

**MIRROR TO A NATION:
FOREIGN OBSERVERS ON THE AMERICAN SCENE**

Emily Jane Charnock

**Paper submitted to the Department of Politics Graduate Student Conference,
University of Virginia
3/26/2009**

This paper is drawn from my dissertation project, provisionally entitled “America the Universal: Globalization and the American Polity.” The project seeks to integrate studies of the domestic American polity with international opinion and ideational flows – considering the ways in which international public opinion, organized movements, and individuals have exerted an influence on political outcomes and opinion in the United States over time. It thus seeks to place American political development within a more globalized context, and reverses the typical directional flow considered in studies of international political exchange—the United States as an *exporter* of political “products,” such as constitutionalism—focusing instead on the U.S. as a political *importer*. In this paper, I first outline a specific mode of international political transmission, foreign observers of the United States and their published commentaries, and consider their specific role in a case study of the 19th Century Anglo-American movement for the abolition of slavery. I then outline further case study possibilities and a general research design for my broader project. I conclude by utilizing the insights of the abolition case to suggest general factors underpinning the dynamics of international political exchange.

1. FOREIGN OBSERVERS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL EXCHANGE

“No other people, it is safe to say, was ever so besieged by interpreters.”
– Henry Steele Commager¹

“It is hardly possible to overrate the value...of placing human beings in contact with persons dissimilar to themselves, and with modes of thought and action unlike those with which they are familiar...it is indispensable to be perpetually comparing their own notions and customs with the experience and example of persons in different circumstances from themselves..”
- John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*²

Amidst the excitement and innovation of the early European Enlightenment, the discovery of the New World released an unprecedented torrent of philosophical and literary energy. An array of Enlightenment figures, including Locke, Voltaire, Jonathan Swift, and Goethe, placed America at the center of their thought—yet most early “commentators” stayed at home. As American society and its polity developed, and transportation technology advanced, a new wave of European commentators crossed the Atlantic Ocean to view it for themselves.

So numerous are the published accounts of visitors to the New World that they form practically their own literary *genre*, one that persists to this day.³ As a corpus, there is much variation in tone and conclusions - thus Frances Trollope’s *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, published in 1832 and based on her time living in Cincinnati, is a testament to European notions of cultural superiority, excoriating the lack of American culture, manners, and learning. Charles Dickens’ *American Notes* (1842), is also somewhat in this mode, being particularly derisive of

rural manners.ⁱ A vast number of historical monographs drawing on these travel diaries and commentaries exist, though their usage as an archival resource has diminished in recent years.

Nonetheless, the accounts of foreign visitors to the United States provide a unique window into the life of the nation at different points in its history, and are an under-utilized resource for political study. This is not to say, however, that the political insights of prominent travelers have been entirely ignored. A major exception is, of course, Alexis de Tocqueville. Probably the most famous foreign visitor to the United States, he is still regularly invoked by journalists and politicians. Arriving in the young United States in 1831 to investigate its prison system, Tocqueville set out to investigate the American democratic experiment and distill its lessons for France. The famous insights of *Democracy in America* (1835) have reverberated down the ages as a warning to democracies everywhere – the tendency to prefer equality to liberty, and the resultant dangers of tyranny of the majority, or of a soft, seemingly benign despotism where the individualistic tendency of citizens has caused them to withdraw entirely from the political sphere – but so too have the remedies he saw in the American case, such as associations, religion, and lawyers.

What is particularly interesting in the case of Tocqueville, whose effort was designed to translate America and its lessons to a *French* audience, is the manner in which it has been reflected *back* to the United States and become a filter on *domestic* perceptions of the political system: American journalists, politicians, and citizens often use Tocqueville’s language and concepts to outline and understand their *own* institutions and political phenomena.ⁱⁱ Tocqueville

ⁱ So appalled was James Fenimore Cooper by the presentation of the United States in most accounts that he produced his own fictional version, *Notions of the Americans: Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor* (1828) in an effort to right the balance. See Melvin J. Lasky, “America and Europe: Transatlantic Images,” in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds., *Paths of American Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970), 477.

ⁱⁱ For an argument that Tocqueville’s reputation suffered in the post-Civil War era and was only revived after WWII, see Matthew Mancini, “Alexis de Tocqueville’s Post-Civil War Reputation.” *Society*, 43:1 (2005).

thus teaches *Americans* how to understand their political system; to recognize its achievements but also to acknowledge some of its flaws. In this regard, then, Tocqueville provides a crucial example of the kinds of indirect and *reflective* impact a foreign observer can exert in the domestic American context – providing a *mirror* to the nation.

Furthermore, as I argue elsewhere,ⁱⁱⁱ the notion of American exceptionalism itself draws heavily on international influences – Enlightenment ideals originating in Europe were projected onto the American canvass, which was seen by European *philosophes* as a unique realm, unhindered by monarchical and feudal restraints, in which such ideals could be realized. The American Revolution both drew on and reinforced this tendency, as the “Americans, finding the mythical representation both flattering and useful, embraced it as their own,” and fueled an exceptionalist vision of the American polity which persists in the contemporary era.⁴ It was *Tocqueville* who first suggested this term, when he observed that “the Americans are in an exceptional situation,” in terms of their social egalitarianism, individualism, emphasis on rights, meritocratic persuasion, and religiosity, and suggested it was “unlikely that any other democratic people will be similarly placed.”⁵ These components that have continued to characterize the vision of America from abroad, but exceptionalism also conditions how Americans *themselves* view their political system, thus Tocqueville again exerts an indirect reflective impact—teaching citizens to view the American polity as distinctive.

Another important exception to the general scholarly silence on foreign observers is James Bryce. His *American Commonwealth* (1888) exerted provided Americans with the first systematic analysis of the party system and influenced reform efforts during the late Gilded Age and the Progressive Era (having an important influence, in particular, on Woodrow Wilson).⁶

ⁱⁱⁱ Draft dissertation proposal.

Even the *outflow* of American ideas has been associated with prominent *foreign* observers. In assessing the impact of constitutionalism abroad, Carl J. Friedrich outlines three major periods of influence and notes that “one book seems to have played a primary role as *the* interpreter of the American political order” in each period.⁷ In the “early” period, following constitutional ratification, this position was occupied by *The Federalist*. But *foreign* commentators come to the fore in the middle (mid-19th Century, embracing the failed European revolutions of 1848) and later periods (post-World War II, when many previously autocratic regimes transitioned to democracy); Tocqueville and Bryce respectively.^{iv}

They are not, however, typical foreign travelers. Unlike Trollope and Dickens, who produced essentially literary accounts—pure travelogues with sensational or humorous insights—Tocqueville and Bryce drew on their travels in a systematic manner, so as to produce social scientific commentaries (suggesting something of the “soak and poke” methodology associated with Richard Fenno).⁸ I refer to such travelers as “observational social scientists,” and it is these accounts which can provide useful insight into American political development and the role of observers within the dynamics of international political exchange

Why study foreign observers?

