
Gordon Fraser

American Quarterly, Volume 68, Number 2, June 2016, pp. 263-286 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

For additional information about this article
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/622082

Gordon Fraser

Building on the foundational work of Hortense Spillers, Sylvia Wynter, Anthony Bogues, and others, recent scholarship in black studies has sought to grapple with the inadequacy of nationhood, identity, or even the human as a way to understand political formations, collectivities, and concerted action. In characterizing (and echoing) Wynter’s work, for instance, Alexander Weheliye suggests that, by fully engaging with colonial and racist histories, one refigures the past in ways that depend neither on narrow identity claims nor on universal, fixed claims about human beings. Rather, what emerges is “a ceaselessly shifting relational assemblage that voyages in and out of the human.” Similarly, Britt Rusert writes that antebellum black scientists enabled the rejection of “traditional categories of personhood, and of the human itself, as the horizon of the political.” In short, scholars have revealed that a fulsome attempt to grapple with racialized assemblages makes clear the contingency, mobility, and, ultimately, porousness of identity claims, whether founded in race, nation, or the supposed universality of classical liberalism. This scholarly tradition has focused attention on how material practices shape what Fred Moten calls the “generative force” of the “freedom drive.”

I suggest that this critical turn demands that we engage the archive of black print culture differently by considering the intersections of black authorship, distributive agency, and textual consumption. These material practices enable a mobile, continually transforming collective politics. This article turns to a brief period between 1827 and 1829 as an emblematic example of such practices, and in particular it examines the emergence of the first two African American newspapers in the United States: Freedom’s Journal (1827–29) and its short-lived successor, The Rights of All (1829). Both periodicals were edited, written, read, and distributed by black people throughout the United States, Canada, Haiti, and the United Kingdom. This print distribution is ideal for
study, in part, because it was both far-reaching in its political consequences and temporally limited. After *The Rights of All* folded in 1829, it would not be until Philip Bell founded the *Weekly Advocate* in 1837 that a black-edited periodical circulated once more. Nonetheless, the black writers, editors, and distribution agents who emerged from this early phase enabled later radical, emancipatory movements.

This history has been largely overlooked. When scholars have examined the interstate and international dimensions of *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All*, they have done so largely through the analytics of editorship and authorship. Their work neglects the fact that to disseminate the more than eight hundred issues of *Freedom’s Journal* published each week, editors Samuel Cornish and John Russwurm built a network that included forty-seven authorized agents and extended from Waterloo, Ontario, to rural North Carolina, from Port-au-Prince to Liverpool to Richmond, Baltimore, and New Orleans (see fig. 1). *The Rights of All* largely continued this network. Importantly, readers from these locations wrote back—and the result is an archive of largely unacknowledged black writers offering firsthand accounts of life in the antebellum South. I suggest that the circulation and distribution of these newspapers, particularly in the South, brought a quasi-national collectivity briefly into being.

