Harvard University Press.
- Langley, J. and H.G. 1845. Whittier in Prose. *The United States Democratic Review*, 17:85, 115–27.
- Lowell, J.R. 1849. Ethnology. *The North Star*, 16 February.
- Merry, R. 2009. *A Country of Vast Designs*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- O'Sullivan, J.L. 1845. Annexation. *The United States Democratic Review* 17:85, 5–10.
- Pitt, W. 1817. Conclusion of a Celebrated Speech of Mr. Pitt, in 1770. *The Columbian Orator*, ed. C. Bingham. Boston, MA: Caleb Bingham and Co.
- Pratt, L. 2016. *Archives of American Time: Literature and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tamarkin, E. 2007. *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, Z. 1848. Letter to Polk, August 15, 1845. In *Messages of the President of the United States*. Washington, DC: Wendell and Van Benthuyssen.