The notion of travel as a *scientific* endeavor has a classical pedigree. The basic etymology of common scientific terms suggests just such a connection: “hodos” in Greek, meant “road,” and from “metahodos,” literally “along the road” we derive “method.”⁹ “Theoria” from which we derive “theory,” meant “journey.” A “theorist” was an emissary who traveled on behalf of his

^{iv} Tocqueville and Bryce had a notable influence on *Australian* politics – with *The American Commonwealth* serving as an important guide to the framers of the Australian Constitution (which came into force in 1901) and Tocqueville providing guidance on how democracy would play out in a large immigrant nation. See Peter Beilharz, “Tocqueville in the Antipodes? Middling through in Australia, Then and Now,” *Thesis Eleven*, No. 65 (2001).

city to other cities or societies to learn from them.¹⁰ The connection has also been forged at a philosophical level – for example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1755) provides an extensive discussion of the role of travel in developing political and philosophical knowledge, and invoked the concept of a “philosophe voyageur,” an individual who would use journeys into unknown countries to compare cases and derive general principles.¹¹ The *philosophe voyageur* thus stands in relation to the mere tourist much like the literary critic to the novella reader. “Observational social scientists” approximate the ideal of Rousseau’s *philosophe voyageur*, and especially when transatlantic travel was relatively rare, and international publics lacked extensive journalistic networks on which to draw for information, have played an important role in transatlantic communication.

In selecting from the corpus of travel accounts (written predominantly in the 18th and 19th Centuries), I rely firstly on an author’s own statements of social scientific endeavor. For example, Frances Trollope explicitly denies any claim to *political* insight or systematic activity:

“I am in no way competent to judge of the political institutions of America; and if I should occasionally make an observation on their effects, as they meet my superficial glance, they will be made in the spirit, and with the feeling of a woman, who is apt to tell what her first impressions may be, but unapt to reason back from effects to their causes.”¹²

In contrast, Harriet Martineau, a famous English political economist and contemporary of Tocqueville, made explicit claims to objective, systematic activity in the gathering of her material, and produced an analytical volume from her American experiences, *Society in America* (1837) which assessed *political* institutions and activity as well as general social themes. She laid out her specific approach to assessing the social *and political* achievements of the United States as comparing “the existing state of society in America with the principles on which it is professedly founded, thus testing Institutions, Morals, and Manners by an indisputable, instead of an arbitrary standard.”¹³ Martineau played an important role in the abolitionist movement, and

while her work has received extensive attention within sociology, primarily due to her methodological treatise, *How to Observe Manners and Morals* (1838), drafted en route to America, it has received comparatively little within political science.

An alternative selection criterion is to include those accounts which explicitly *aim* for political impact within the auspices of an international movement.^v This would embrace Fanny Kemble, the English actress whose personal journal of life on a Southern plantation proved important to the abolitionist cause.

Ultimately, reflecting Friedrich's suggestion that "[t]he channels through which ideas flow are very numerous,"¹⁴ I would argue that at least *one* if these international channels forged by foreign commentators (and the transmission *can* flow both ways). The role of observational social scientists in international political exchange (specifically observers of the *United States*) is thus an under-explored and important area of study. I do not argue foreign commentators *always* have an impact, nor that it is necessarily large or determinative, but that they can have a *significant* influence on conceptions of the American polity, and even on particular political outcomes (as will be explored in my cast study on the abolition movement). This fits into a dissertation project considering the dynamics of international political exchange more broadly, considering the role of foreign observers as one kind of transmission mechanism for international public opinion and social movements, and focusing on the idea of the United States as a political *importer*, rather than its exporting role, as is traditionally emphasized. In my dissertation, I will consider more broadly *when* such views are influential, what factors underpin it, and what other transmission mechanisms are apparent.

^v Though this may raise methodological problems – selection on the dependent variable?

2. CASE STUDY: THE INTERNATIONAL ABOLITION MOVEMENT

The movement to abolish the international slave trade, then slavery itself, provides an excellent arena in which to consider the dynamics of international political exchange. A “slow moving process” taking almost sixty years to accomplish its aims, it reveals the importance of, in this case, *British* influence on the American polity.”¹⁵

An important exploration of this movement, considering both its British and American dimensions, has been undertaken by political scientists Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink in their book, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*.¹⁶ Keck and Sikkink provide a historically rich and sociologically informative account of the abolition movement, as a historical precursor to the contemporary “transnational advocacy networks” that form their main focus. However, their account lacks a strong role for individual observers serving as vehicles for international ideas or the wider implications for the American polity of the British abolition movement. Nonetheless, I suggest an important role for such foreign observers, and a strong case for international (British) influence throughout the long campaign to abolish slavery in the United States.^{vi}

The British Abolition Movement

The British campaign against the Atlantic slave trade, and subsequently against the existence of slavery more generally, can be traced to a number of sources. Firstly, a legal test case in 1772 eroded the legal standing of slavery within the British Isles. Foreshadowing the issues that would emerge in the American judicial context with *Dred Scott*, *Somerset’s Case* considered the claim of a slave, James Somerset, that by being brought into England, his state of bondage had

^{vi} As this point, I have not explored the potential impact of other countries in this area, such as France.

ceased.^{vii} Lord Mansfield rendered a narrow judgment focused on legal details rather than broader moral principles, but it was to have profound implications for the status of slavery in England, and eventually the British Empire. He noted that colonial laws permitted slavery, but the common law of England did not (no contract could be binding without the individual's consent), nor did any positive act of Parliament recognize the existence of slavery. Thus, given the "odious" nature of slavery, which rendered it "incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political," the only basis under which it could operate was *positive law*, and the absence of such law in England made slavery *illegal* there.¹⁷ Somerset was declared free.

A second factor fueling the British campaign against slavery was, initially, a pragmatic one. The need for soldiers during the American War of Independence had necessitated the recruitment of blacks in the colonies. The British had offered freedom in return for military service, and this offer, forged in the exigencies of wartime, marked a pragmatic commitment to abolition that developed into a principled commitment in peacetime.

A third factor promoted this principled commitment; the anti-slavery agitation of religious dissenters and prominent political advocates – notably William Wilberforce, Member of Parliament for Hull. Emanating from the religious commitment of the dissenting churches, viewing slavery as an unforgivable sin, abolitionism in Britain quickly became a mass movement. In 1791-92, approximately 400,000 people, almost one in every eleven adults, signed petitions against the slave trade. By 1814, this number had risen to 750,000, approximately one in *eight* (now signing petitions against slavery *itself*), and by 1833, one in seven adults had signed petitions favoring emancipation, which was twice the number who had *voted* in the most recent election.¹⁸ William Wilberforce was the most active parliamentary advocate of this

^{vii} Somerset had been brought to England in 1769 by his American owner, Charles Steuart, but escaped in 1771. Recaptured and due to be sent to Jamaica, anti-slavery advocates applied for a writ of *habeas corpus*, such that a British court would decide whether the imprisonment of Somerset was legal.

movement, and despite several initial failures, he was able to push through a parliamentary ban on the international slave trade in 1807 (the same year that the U.S. Constitutional prohibition on ending the international slave trade expired, facilitating a congressional ban signed by President Thomas Jefferson). A full parliamentary ban on slavery within the British Empire was not achieved until 1833,¹⁹ but the ban on the transatlantic slave trade was no empty rhetorical commitment – it was backed up by the full force of the British Navy, risking international conflict in order to suppress smuggling and enforce its edict.²⁰