I call this collectivity *quasi*-national because it can be distinguished from nations in key ways. As students of nationalism have long acknowledged, the newspaper enables a person to envision herself as one member of a larger, “imagined” community, joined by the simultaneity of experience across geography. And yet recent work on both print culture and African American history, literature, and orature have told a much more complicated story. For Lloyd Pratt, the black nation’s imagined simultaneity crosses temporal boundaries, linking the past and present in a shared deferral of “messianic justice.” The community is linked not only geographically but across time. Trish Loughran, moreover, points out that early nineteenth-century print culture did not produce an imagined simultaneity at all. The unreliability of the post meant that print was either consumed locally or received from far-flung locales at irregular intervals and through ad hoc networks. I am suggesting, then, that we read black print cultural practices as enabling a mobile, continually transforming communal affiliation that is not national in the conventional sense. *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* allowed readers in New Salem, North Carolina, and Fredericksburg, Virginia, and Norwich, Connecticut, to imagine their community as crossing temporal, spatial, and biopolitical borders, not just geographic ones. This not only produced “an everyday globality” (to borrow Stephen Knadler’s apt expression) but an emancipatory cosmology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Freedom's Journal</th>
<th>The Rights of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Yarmouth, ME</td>
<td>Calvin Stockbridge</td>
<td>Calvin Stockbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>Isaac Talbot; Reuben Ruby</td>
<td>Isaac Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo, Ontario</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel George</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>Austin Steward</td>
<td>Austin Steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica, NY</td>
<td>Tudor E. Grant</td>
<td>Tudor E. Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>Frederick Holland</td>
<td>Frederick Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, NY</td>
<td>Joseph Pell</td>
<td>Joseph Pell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, NY</td>
<td>Rev. R.P. G. Wright</td>
<td>R.P. G. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy, NY</td>
<td>William Rich</td>
<td>William Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>George DeGrasse</td>
<td>Wm. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flushing, NY</td>
<td>Paul P. Williams; Rev. W.P. Williams</td>
<td>Rev. W.P. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem, MA</td>
<td>John Remond (sometimes “Remmond”)</td>
<td>John Redman (later “Remmond”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>David Walker; Rev. Thomas Paul</td>
<td>David Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>George C. Willis</td>
<td>George C. Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>John Shields; S.C. Augustus</td>
<td>S.C. Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London, CT</td>
<td>Isaac Rodgers; Isaac Glasko</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich, CT</td>
<td>Isaac Glasko</td>
<td>Isaac C. Glasko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, NJ</td>
<td>Leonard Scott</td>
<td>Leonard Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton, NJ</td>
<td>Theodore Wright</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>James Cowes</td>
<td>James C. Cowes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Rev. B.F. Hughes; Charles Anderson</td>
<td>Rev. Mr. Charles Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Francis Webb</td>
<td>Francis Webb; Charles Leveck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, PA</td>
<td>Stephen Smith</td>
<td>Stephen Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle, PA</td>
<td>J.B. Vashon</td>
<td>J.B. Vashon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>R. Cowley (sometimes “Cooley”); Charles Hackett; Hezekiah Grice</td>
<td>Thomas Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>John W. Prout</td>
<td>J.W. Prout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, DC</td>
<td>Thomas Braddock</td>
<td>Thomas Braddock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg, VA</td>
<td>W.D. Baptist</td>
<td>W.D. Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Rev. R. Vaughn; John Shepherd</td>
<td>W.D. Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bern, NC</td>
<td>John C. Stanley</td>
<td>John C. Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown, NC</td>
<td>Lewis (Louis) Sheridan</td>
<td>Lewis (Louis) Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Salem, NC</td>
<td>Seth Hinshaw, P.M. (Postmaster)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Peter Howard</td>
<td>Peter Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-au-Prince, Haiti</td>
<td>W.R. Gardiner; Wm. Bowler</td>
<td>Wm. Bowler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool, England</td>
<td>Samuel Thomas; Thomas Dickinson</td>
<td>R. Dickinson and Samuel Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.
The table lists the cities to which *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* were distributed.
This phrase—emancipatory cosmology—is appropriate because, since the eighteenth century, “cosmology” has been operative in both science and philosophy as an account not simply of the movement of bodies through space and time but of the laws that govern these movements. Freedom’s Journal and The Rights of All described (in their pages) and modeled (through their circulation, distribution, and seriality) a broader, revolutionary historical pattern. Both newspapers depicted a black collectivity that—like a moon in orbit—waxed and waned with each revolution, all the time drawing new bodies into its gravitational field. Readers, North and South, encountered a textual space that mapped the celestial and political universes onto each other by accounting for recent scientific discoveries about the heavens and offering histories of the political revolutions that were their worldly corollaries. Accounts of political orbits, which predicted the return of black power, were validated by an ever-widening circulation of black-authored print, made legible in the expanding list of circulating agents and cities of distribution on each newspaper’s final page (see fig. 2). The overlap—celestial, political, textual—produced a cosmology: a mobile, interconnected system of bodies governed by a set of predictive laws.

The present study is not the first to note the link between antebellum black science and antebellum black politics. Rusert suggests, for instance, that we consider a later phase of black interest in astronomy—the 1840s and 1850s—as emblematic of “fugitive science.” This practice allowed black writers and readers to counter the scientific racism of the nineteenth century; to instrumentalize scientific technologies, like the compass, to promote the freedom of individuals; and to consider a “rich imaginative landscape” that allowed individual people to “meditate on slavery and freedom.” Additionally, this interest in astronomy produced complex, networked maps that accounted for time and space. The central problem of imagining a black nation in 1827, or even today, is that it has none of the conventional markers of nationhood. It has no territory, no state, and no hierarchical political organization. It is a nation of shared dispossession and affiliation across the borders of geography and temporality. Although black writers frequently made comparisons between their freedom struggle and similar struggles in Greece, Poland, or France, they also recognized that an emancipatory assemblage joined by blackness was different. Blackness was geographically mobile and temporally fluid. It would have to be imagined,
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Davd B. B. Brown.