Such behavior by a state actor defies explanation by most traditional approaches within international relations, as it was undertaken *against* material interest and for apparently purely moral or ideational purposes—it thus provides an extremely rare example of “costly international moral action.”²¹ However, in their exploration of this costly moral action, in which they suggest that a constructivist account can provide some understanding of moral power in international relations, Chaim Kaufmann and Robert Pape *challenge* the notion that has been promoted in constructivist accounts that other-regarding *cosmopolitanism* drove the anti-slavery campaign. Instead, they suggest “a parochial religious and political imperative to reform their domestic society” in which “suppression of the slave trade was one part of a wider program to root out corruption in all aspects of English society.” They conclude that “[t]ransnational efforts at persuasion and political assistance played virtually no role, whereas domestic coalition politics, which are not emphasized in the existing theories, played a decisive role at several points.”²²

While denying the other-regarding motivation for British action in this sphere does not erode evidence of British *influence*, it does raise an important and interesting question about the domestic ramifications of a nation’s external posturing. Kaufmann and Pape’s argument that the British anti-slavery position had positive implications at home (whether in terms of popular

support for politicians, prestige, or bolstering a campaign of moral reform) suggests a factor that might apply in other countries. In many Arab nations today, for example, politicians and governments taking strong positions against America and its foreign policies appear to receive positive goods in the domestic political context.

The Anglo-American Abolition Movement

In North America, a mass anti-slavery movement opposed to slavery did not develop until the 1830s, growing out of the evangelical Christian churches amid the religious fervor of the second great awakening. As Sidney Milkis has argued, this shows evangelical Christianity in a far different light to its contemporary image, as a powerful agent of reform in the pursuit of equality rather than as a force for religious conservatism.²³ Spearheaded by William Lloyd Garrison's American Anti-Slavery Society, more than 200,000 people (mostly in the New England states) belonged to an abolitionist society by the time of the Civil War.²⁴ Encouraged to establish new chapters and petition Congress to abolish slavery, the sheer volume of these petitions sent precipitated a crisis over whether they should be received at all, with John C. Calhoun arguing powerfully for a "gag rule," or non-reception of the petitions, and prevailing.²⁵ The gag rule on abolition petitions remained in place until 1844, when it was successfully challenged by former president John Quincy Adams, serving in the House at that time.²⁶

Keck and Sikkink argue that the Anglo-American abolition movement cohered sufficiently to be classified as a "transnational advocacy network," which they define as a network that "*includes those relevant actors working internationally on an issue who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services.*"²⁷ They point to an asymmetrical relationship, however, in which the British pole was

dominant. An important component of transnational advocacy networks is the interchange of “tactics, organizational forms, research, and language from each other,” and this is evident among British and American antislavery groups.²⁸ Keck and Sikkink note how the groups used “the tactics of the petition and boycotts of slave-produced goods and hired itinerant speakers very successfully on both sides of the Atlantic. *Many of these tactics originated in Britain*, and the transnational network served as a vehicle for diffusing tactical recipes and collective action repertoires from one domestic social movement to another.”²⁹

This reflects what Elizabeth Clemens, in her study of interest group organization in the late 19th Century, has called “organizational isomorphism.”³⁰ Working within the sociological “new institutionalist” approach,^{viii} Clemens considers the strategic options available to groups seeking to change the status quo in various policy areas, such as women’s suffrage. She suggests two main strategies – either to appropriate the organizational forms and collective-action strategies of already legitimate actors in targeted arenas, such as business groups, or to transplant their own existing organizational forms and collective-action strategies to unfamiliar settings.³¹ Hence, in the case of the women’s movement, constrained by a “logic of appropriateness” which dictated what activities women could acceptably engage in, information campaigns were an “appropriate” and effective extension of their current organizational “scripts” (repertoires of organizational action and justification). Both strategies suggest the extension of consistent patterns of organization, though the first is an example of “mimetic isomorphism,” adopting the approach of an existing group that is proving effective in your chosen policy area. The (early) approach of the American anti-slavery movement, to mimic the organizational forms and tactics

^{viii} This approach, associated with James March and Johan Olsen envisions institutions as collections of rules and organized practices. Institutions generate a “logic of appropriateness,” prescribing certain behaviors for specific actors in defined situations. See James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, “The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life.” *The American Political Science Review*, 78, 1984.

of a foreign group with similar substantive aims, seems to fall into this category. Clemens points out, however, that such borrowings are rarely *purely* mimetic – they are subjected to an antagonistic, competitive process in which forms and scripts are altered.³² This raises the question, particularly important in terms of *foreign* interchange, of what *happens* to forms and tactics when transplanted to an entirely different political, cultural and institutional context.

Foreign Observers and the Anglo-American Abolition Movement

Within the information flows crucial to maintaining the transnational abolitionist advocacy network, foreign observers of the United States played an important communicative role. Many British observers traveling in the ante-bellum U.S. had shown themselves critical of slavery, such as Dickens and Trollope, reflecting broader British public opinion in favor of abolition. Another prominent commentator and self-conceived “observational social scientist, Harriet Martineau, became a strong proponent of the Abolitionist cause and used her writings to promote its endeavors.

Martineau, a British author of French Huguenot extraction, was already the famous author of *Illustrations of Political Economy* when she set out on a two year tour of America in 1834. Martineau’s specific approach to assessing the social *and political* achievements of America was, as mentioned earlier, to “compare the existing state of society in America with the principles on which it is professedly founded, thus testing Institutions, Morals, and Manners by an indisputable, instead of an arbitrary standard.” With the most prominent founding profession of ideals and principles in her mind, the *Declaration of Independence*, the “peculiar institution” of slavery could not fail to appear aberrant.

It is important to note the role of *universalism* in the standard applied by Martineau. The ideals of the *Declaration* are *universalist*. Even in their contemporary interpretation, they extended to all men by virtue of their existence *as men*, not as citizens of the United States of America. It is this universality which can animate the crusading side of American political activity in the wider world, but it can also be utilized by the world to hold America to account – forcing Americans to both confront and question inconsistencies in their image of the nation and what it represents.³³ This perhaps indicates why international opinion can play an influential role in the American polity and could explain the often impassioned nature of international public opinion – as American political values purport to apply to citizens throughout the wider world, so that world comments when Americans fail to live up to these standards in their domestic context. In this sense, America's position since the Revolution as a beacon of universal rights also comes with internationally imposed responsibilities to uphold those commitments, in order to maintain its prestige and standing.

Unlike Alexis de Tocqueville, Martineau made an extensive tour of the South, where she was able to encounter slavery firsthand. She was shocked by its human face and advocated abolition strongly in the writings that would be published from this trip, the analytical volume, *Society in America* (1837), and the more popularly-oriented *Retrospect of Western Travel* (1838). Commenting on the students she encountered when visiting the University of Virginia, Martineau remarked: “To observing eyes it appears plain that the hour is approaching when these young men must, like all other American men, choose their part, and enter decisively into struggle to maintain or overthrow the first principles of freedom....The eyes of the world will be fixed on Jefferson's University during the impending conflict between slaveholders and freemen.”³⁴ Her anti-slavery activities did not cease with her return to England and publication

of these accounts. In 1839, she wrote an article entitled “The Martyr Age of the United States” for the *Westminster Review*. In it she introduced the abolitionist movement and its major figures to an English audience, and the tract proved extremely influential in England – it was distributed widely, reprinted as a single pamphlet, and stimulated the establishment of abolitionist clubs and fundraising efforts throughout the country. It was also circulated widely among abolitionist circles in the United States.