Recently received a letter from the public agent in New York, stating that he has bought a house and lot in the town of New York, and I am now the owner of the real estate. The property is situated at the corner of Broadway and Prince Street, and is valued at $50,000.

The establishment is to be called the "New York Log Cabin." It will be a two-story building, with twenty-five rooms, and will accommodate thirty persons. The grounds will be divided into three parts, one for the use of the patrons, the other for the use of the employees, and the third for the use of the public. The building will be furnished with all the conveniences of a first-class boarding house.
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New York, March 25, 1853.
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NOTICE: -- A meeting of the Literary and Scientific Society of the City of New York will be held at the African Free School, No. 106, on the 22d of this month, at 7 o'clock, for the purpose of organizing a new society for the benefit of the African population. All persons interested are requested to attend.
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Revolutionary Movements of Black Print Culture
then, as a collectivity in motion over time: revolving, transformational, and circling toward renewed greatness. *Freedom’s Journal* offered this. So did *The Rights of All*. And the distribution networks of both publications made material the print cosmos that the texts themselves articulated.

**Methodology: An Ephemeris for the Print Cosmos**

The study of early nineteenth-century black print culture poses a set of difficult problems, not the least of which is the complex relation between editorship, authorship, readership, circulation, distribution, seriaty, history, and scientific prediction. Both *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* published original writing and reprinted items from other newspapers, from scientific texts, and from histories. Moreover, many articles were serialized, appearing across multiple issues. Finally, these texts were both circulated (to agents who received their copies through the post) and distributed (or passed from agent to reader, or among readers themselves). The geographic distance between sites of circulation and distribution makes matters more complicated. The postal service in the 1820s remained highly irregular. While some routes had been significantly expedited (the Washington, DC, to Nashville route took eleven days, for instance), weather often disrupted service, and service to rural areas remained intermittent at best. The consumption of black print culture was not “almost precisely simultaneous,” as in Benedict Anderson’s model of print nationalism. Rather, a newspaper might take weeks or months to reach a particular reader. The content of early black newspapers modeled this failed simultaneity, focusing as much on scientific predictions for the distant future and historical accounts of the distant past as on news in the present. Explaining how printed ephemera shaped an emergent racial assemblage in a period without a truly national print culture, then, requires an *ephemeris.* In astronomy, an ephemeris is a kind of map, but one that accounts for the mobile, intersecting movements of bodies in the cosmos. It is a predictive map accounting for time and space.

To fashion such an ephemeris, the present article examines three important print-culture practices. First, it considers how *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* positioned their readers not only within a political context but within a cosmic one. Both newspapers reported on the movements of the heavens, offering scientific predictions for the distant future and commenting on the political ramifications of these predictions. Second, this article traces how reading practices shaped the reception of each newspaper in the South. While *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* were published in New York and widely
distributed throughout the North, they were also read in Southern states by communities of free and enslaved people. Some accounts of these reading practices were published in other venues. Finally, this article recuperates the stories of Southern distribution agents. By relying on census data, Southern newspapers, private correspondence, and other textual sources, it explores how the agents listed in the pages of *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* distributed their newspapers.

Recuperating the Southern circulation and distribution of these two newspapers adds to an already rich archive of scholarship, particularly pertaining to *Freedom’s Journal*. Frances Smith Foster, for instance, calls attention to how *Freedom’s Journal* moved beyond the narrowly political concerns of the present to address issues that crossed cultures, geographies, and time periods. Foster suggests that by mining the periodical press for narrowly political claims or by ignoring it entirely in the name of “literary” study, contemporary scholars have obscured the interconnectedness of geographies, genres, and temporalities. Foster is intervening, moreover, in a broader conversation about *Freedom’s Journal*, one in which a small cohort of scholars has been doing extraordinary work. Charlton W. Yingling, for instance, has uncovered how the editors of *Freedom’s Journal* engaged with an international politics, one attentive to revolutionary Haiti’s implications for the US political sphere. Timothy Helwig, meanwhile, has examined the interconnections between the black periodical press and the print culture of the white working class. Each of these scholars, in short, has considered how *Freedom’s Journal* provided a venue through which authors and editors could access a networked, interconnected black assemblage.