Another Englishwoman traveling America at this time was Frances Kemble. “Fanny” Kemble was even more famous than Martineau – a celebrated actress from a prominent theatrical family who undertook an American tour in 1832. During this time she married Pierce Butler, a Southerner who would soon come to inherit a series of large plantations, and become one of the largest slaveholders in Georgia. Kemble was an ardent abolitionist, and the marriage was not to survive the strains of this fundamental dispute.³⁵ However, during their marriage they lived for a period at one of his Sea Island plantations, and she kept a diary of this experience. Not published until 1863, the *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839* caused a sensation on both sides of the Atlantic, containing as it did the first eye-witness account of plantation slavery from the perspective of a White abolitionist plantation mistress.³⁶

Though Kemble’s deeply personal journal does not approach the level of social scientific rigor of Martineau, she deserves inclusion in this case study given her involvement in the abolitionist cause, her prominence, and the *express* purpose of publication being to influence public opinion on both sides of the Atlantic with regard to the slavery question.

One important implication of the works of Martineau and Kemble can be linked to the most direct act, or, technically, lack thereof, which influenced the outcome of the American Civil War and thus the course of American political development itself: the British failure to

diplomatically recognize the Confederacy. According to Keck and Sikkink, “antislavery sentiment in Britain was “one of a combination of influences” that helped keep the British from recognizing the Confederacy and extending aid to it.” However, even if only a single factor in a broader web of diplomatic and economic concerns, “each factor weighing against intervention was important” given “how close the British came to recognizing the South.”³⁷ Thus Martineau made an important contribution in terms of building up the British abolition movement.

Kemble’s contribution was more proximate and direct, targeting what many saw at the time as widespread public ignorance as to the true nature and extent of the conflict and prevalent Confederate sympathies. A contemporary pamphlet warned against the danger of giving “active support to the wrong side,” which, “when we remember *the immense weight of English opinion in America*, and the momentous consequences hanging on the event of war...will be confessed a dreadful evil.”³⁸ Kemble’s Georgia journal fits into the “information politics” approach of transnational networks, which Keck and Sikkink describe as “[o]ne of the most important tactics the abolitionists used,” akin to the modern human rights methodology of promoting change by reporting facts.”³⁹ Keck and Sikkink focus on the importance of *American Slavery as It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses* (1839), the factual record compiled by the Grimke sisters (Angelina and Sarah) and Theodore Weld (all Americans), which sold more than 100,000 copies in its first year, and continued to sell beyond that.⁴⁰ Yet Kemble’s work also cause a sensation, was widely read in its own right and reprinted in the publications of numerous antislavery organizations in Britain and America.⁴¹ Indeed, some have even attributed the British failure to recognize the Confederacy to the frenzied reaction to Kemble’s book, indicating vividly to the government the state of public opinion.^{ix}

^{ix} Although, Kemble’s most recent biographer, Catherine Clinton, disputes this claim.

Interestingly, as Keck and Sikkink indicate, the British abolitionists were by no means advocating equal rights for blacks, *or for women*. Yet ironically, some of their most powerful voices were those of women – like Martineau and Kemble. At the first world antislavery conference, held in London in 1840, the English majority refused to seat female delegates (both black and white) who had been elected by the American movement,⁴² indicating that tensions can occur between different projects for equality, even within ostensibly “progressive” movements.^x In this respect, then, the American abolition movement was more egalitarian and may eventually “have encouraged the British movement to include women on a more equal footing.”⁴³

Case Study Conclusions: British impact on Abolition in the United States

Though they do not fully draw out the domestic political implications of the British abolition movement, Keck & Sikkink do provide grounds for an interesting hypothesis as to *when* international influence will be strongest. They suggest that the “[t]ransnational dimension was most influential and decisive *when government links with civil society were impaired*.”⁴⁴ The South, utilizing its dominance in political institutions to keep slavery off the table (as, for example, through the “gag rule”) was matched by Northern unwillingness to address the issue amid fears for the Union’s stability. Thus, the lack of abolitionist expression in *American* political institutions “made transnational linkage politics an attractive strategy for American abolitionists; by joining with British activists and at times leveraging the power of the British government on behalf of the antislavery cause, they could amplify their own voices.”⁴⁵

Understandably, then, when an antislavery leadership *did* emerge in Congress (with the

^x By comparison, in Australia and New Zealand we see the reverse tension - early attention to women’s equality, yet indifference to the rights claims of the indigenous Aboriginal and Maori populations. This suggests that, historically and comparatively, there has been no fixed priority ordering among these egalitarian objectives.

formation of the Republican Party) the influence of British abolitionists in the U.S. was diminished. However, an international component was still crucial to this result, as Keck and Sikkink note: “[p]aradoxically, it was a transnational factor, immigration, that robbed the South of its historical dominance of political institutions.”⁴⁶ Quoting from Robert Fogel, they explain, “[t]he “huge influx of foreigners into the North after 1820” affected the distribution of House seats and electoral votes, giving the North the possibility of gaining control of the Federal government.”⁴⁷ Landy and Milkis have also argued that Jacksonian democracy *contributed* to the abolitionist cause, despite the efforts of both parties to keep the slavery issue off the table, by politicizing the general public and promoting mass forms of political communication. Thus, while the abolitionist movement had emerged *outside* of the existing political and party structure, it interacted with a populace increasingly attuned to politics, and was able to appropriate some of the tactics of the Jacksonians themselves (as exemplified by William Lloyd Garrison’s abolitionist newspaper, *The Liberator*).⁴⁸ In this sense, we see another example of “isomorphism” in the abolitionist movement, this time *within* the domestic context.

Ultimately, the British abolitionist movement did not secure outcomes in America directly or unilaterally. Robert Fogel has argued that while “England provided the spark for a new American crusade, the fire would neither have been lit nor sustained without kindling and a large reserve of fuel.”⁴⁹ As Keck and Sikkink conclude, in a manner reminiscent of John Kingdon, “[t]here must be an idea, advocates to spread it, and a public ready to receive it.”⁵⁰ My argument is that foreign observers can serve as just this kind of advocate.

3. FURTHER CASE STUDIES AND RESEARCH DESIGN

“...there is no nation which does not need to borrow from others...”
- John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*⁵¹

As mentioned earlier, my broader dissertation considers the dynamics of international political exchange, focusing on the United States as an *importer* of foreign political “products” from a long term perspective.^{xi} The abolition case study shows the American abolition movement as an importer of organizational scripts and tactics from its British counterpart, and suggests a general influence for British ideas about emancipation.^{xii}

Scholars working in the American Political Development field have been deeply concerned with *internal* sources of change, those embedded in the polity itself,^{xiii} and often divorce changes and developments in the American polity from the international stream of ideas and events,⁵² or imply such a focus by excluding “foreign policy” from their cases. I would argue that the international context does not solely impact *foreign* policy, and this is an artificial distinction that has impeded understanding of how non-domestic influences can affect *domestic* policies and political development. Where external factors have been included, it is typically as a dichotomous choice between the presence or absence of war,⁵³ or the inclusion of an “exogenous shock” such as a foreign financial crisis. Thus, in my dissertation, I aim to explicitly link international and domestic developments, and show greater sensitivity to issues of temporality⁵² by incorporating the non-dichotomous contours of transnational political exchange.⁵⁴ Reflecting the fact that the United States is not a hermetically sealed polity, I hope to situate the APD approach within a global context and thereby provide a richer understanding of political interaction between the United States and the wider world.

Some previous work has addressed elements of this agenda: Daniel Rodger’s *Atlantic Crossings* comes closest to my aims, examining the role of the United States as an importer and

^{xi} I have yet to define and narrow my period of interest.

^{xii} Though, in an interesting twist, these were drawn from the universalist ideals of the *Declaration of Independence*.

^{xiii} As, for example, with the “intercurrence” model, in which different “orders” are overlaid, conditioning and constraining future developments and building in the tensions which produce change. Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek, *The Search for American Political Development* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

suggesting important considerations for my study of international political exchange. Examining the Progressive-era exchange in social policy ideas between Europe and the United States, the “Atlantic era in social politics,”⁵⁵ Rodgers argues that new institutional connections between the United States and European nations, an intellectual shift to seeing America as *part of* a larger historical movement, and the emergence of new sorts of intellectual “brokers,” able to synthesize and disseminate new ideas, facilitated cross-national exchange on an unprecedented scale.⁵⁶ Importantly, he stresses the “asymmetry of the exchange,” with the United States looking to European examples rather than the reverse.⁵⁷ Although at times he may overstress the asymmetry of exchange, and he ignores non-European sources of progressive policies, such as the Australasian nations,^{xiv} Rodgers provides an impressive model of research in this area. Of particular relevance to my project are the mechanisms of exchange he suggests, such as academic networks, and his insights into what underpins successful exchange (namely, “a foundation of common economic and social experience” and a sense of kinship, where polities appear “to face similar needs and problems, to move within shared historic frames, and to strive toward a more commonly imagine future.”)⁵⁸ Rodgers’ study is therefore illuminating, but it is important to consider *alternative* policy areas and institutional arenas, and to place the case of social policy within a more general understanding of the dynamics of international political exchange.

Given space constraints, I can only sketch a potential research design and suggest other cases that could be fruitful subjects for investigation. Further case study possibilities include the rise of socialism or trade unionism (1840s-1930s); the women’s suffrage movement (1840s-1920s);

^{xiv} Rodgers significantly underplays the innovative role of Australia and New Zealand in social politics. Despite being political *importers* in terms of their constitutional frameworks and political theory, they have served as policy *innovators* and *exporters* in a number of areas, such as women’s rights and electoral procedure.

political party reform efforts (1880s-1950s); and the drive to desegregate the South (1950s).^{xv} To consider the United States as a political *importer*, I intend to assess each case in terms of three separately conceived (but interactive) sources of international influence, differing in terms of *scale* and *organizational coherence*, as shown in Table 1. I will supplement qualitative case study methods with quantitative indicators and behavioral measures where appropriate. At the narrowest point on the *scale* criterion lie individual foreign observers. They register differently on the *organizational coherence* criterion depending on whether their work lies within the auspices of an organized international movement or not – thus Martineau qualifies in this regard while Tocqueville does not. The second source, “organized international movements” denotes a larger scale and a high level of organization coherence (though I have no fixed threshold). This source interacts with individual observers and embraces transnational advocacy networks. The third source, “international public opinion,” is more diffuse – having the largest scale but the least organizational coherence. It is reflected in broader journalistic output and gains expression in the contemporary era through international polling. Each source, then, is likely associated with different mechanisms for the transmission of ideas and may register in different institutions (in both state and society) within the United States.

Table 1

Source of influence	Scale	Organizational Coherence
Individual observers	Low	Variable
Organized international movements	Mid	High
International public opinion	High	Low

The *likelihood* of impact and the *conditions* under which they exert influence may also differ between the sources. For example, an obvious null hypothesis would have organized international movements as mostly likely to secure substantial political results.⁵⁹ However, it

^{xv} I have yet to determine what would provide appropriate criteria for which of these cases to select.

will be important to test this hypothesis against the influence of individual foreign observers and that of more amorphous “public opinion.” It will also be important to consider whether the *nature* of influence differs between them.

To illustrate the role of the three sources in the abolition case, we see an organized “transnational advocacy network” of abolitionists (utilizing newspapers, pamphlets, conferences and speaker tours), engaging, focusing and expressing broader “public opinion” (via such vehicles as the petition), and drawing on the works of individual observers such as Martineau and Kemble. Alternatively, in the case of 20th Century desegregation, an important role for international public opinion and the international Cold War context more generally has been established by Mary Dudziak in *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Dudziak argues that “civil rights reform came to be seen as crucial to U.S. foreign relations”⁶⁰ amid increasing international condemnation of Jim Crow in the South and concerns for American moral standing against Soviet propaganda. A foreign “observational social scientist” also played a prominent role (though less as a vehicle for the transmission of international ideas and more by virtue of his purported “objectivity” as a foreigner). Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish economist, published *An American Dilemma, the Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*, an extensive study conducted under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation, which was to have a powerful impact on efforts to eradicate Jim Crow. It was cited in the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, outlawing racial segregation in public schools, and Myrdal himself was a signatory on the 1950 UNESCO statement, *The Race Question*, which also proved influential in the *Brown* decision.⁶¹ The role of organized international movements is, however, less clear in this case.

Quantitative indicators will also prove helpful in tracing the mechanisms of international ideational or institutional transmission, providing tangible evidence for the *reception* of such international exports which can then be tallied. Archival research will be important here – in terms of drawing on the presidential papers and the congressional record, among other sources. Survey data considering foreign attitudes on various policy areas is also crucial and available from a number of sources; the U.S. Department of State and the *Pew Global Attitudes Survey* have conducted extensive polling in recent decades, with earlier surveys provided by the U.S. Information Service. An important caveat is that “international” opinion is not a homogenous bloc (nor is opinion *within* foreign countries); though polling of foreign nations permits the aggregation of “world” opinion, this is not always appropriate. For example, during the administration of George W. Bush the *Pew Global Attitudes Survey* found a general decline in positive attitudes toward America internationally – yet in a specific region, South East Asia, the general trend was *reversed*.⁶² Thus indiscriminate aggregation, lumping together all countries and regions as “international opinion” can erode meaningful differences. It is likely therefore, that when approaching both case studies or quantitative data, I will focus on specific countries which engage most in the policy area (i.e. England did in the abolition case).