I add to this by considering the relation between authorship, distributive agency, and textual consumption. The far-flung racial assemblage enabled by *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* was instantiated through the complex relation between textuality and materiality, through an emergent black print culture and its widespread distribution. This relation, moreover, formed just as a national print culture began to emerge in the United States. As Trish Loughran points out, abolitionist projects were often leaders in the experiment of widespread print distribution. Benjamin Lundy famously expanded the distribution of his newspaper, *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, by hand-carrying it to far-flung locales. Martha Schoolman adds that abolitionists deployed geographic discourses—often anachronistic or fictional discourses—as a way to marshal counterhegemonic power. I am suggesting that these experiments were preceded by an effort to circulate a black print culture. This earlier experiment depended on the material relation between print production, distribution, and readership, and enabled the collected—if not wholly unified—politics of an emergent assemblage.
Ultimately, fractures appeared in this collectivity. In September 1827 Cornish stepped down as senior editor to become a “General Agent.” Russwurm then guided the financially struggling newspaper until March 1829, when he officially shuttered the publication to depart for Liberia.\(^2\) This outraged a number of readers and agents, who viewed the American Colonization Society’s plan for settlement in Liberia with repugnance. Cornish responded by founding *The Rights of All*, which restored the anticolonization stance of the original *Freedom’s Journal*.\(^2\) Cornish’s attempt failed within a matter of months, however. Only six issues of *The Rights of All* were published, and the newspaper folded by autumn 1829.\(^2\) But in their time, and despite the appearance of ideological fissures, these two newspapers offered something radically new. In their inaugural editorial, Cornish and Russwurm write: “It is our earnest wish to make our Journal a medium of intercourse between our brethren in the different states of this great confederacy.”\(^2\) By the 1820s stable black institutions—especially churches and mutual aid societies, but also schools and literary societies—existed in many Northern cities. While these institutions were sometimes effective in responding to the marginalization and segregation of African Americans, they were nonetheless geographically isolated. Many, moreover, hewed closely to a spiritually isolating uplift ideology.\(^2\) Cornish and Russwurm suggest here more than an effort to create local support networks. Rather, their goal is to create an interconnected network between states and to combine divided communities into something resembling, but not precisely continuous with, a national community.

**The Cosmological Assemblage**

Southern slave owners were troubled by—probably should have been troubled by—the potential for political solidarity brought about by the distribution of *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All*. While neither newspaper promoted radicalism (the violent overthrow of the slave system, for instance), both promoted black unity. More significantly, articles in both newspapers treated black political emancipation as *revolutionary* in every sense: latent potentials that traced political orbits modeled on their celestial corollaries. Black politics was always depicted as existing in motion, having emerged from a past of political power and tracing a path toward renewed greatness. One result of the orbital metaphor was that all political orders were depicted as temporary *because* they were in motion. And this is one reason, I suggest, that the journals devoted as much attention to scientific discoveries as to political history.
Consider, for instance, a short article about Encke’s Comet, which appeared in *Freedom’s Journal* early in 1829. This essay, excerpted from an 1828 essay by the Scottish astronomer David Milne, is emblematic of much of the scientific writing that appeared in the two New York newspapers. The article is worth quoting at some length because it suggests for the celestial sphere precisely the movement that *Freedom’s Journal* suggested for the political sphere:

Others have computed that in the course of 18,000 years this comet will come as near to us as the moon; that in four millions of years it will pass at the distance of about 7,700 geographical miles, when if its attraction should equal that of the earth, the waters of the ocean will be elevated 12,000 feet that is, above all European mountains except mount Blanc. The inhabitants of the Andes and the Himalaya mountains therefore, would alone be able to escape such a deluge; which would probably, leave upon our globe, records of its existence, similar to those discoverable at the present day.—After a lapse of two hundred and nineteen millions of years, according to the calculation of the same astronomer, an actual collision will take place between this comet & the earth, severe enough to shatter its external crust, alter the elements of its orbit, and annihilate the various species of animated beings dwelling on its surface. Hence we may conclude that, in the course of two hundred and nineteen millions of years, our globe will certainly be smashed by a comet.27