A more explicitly behavioral component may also be a useful contribution to the overall dissertation. For example, utilizing polls or even content-analysis of foreign newspapers for an earlier period to provide a measure of international opinion on various policy areas (with the caveat about aggregation mentioned earlier) and assessing its relationship with a political output measure within the United States, would provide a more direct exposition of the dynamics of international political exchange. Relevant output measures can be found in all three branches of the federal government – for example, congressional hearings in a relevant policy area (where

foreign opinion has been strongly in favor of a certain measure), bill consideration, bill passage (even potentially, major legislation)⁶³ or congressional resolutions; executive orders or significant executive action; amicus briefs and Supreme Court opinions. It is even possible that foreign opinion might encourage policy action on the state level, though this is outside the scope of my study.

Such an approach could also illuminate the contours of anti-Americanism in a longer-term perspective, and the possibility of its exerting a reflective impact on domestic perceptions. The surveys mentioned above question respondents on their attitudes to American government, values and its people more broadly, and there are also country-specific surveys which ask about opinions on Americans, such those conducted by *Mass Observation* in Britain.⁶⁴ Utilizing these surveys, or supplementing with newspaper content, to operationalize “U.S. standing” or reputation abroad in some fashion, could allow for consideration of *indirect impact* in the US – by assessing the relationship of this independent variable with opinion within the United States, such as the *perception* of U.S. standing abroad,^{xvi} satisfaction with government institutions, and even *trust* in government itself.

4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Reviewing the abolitionist case study suggests six major considerations to bring to bear on other cases, providing insights for my broader dissertation project. The considerations have been grouped in response to the particular questions on international influence they address.

What is international “influence”?

- **direct vs. indirect (reflective) influence**

^{xvi} Is there even a correlation here? When “international” esteem for the US goes down, does it *register* in the US?

An important point to clarify is *what counts* as international “influence.” In this study, I have distinguished between two general kinds: “direct” and “indirect,” or *reflective*. To clarify, by “direct,” I mean explicit *efforts* by international organizations or governments to influence the U.S. domestic (political) sphere which registers in concrete indicators such as policy outcomes. By “indirect” impact, I suggest situations where foreign public opinion, organized movements, or the work of individual commentators, has an impact on the American polity without any explicit intention to influence the American polity from the foreign source. This impact, I envisage, is typically less concrete than that of direct efforts (though foreign sources might come to be utilized by domestic actors in order to promote their own specific aims, without their explicit intention, and so may register in a more concrete outcome). *Reflective* impact thus appears as a subtype of indirect influence having a particular kind of *effect* – conditioning Americans’ perceptions of their own political system.

In the abolition case, the British abolition movement (and government) undertook *direct* action to bring about the abolition of slavery in the United States, though the aim was achieved in a more indirect fashion – by providing organizational resources which sustained the U.S. movement until an antislavery leadership in Congress (and the presidency) could develop. Direct impact was also important in that the British movement constrained the diplomatic action of Great Britain so as to prevent recognition of the Confederacy.

There are, however, a number of complications with both of these definitions and more clarification is needed. For example, should I confine my definition of “direct” influence to efforts to influence only *domestic* policies, or include American *foreign* policy also, and thereby embrace more standard diplomatic activities?

Under what conditions is international influence more likely to occur?

- **when leadership vacuums are apparent**

The notion that international leadership can fill a vacuum when domestic leadership is constrained, as with congressional advocacy on the slavery issue prior to the mid-1850s, suggests an important factor conditioning international influence to consider in other cases. It also suggests a political action which is beyond the range and capacity of foreign commentators, international organizations and public opinion: Keck and Sikkink suggest that “[t]he task that fell to the new political antislavery leadership [in Congress] was one that *only domestic leaders could carry out*—a reinterpretation of the meaning of the Constitution.”⁶⁵ This suggests that *constitutional interpretation* is a purely American endeavor, resistant to direct international influence and even to indirect influence as well. Alexis de Tocqueville, for example, provides an account of American democracy, its institutions, parties, social underpinnings and operation, but *not* an account of its constitutional settlement – the understanding of *what the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution means* to a particular generation. When this changes substantially, it amounts to what Sidney Milkis has termed a “refounding.”⁶⁶ Tocqueville’s reflective impact on American domestic perceptions is thus absent from the highest level of constitutional interpretation. This distinction perhaps suggests why *judicial* reference to international opinion and movements has become controversial (explored below), given the Court’s role as a defender of the prevailing constitutional interpretation.⁶⁷

- **when domestic ramifications for foreign governments are positive**

Kaufmann and Pape argued that the British government engaged in “costly moral action” on the abolition question due to positive domestic ramifications – namely a campaign to suppress societal corruption. The domestic political goods which could be provided by external posturing are numerous, including political advancement, prestige, or electoral security, and it is important

to consider the *motivations* behind any *explicit* efforts to affect American policies in my case studies. When positive benefits will accrue, such efforts would appear more likely.

How are international ideas, policies or institutions transmitted?

- **via organizational isomorphism (Sociological New Institutionalism)**

The importance of organizational isomorphism in international advocacy networks suggests that the sociological new institutionalist approach will be useful in considering other cases.

Isomorphism also raises the issue of domestication, how imports are altered by and adapted to their new political contexts. For example, Friedrich notes that “particular features of a system of institutions, torn from their context of living relations, rarely function in the same way within the new context to which they have been transplanted.”⁶⁸

How do core conceptions of the American polity condition international influence?

- **The universality of American values**

The abolitionist case raises ideological *universality* as a factor in understanding the American relationship with the wider world. Martineau’s methodological approach compared the realities of America to the “principles on which it is professedly founded,” thus drawing on the ideals of the *Declaration of Independence*—ideals which applied to *mankind*, not just Americans. Richard Hofstadter suggested it had been America’s “fate as a nation not to have ideologies, but to be one,”⁶⁹ by which Michael Mosbacher and Digby Anderson explain, “[h]e meant that the United States is not just another nation, it is the embodiment of a set of ideas and ideals, some realized, others waiting to be realized and possibly unrealizable.”⁷⁰ It is therefore important consider how universalism might operate in other issue areas, and whether the universalist ethos of American politics conditions how foreign publics perceive the U.S., how foreign actors interact with it, and the kinds of influence they *expect* to have.

- **American Exceptionalism**

Though the abolition case covers a negative element of American “exceptionalism,” the term is usually employed to denote the unique political circumstances and institutions of the U.S. and usually implies a level of *superiority* in this regard. “Exceptionalism” might operate as a *constraint* on the international transmission of ideas, organizational forms and even institutions themselves, as the apparent uniqueness of American political culture, national identity and institutions suggests *resistance* to external influences which might have exerted a homogenizing effect on other nations. Louis Hartz, for example, used the *lack* of a feudal tradition in America to explain the failure of socialism in the U.S. despite its influence elsewhere: Lockean liberalism was able to dominate, without provoking real “conservative” opposition, starving socialism of any space to develop.^{xvii}

Exceptionalism may also make the U.S. less of an intentional political “exporter” than typically envisaged (by scholars emphasizing its “crusading” nature, for example). Friedrich suggests that while “the French revolutionaries readily assumed that their plans were valid for all peoples and their constitutions a model of a political order for any free nation...the Americans were more sober and inclined to take the view that what was possible in America need not be possible elsewhere,” a sentiment “widely shared among visitors to the United States.”⁷¹ Thus the applicability of America’s universal values to all mankind is, in this formulation, practically circumscribed. This amounts to a much more romantic, rather than universalist vision of the feasibility of international political exchange, where the strong romantic view “superbly stated by Burke and the historical school, is that no such transfer [of political institutions] is possible at all.”⁷² Friedrich does not argue that Americans were generally this extreme, and indeed outlines

^{xvii} I would argue that his explicitly *comparative* grounding of exceptionalism and connection to international affairs (how the Cold War might *crack* the liberal consensus) has been overlooked. See Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*. 2nd ed. (San Diego: Harcourt, 1991).

the influence of American constitutional ideas abroad, but the tension between American universalist aims and an, at times, romantic vision of their own unique amenability to these universal values is an interesting one.

The possibility of foreign influence on American domestic affairs is not uncontroversial. Nations do not wish to see their political sovereignty as permeable: in the abolition case, for example, British dominance of the movement (at least prior to the 1850s) was resented by “many U.S. policymakers and citizens” who explicitly viewed it as ““intervention” in their affairs.”⁷³

The policy areas in which contemporary international governments and organizations might seek to influence American policies and practices are not comparatively benign: the use of the death penalty in 37 U.S. states (especially, until 2002, the execution of the mentally retarded, and, until 2005, of minors in some states)⁷⁴ has been the subject of intense international scrutiny., and international exemplars feed into many hot-button cultural issues such as abortion and euthanasia. The inclusion of international public opinion, or emerging Western “moral standards” in court decisions has been particularly controversial – with Supreme Court Justices David Souter and Antonin Scalia representing opposite poles on the issue, for and against respectively. This suggests that “foreign influence” may also be conditioned by ideological or even partisan factors.^{xviii} During the 2004 presidential election, for example, Democratic candidate John Kerry was criticized for suggesting he would be a more popular president in Europe,⁷⁵ while in the 2008 contest, Barack Obama’s perceived popularity in Europe was interpreted as a political *asset* – so much so that he took the unprecedented step of campaigning overseas. Prevailing partisan trends provide the most obvious explanation, yet do not entirely

^{xviii} The use of international precedents feeds into broader conservative opposition to “judicial activism” and is likely affected by the generally “liberal” thrust of international opinion.

account for the difference. The 2008 election also provides an example, at least anecdotally, of *reflective* international influence—yet studies of anti-Americanism rarely address its domestic implications and have not explored how it might condition U.S. citizens’ perceptions of their own polity.⁷⁶

Ultimately, even if the prospect of foreign influence is not welcome in all domestic quarters, the United States cannot be divorced from the international context amid interdependent economies, instant communications, and the reach of global terrorism. Such globalization inevitably brings with it reciprocal influence. A long-term consideration of both the direct and indirect impact of international forces on the American polity is thus timely, as is the effort to open American Political Development more broadly to the competition and cross-currents of a globalized world.

REFERENCES

-
- ¹ Henry Steele Commager, *America in Perspective: The United States Through Foreign Eyes* (New York: Mentor, 1948), xii.
- ² John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy, with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy* (London: Lee and Shepard, 1872), 351-352.
- ³ 20th Century examples include Simone de Beauvoir, *America Day by Day*, Patrick Dudley trans. (London: Duckworth, 1952) and Jean Baudrillard, *America*, Chris Turner trans. (New York: Verso, 1988).
- ⁴ John Kane, “Ambivalent Anti-Americanism,” in Brendan O’Connor and Martin Griffiths, eds., *The Rise of Anti-Americanism* (London: Routledge, 2006), 49-50.
- ⁵ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. II. trans. George Lawrence (New York: Perennial, 2000), 455. Thanks to HER for this reference.
- ⁶ James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, Vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1911). Volume 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1913).
- ⁷ Carl J. Friedrich, *The Impact of American Constitutionalism Abroad* (Boston: Boston University Press, 1967), 4.
- ⁸ Richard Fenno, *Home Style: House Members in their Districts* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978).
- ⁹ Bernard-Henri Levy, *American Vertigo: Traveling America in the Footsteps of Tocqueville* (New York: Random House, 2006), 7.
- ¹⁰ Sheldon Wolin, *Tocqueville Between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 5.
- ¹¹ Levy, 14. The discussion is in Footnote 10 of the *Discourse*.
- ¹² Quoted in Lila Marz Harper, *Solitary Travelers: Nineteenth-Century Women’s Travel Narratives and the Scientific Vocation* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001), 108.
- ¹³ Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, vol. 1 (New York: Ams Press, 1966), viii.
- ¹⁴ Friedrich, 3.
- ¹⁵ Paul Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 9.

¹⁶ I draw from Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, “Historical Precursors to Modern Transnational Social Movements and Networks,” in John A. Guidry, Michael D. Kennedy and Mayer N. Zald, eds., *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 35-53. See also Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

¹⁷ George Van Cleve, “Somerset’s Case and Its Antecedents in Imperial Perspective,” *Law and History Review*, 24:3 (2006).

¹⁸ Notably women were not excluded from signing *petitions*, which probably explains the larger number of petitioners than voters. Statistics from Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: Norton, 1989), 212, 217, 227. Cited in Keck and Sikkink, 38.

¹⁹ Catherine Clinton, *Fanny Kemble’s Civil Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 103.

²⁰ Chaim D. Kauffmann and Robert A. Pape, “Explaining Costly International Moral Action: Britain’s Sixty-year Campaign Against the Atlantic Slave Trade,” *International Organization* 53:4 (1991), 635.

²¹ Kauffmann and Pape, 631.

²² Kauffmann and Pape, 632. *Italics added.*

²³ Sidney Milkis, March 12, 2009.

²⁴ Marc Landy and Sidney Milkis, *American Government: Balancing Democracy and Rights*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 643.

²⁵ John C. Calhoun, “Speech on the reception of Abolition petitions, February 6th, 1837,” in Ross M. Lence, ed., *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1992), 463-476.

²⁶ Landy and Milkis, 146.

²⁷ Keck and Sikkink, 52.

²⁸ Keck and Sikkink, 38-39.

²⁹ Keck and Sikkink, 38-39.

³⁰ Elizabeth Clemens, *The People’s Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997). PAGE

³¹ Clemens, 56.

³² Clemens, 324.

³³ Thanks to MCO for this point.

³⁴ Harriet Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel*, vol. 2 (London: Saunders and Otley, 1838), 205.

³⁵ Clinton.

³⁶ Frances Kemble, *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839* (New York: Cosimo, 2007).

³⁷ Keck and Sikkink, 44.

³⁸ Quote from the pamphlet “Federalists and Confederates, for What Do They Fight?: The True Issue of the American Civil War” (London: Caldwell, 1863) in Alfred Grant, *The American Civil War and the British Press* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), 3. *Italics added.*

³⁹ Keck and Sikkink, 39.

⁴⁰ Keck and Sikkink, 39.

⁴¹ The Ladies’ Emancipation Society of London produced a pamphlet quoting heavily from Kemble, “The Essence of Slavery,” distributing hundreds of thousands of copies (<http://www.cfa.ilstu.edu/jmwilso4/aboutfanny.htm>)

⁴² Keck and Sikkink, 40.

⁴³ Keck and Sikkink, 39.

⁴⁴ Keck and Sikkink, 41. *Italics added.*

⁴⁵ Keck and Sikkink, 41.