In 1829 this was cutting-edge astronomical research. Milne had won the astronomy prize at Edinburgh University and was one of a growing body of astronomers to recognize that, although the relative mass of comets was less than previously imagined, their velocities nonetheless made them threatening to planetary bodies.28 Milne and others revealed the contingency of the world as it appears in the present. And yet if, as Laura Dassow Walls writes, mid-nineteenth-century science was increasingly committed to “separating the object of science from the human observer,” Russwurm’s use of scientific research here could not be more out of step with contemporary trends.29 Russwurm shares scientific discoveries because they bear directly on human politics. Excerpted in this way, Milne’s writing reveals that the past and, more significantly, the future, were and would be radically different from the world today. In four million years, the only civilizations on earth will sit atop the Andes and the Himalayas. In two hundred nineteen million years, there will be no human civilization at all. This is grim news, in many ways. But it fits into a larger cosmological pattern—one that treats all positions as contingent and mobile. Moreover, these changes over time were revolutionary. Encke’s Comet would return and return and return again, each time producing a new organization of bodies and bringing about catastrophic changes in the human lifeworld.
This view makes more sense when we consider the proliferation of articles that discussed the other varieties of revolutionary movement—personal, political, historical—and discussed them in terms of orbital contingency. In 1828, for instance, *Freedom’s Journal* printed an article suggesting that “man is not the same being today that he was yesterday. His mind, like his body, is in a constant state of revolution.” The revolutionary orbits of a contingent universe, then, applied directly to the lives of individual human beings. Likewise, these same orbits applied to the political world. In an article from the previous year, reprinted from the *Christian Spectator*, an anonymous author traced patterns in political revolutions worldwide, writing:

I appeal then to Sierra Leone, to Hayti, to Colombia, and say that slaves have been liberated, in so great numbers as to form the mass of the population, particularly in Hayti, and that the difficulties and dangers of the process have always arisen, not from the turbulence and disorder of the liberated slaves, but from the vexatious, unreasonable conduct of their masters, struggling to retain or recover their power to oppress. And so it has been in all revolutions where the struggle was between liberty and despotical power.

The author’s primary point deals with the liberation of slaves and how a white fantasy of black civil unrest had been used to forestall black emancipation. Yet in making this argument, the author makes an *implicit* claim: that revolutions in the political sphere are ongoing and that black emancipation has happened, is happening, and will happen again. As John Ernest points out in discussing a later phase of writing about Haiti, the island nation offered outsiders “revolution as a lesson in destiny.” In this passage, Haiti is one revolutionary body among many. Here *Freedom’s Journal* treats both past and future as part of an explicable, ordered, and mobile set of patterns—patterns that cut across Haiti, Sierra Leone, Colombia, and the United States, and that tend toward justice and emancipation.

This way of thinking about the political and cosmological universe was by no means original or unique. As early as 1758, historians had been referring to the “revolutions of history,” treating the movement of time as a set of explicable, regular, and curved patterns. And this line of thought became central to emancipatory political movements, as Stephen Hall suggests. The Unitarian minister Theodore Parker called on this metaphor of political action as cosmological calculation in an 1853 sermon, in which he said: “I do not pretend to understand the moral universe. The arc is a long one. . . . I cannot calculate the curve and complete the figure by experience of sight. I can divine it by conscience. And from what I see I am sure it bends toward justice.” Parker’s metaphor would be made famous by Martin Luther King
Jr.’s 1965 speech on the steps of the Montgomery, Alabama, capitol building, in which he said, “The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.” In compressing—and, arguably, improving—the expression, King elided a nineteenth-century way of thinking about the universe that drew on a metaphor of political revolution as orbital and subject to calculation. The moral universe would not have an arc at all, in other words, if it were not traveling in an orbit—if it were not revolutionary. When Parker said that he could not “calculate the curve and complete the figure,” he was invoking a cosmological way of reading history and the future.