⁴⁶ Keck and Sikkink, 42.

⁴⁷ Fogel, 319. In Keck and Sikkink, 42.

⁴⁸ Landy and Milkis, 643-644.

⁴⁹ Fogel 267, in Keck and Sikkink, 39.

⁵⁰ Keck and Sikkink, 39.

⁵¹ Mill., 351-352.

⁵² For example, Daniel Carpenter’s examination of bureaucratic change does not consider comparable international bureaucratization. See Daniel P. Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

⁵³ On this point, see David R. Mayhew, *Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

-
- ⁵⁴ Pierson, 9.
- ⁵⁵ Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1998), 4.
- ⁵⁶ Rodgers, 6.
- ⁵⁷ Rodgers, 70.
- ⁵⁸ Rodgers, 33.
- ⁵⁹ Based on the common assertion that organized groups are best situated to achieve their political aims in the United States. See, for example, Theodore J. Lowi, *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*, 2nd ed (New York: Norton, 1979).
- ⁶⁰ Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 6.
- ⁶¹ Gunnar Myrdal. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York: Harper, 1944). See also Stephen Brooks, *America Through Foreign Eyes: Classic Interpretations of American Political Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- ⁶² Pew Global Attitudes Project. "Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)." (Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, Dec. 18, 2008). (<http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/263.pdf>) 2.
- ⁶³ Such as the list of significant congressional legislation compiled by David Mayhew. See David R. Mayhew, *Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking and Investigations, 1946-2002*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).
- ⁶⁴ Michael Mosbacher and Digby Anderson, "Recent Trends in British Anti-Americanism," in Paul Hollander, ed., *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*. (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004), 91.
- ⁶⁵ Keck and Sikkink, 42. *Italics added*.
- ⁶⁶ Sidney Milkis, March 12, 2009.
- ⁶⁷ Bruce Ackerman, *We The People: Foundations* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1991), 10.
- ⁶⁸ Friedrich, 11.
- ⁶⁹ Hofstadter is quoted in Mosbacher and Anderson, 86-87.
- ⁷⁰ Mosbacher and Anderson, 86-87.
- ⁷¹ Friedrich, 6.
- ⁷² Friedrich, 10.
- ⁷³ Drawing on Douglas Charles Stange, *British Unitarians against American Slavery, 1833-65* (Canbury NJ: Associated University Presses, 1984), 63, 73, 84. In Keck and Sikkink, 36.
- ⁷⁴ These practices were ended by two Supreme Court decisions: *Atkins v. Virginia*, (2002) regarding mentally impaired convicts, and *Roper v. Simmons* (2005), regarding convicts under the age of 18.
- ⁷⁵ Jodi Wilgoren, "Kerry Remark on Foreign Leaders Faulted," *New York Times*, Mar. 15, 2004 (<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9D05EED81F3EF936A25750C0A9629C8B63>)
- ⁷⁶ For example, Paul Hollander, ed., *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004) addresses the development of anti-American sentiment *itself* at home, but denies that *foreign* anti-Americanism affects domestic attitudes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Bruce. *We The People: Foundations*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1991.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *America*, Chris Turner translation. New York: Verso, 1988.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *America Day by Day*. Patrick Dudley translation. London: Duckworth, 1952.
- Beilharz, Peter. "Tocqueville in the Antipodes? Middling through in Australia, Then and Now." *Thesis Eleven*. No. 65 (2001), 51-64.
- Brooks, Stephen. *America Through Foreign Eyes: Classic Interpretations of American Political Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth*. New York: Macmillan. Volume 1, 1911. Volume 2, 1913.
- Clemens, Elizabeth. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Calhoun, John C. "Speech on the reception of Abolition petitions, February 6th, 1837." In *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*, edited by Ross M. Lence, 463-476. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1992.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Clinton, Catherine. *Fanny Kemble's Civil Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Commager, Henry Steele. *America in Perspective: The United States Through Foreign Eyes*. New York: Mentor, 1948.
- Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Fenno, Richard. *Home Style: House Members in their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1978.
- Fogel, Robert William. *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery*. New York: Norton, 1989.
- Friedrich, Carl J. *The Impact of American Constitutionalism Abroad*. Boston: Boston University Press, 1967).

-
- Grant, Alfred Grant. *The American Civil War and the British Press*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000.
- Harper, Lila Marz. *Solitary Travelers: Nineteenth-Century Women's Travel Narratives and the Scientific Vocation*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001.
- Hartz, Louis. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*. 2nd edition. San Diego: Harcourt, 1991.
- Hollander, Paul Hollander, ed. *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004.
- Kane, John. "Ambivalent Anti-Americanism." In *The Rise of Anti-Americanism*, edited by Brendan O'Connor and Martin Griffiths, 48-67. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Kemble, Frances Anne. *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839*. New York: Cosimo, 2007.
- Kauffmann, Chaim D. and Robert A. Pape. "Explaining Costly International Moral Action: Britain's Sixty-year Campaign Against the Atlantic Slave Trade." *International Organization* 53:4 (1991), 631-668.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. "Historical Precursors to Modern Transnational Social Movements and Networks." In *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere*, edited by John A. Guidry, Michael D. Kennedy and Mayer N. Zald, 35-53. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Landy, Marc and Sidney Milkis. *American Government: Balancing Democracy and Rights*, 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Lasky, Melvin J. Lasky. "America and Europe: Transatlantic Images." In *Paths of American Thought*, edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, 465-491. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.
- Levy, Bernard-Henri. *American Vertigo: Traveling America in the Footsteps of Tocqueville*. New York: Random House, 2006.
- Lowi, Theodore J. *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*, 2nd edition. New York: Norton, 1979.
- Mancini, Matthew. "Alexis de Tocqueville's Post-Civil War Reputation." *Society*. 43:1 (2005), 75-81.

-
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen, "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *The American Political Science Review*, 78, 1984.
- Martineau, Harriet. *Society in America*. Volume 1. New York: Ams Press, 1966.
- Martineau, Harriet. *Retrospect of Western Travel*. Volume 2. London: Saunders and Otley, 1838.
- Mayhew, David R. *Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Mayhew, David R. *Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking and Investigations, 1946-2002*, 2nd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Principles of Political Economy, with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*. London: Lee and Shepard, 1872.
- Mosbacher, Michael and Digby Anderson. "Recent Trends in British Anti-Americanism." In *Understanding Anti-Americanism: Its Origins and Impact at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Hollander, 84-104. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2004.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper, 1944.
- Orren, Karen and Stephen Skowronek. *The Search for American Political Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Pew Global Attitudes Project, "Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, 2008.
- Pierson, Paul. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1998.
- Stange, Douglas Charles. *British Unitarians against American Slavery, 1833-65*. Canbury NJ: Associated University Presses, 1984.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*, Vol. II. Translated by George Lawrence. New York: Perennial, 2000.
- Van Cleve, George. "Somerset's Case and Its Antecedents in Imperial Perspective." *Law and History Review*. 24:3 (2006).

Wilgoren, Jodi. "Kerry Remark on Foreign Leaders Faulted." *New York Times*, March 15, 2002.

Wolin, Sheldon. *Tocqueville Between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.