Freedom’s Journal and The Rights of All serve as forerunners to this revolutionary pattern of thought in emancipatory black politics. But they would be a mere footnote if they had not combined this mobile, cosmological worldview with an equally mobile and capacious plan of distribution. The newspapers strove to become “a medium of intercourse between . . . brethren in the different states.” Contrary to the assumptions made by reactionary Southerners, neither newspaper openly advocated rebellion. But both proposed something perhaps more dangerous: a cosmological worldview in which equality and justice would be the inevitable consequence of mobile, predictable political transformations. They offered an alternative to a fixed, hierarchical politics, suggesting instead that powerful civilizations wax and wane as they predictably revolve. And the two newspapers proposed this, finally, by reaching into the heart of the slave system and speaking directly to enslaved and free blacks. In one editorial, for instance, Samuel Cornish warned against state and local governments defying federal authority, writing that “if the proper authorities do not check this evil disposition while in embryo we soon shall have 24 Independent Republicks or petty Kingdoms.” Cornish’s specific complaint was with the economic and political exclusion faced by African Americans in the Cincinnati area—in response to which, more than one thousand would leave and begin a colony in Canada. But Cornish’s implicit point is more radical. The United States is, like all nations, subject to the revolutionary vicissitudes of history. The current arrangement of political bodies is temporary and contingent. The future arrangement of these bodies, Cornish suggests, may be radically different.

Southern Reading as Radical Reading

The ability of Cornish and Russwurm to distribute their newspaper to the slave states gives lie to the claim that Freedom’s Journal was a relatively conservative mouthpiece for gradualist, Northern abolition—although this gradualist perspective certainly found a forum in the newspaper’s pages. By narrating a
A cosmological worldview in which the distribution of black-authored print, the mobile organization of the universe, and the orbits of black history all tended toward emancipation, *Freedom’s Journal* brought about a radical, if not necessarily unitary, assemblage. A number of scholars have noted the importance of geographic imaginaries to political organization. Martin Bruckner notes that geography’s material practices shaped the “construction of the American subject” in the early Republic. Paul Giles suggests that the study of geography allowed early US nationalists to grapple with the spatial indeterminacy of the United States. Hsuan L. Hsu suggests, moreover, that “spatial feelings”—about the home, the nation, the globe, and the universe—“have concrete effects.” I suggest something similar here. By providing a forum for debate that moved geographically, early black newspapers created a mobile, transformative space as accessible to people in New Bern as in New York.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of this development. Consider, for instance, an account from William Lloyd Garrison’s *Liberator*, from May 1831:

> A few years since, being in a slave state, I chanced one morning, very early, to look through the curtains of my chamber window, which opened upon a back yard. I saw a mulatto with a newspaper in his hand, surrounded by a score of colored men, who were listening, open mouthed, to a very inflammatory article the yellow man was reading. Sometimes the reader dwelt emphatically on particular passages, and I could see his auditors stamp and clench their hands. I afterwards learned that the paper was published in New-York, and addressed to the blacks.

The Northern, white correspondent—identified only as “V.”—does not tell the reader where this act of quasi-illicit reading took place, but the details he does provide allow contemporary scholars to identify the newspaper as either *Freedom’s Journal* or *The Rights of All*. There were simply no other “New-York” newspapers “addressed to the blacks” circulating in the South at that time. (Most scholars suspect he was referring to *Freedom’s Journal* and not to its short-lived successor.) Moreover, the setting of this illicit reading seems urban or semi-urban: his chamber window opens onto a backyard. But the impressiveness of the *Freedom’s Journal* distribution network leaves us with several options: Fredericksburg or Richmond, Virginia; Baltimore, Maryland; New Bern, New Salem, or Elizabethtown, North Carolina; or New Orleans, Louisiana.

*Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* were distributed to places in which free African American populations lived alongside slave populations, and the newspapers were consumed by communities of literate readers and often nonliterate auditors. This was a common practice in the antebellum South. The white Southerner J. G. Clinkscales remembered of his childhood on a South Carolina
plantation, for instance, that the slave Dick “spent the long winter evenings reading to the other slaves. Sometimes a score or more of them would assemble in his cabin to hear him.” Moreover, most nineteenth-century readers shared periodicals, regardless of their level of literacy. Nineteenth-century newspapers are replete with articles by editors and publishers decrying this practice, and *Freedom’s Journal* was no different. In the South, however, these practices of reading aloud and sharing newspapers would have political ramifications.

In 1830 an article in the *Recorder*, of Wilmington, North Carolina, identified *The Rights of All* as part of a vast conspiracy by free blacks in the North to radicalize the Southern black population. The *Recorder* reported that “emissaries have been dispersed, for some time, throughout the Southern states, for the purpose of disseminating false principles and infusing the poison of discontent.” *The Rights of All* had been defunct for eleven months by the time this complaint was published. But *Freedom’s Journal* had been traveling to New Bern and Elizabethtown, delivered by the same agents, since at least 1828. In many ways, the writer for the *Recorder* was overreacting. *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* never overtly advocated violence or rebellion. And yet the black-authored newspapers did offer messages to their Southern readership that would have been shocking to slave owners. These messages, moreover, were distributed through private, partially invisible reading networks.

When considered in relation to a Southern slave readership, the two publications appear more subversive than they would otherwise. The October 9, 1829, issue of *The Rights of All*, for instance, included a consideration of the Virginia constitutional convention. The convention was primarily held to consider political representation. The Tidewater and lower Piedmont counties had a political advantage in that their enslaved population were counted toward their legislative representation. Representatives from the western counties, which had relatively fewer enslaved people, resented this. But when *The Rights of All* reported on the “ABOLITION OF NEGRO SLAVERY IN VIRGINIA,” it took news of this debate more than a little out of context. The article’s anonymous author reports: “We have received sundry letters, and verbal information, from various parts of that Commonwealth [of Virginia]; and we are rejoiced to learn that this subject will be pressed upon the consideration of the Convention, as one of paramount importance.” This article was distributed to enslaved and free African Americans in Fredericksburg and Richmond, in addition to other Southern cities. Peter Hinks writes that reports of emancipation “directly contributed to renewed and large-scale slave resistance” throughout the state. One correspondent to Virginia governor William Giles reported that some enslaved people in Mathews County had “advocated insurrection” if the
convention failed to abolish slavery. Although many of those resisting must have received news of the convention and its attendant rumors of emancipation from other sources, it is unsurprising that the Recorder would be troubled by an African American newspaper, distributed throughout the South, reporting on the imminent end of slavery.

**Patterns of Distribution**

The cosmological assemblage imagined in the pages of Freedom’s Journal and The Rights of All was made manifest through patterns of distribution. Just as the United States was—ostensibly—being pulled apart by the violent, radical orbits of history, simultaneous forces were pulling a far-flung black assemblage together. In the May 29, 1829, issue of The Rights of All, Cornish published an essay suggesting that Southern enslavers could begin a process of buying people, setting them to work at wages, and allowing them to earn their freedom by refunding their purchase price. In Cornish’s account, “A plan something like this has been followed by two very respectable coloured men in North Caroline.” Many of Cornish’s facts about these two men, whom he does not identify, are incorrect. But Cornish was correct in stating that there were two North Carolina enslavers—both “coloured”—who had freed people. In fact, both men were readers of and agents for Cornish’s newspapers.

John Carruthers Stanley and Louis Sheridan were wealthy, free African Americans living in the South—Stanley in New Bern and Sheridan in Elizabethtown. They were added to the Freedom’s Journal roster of agents on January 11, 1828. When Cornish launched The Rights of All in May 1829, Stanley and Sheridan remained distribution agents. Contrary to Cornish’s account, however, these men were not the entirely benevolent workers for emancipation. They were business owners—at times, ruthless ones. Yet by intentionally or unintentionally fictionalizing Stanley’s and Sheridan’s emancipatory politics, Cornish offers his readers a picture of increasing political solidarity—solidarity that drew enslavers together with their slaves.

If Stanley was a philanthropist, he was an unconventional one. As the distribution agent for New Bern, he provided Freedom’s Journal and The Rights of All to readers in what was, at the time, the largest urban center in the state. Craven County, of which New Bern was the county seat, had 10,474 people as of the 1830 census, of whom 3,663 were slaves and 337 were free blacks. John C. Stanley (as he was identified in Freedom’s Journal) was the wealthiest black man in Craven County, and possibly even in the entire South. But, as one of the county’s 337 free African Americans, his position was precarious.
By 1828 Stanley owned 2,600 acres of rural land, in addition to multiple properties in New Bern proper. An economic depression in the region, brought about partly by an 1827 hurricane and subsequent banking crisis, had created business opportunities, and Stanley bought several state-confiscated properties at auction, paying as much as $800 for an individual lot. Loren Schweninger suggests that Stanley was typical of enslavers in that he divided families by selling individuals away and advertised rewards for runaways. As of 1828, he was the lawful owner of fifty-eight people, and a Craven County deed from 1830 lists 125 enslaved workers—owned and hired out—employed on his plantations. Despite this, Stanley had freed members of his own family, and in 1829 he petitioned the Craven County court to emancipate four people who were not related to him: Brister, Boston, Money, and Betty. It is not clear whether this was an experiment in gradual emancipation, as The Rights of All suggests, or whether it was instead an indication that he favored particular individuals. His motivations might have been mixed.

What is clear is that Stanley remained ambivalent about slavery. Despite business misfortunes brought about by his white half-brother, John Wright Stanley, and the subsequent process of mortgaging and downsizing that hollowed out his small plantation empire by 1840, Stanley worked throughout the 1830s to legally free individuals attached to the estates of his deceased neighbors and acquaintances. One such effort resulted in a lawsuit argued before the state Supreme Court. In many ways, Stanley’s wealth and position separated him from other African Americans in the South, slave or free. In a time of increasing restrictions on black movement, Stanley enjoyed relative mobility and independence. (Lyon’s Pasture, his Jones County plantation, was eight miles from New Bern.) Yet Cornish made an effort in The Rights of All to bring individuals like Stanley into an emerging black collectivity. Stanley’s decision to remain a distribution agent for this newspaper, even after Freedom’s Journal folded, indicates that he desired this connection, as well.

Through the pages of Freedom’s Journal, moreover, we know something about the relation between readership and editorial content. In 1828 an anonymous correspondent in New Bern—Stanley’s city—reported on the domestic slave trade. The correspondent writes: “A few days ago a vessel was launched from a public wharf in that place [New Bern], with a cargo of Slaves, bound for Elizabeth city, N.C., or Norfolk, Va., thence to be re-shipped for New-Orleans. To hear the screams and moans of them and of their bereaved parents left behind was enough to pierce the hardest heart.” We will likely never know if the correspondent was Stanley or one of his subscribers. Russwurm published only an anonymous fragment of this letter, adding below it an unsigned editorial
commentary. This unsigned editorial is radical, suggesting that if the domestic slave trade does not cease, then “the day will come, when all we have read of Spartacus and his servile band—of the horrors of the revolutionary scenes of St. Domingo, will be reacted before our eyes.”

Consider the complexity of this interaction. *Freedom’s Journal* moved from New York to New Bern to Elizabethtown to New Orleans. Reports from readers, likewise, doubled back on the same network, with messages returning to New York. In addition, readers and editors recognized that black suffering was enabled by the movement of bodies along other networks: from New Bern to Norfolk to New Orleans. And this recognition prompts a writer for *Freedom’s Journal*, possibly Russwurm, to suggest an alternative system of movement—one that is not merely geographic but temporal. From ancient Rome to eighteenth-century Saint Domingue to present-day New Bern, the revolutions of history will continue, according to the newspaper. Political bodies, revolving through time, will collide in geographic space, transforming the politics of the present.

The radical potential of such networks is amplified when we consider how many African Americans in the South may have read this article or others like it. To that end, consider the distribution network in nearby Elizabethtown. Sheridan, the agent there, was similar to Stanley. Sheridan was an enslaver and was described at the time as a free mulatto with a fair complexion. (Despite this, he was recorded in the 1810, 1820, and 1830 censuses as white.) Like Stanley, Sheridan was a successful merchant and landowner, although the development of “Free Black Codes” in the 1830s significantly curtailed his rights. Also like Stanley, Sheridan’s position vis-à-vis slave ownership was complicated. Although Sheridan continued to own slaves until his emigration to Liberia in 1837, there are vague accounts that he freed at least some individuals “for conscience sake.”

We can discern slightly more about the extent of Sheridan’s distribution network in Elizabethtown, however, because he wrote about it. When news reached North Carolina of David Walker’s radical *Appeal*, both Sheridan and Stanley were suspected of having a connection to the pamphlet’s distribution. The *Recorder*, of Wilmington, reported in 1830 that there was “now no doubt in our minds that a conspiracy for exciting insurrection in the South is carrying on, by the free coloured people of the North . . . and that emissaries have been dispersed, for some time, throughout the Southern states.” Stanley and Sheridan, as agents for *The Rights of All*, were named along with Walker as members of this conspiracy. Sheridan immediately distanced himself from the project of African American print circulation by writing a letter to the editor of the *Recorder*, which was published in the subsequent issue. The letter is
revealing, although some of what Sheridan writes is almost certainly false. In the letter, Sheridan claims to have no knowledge of Walker, the author of the *Appeal*. As Hinks points out, Walker’s name had been listed as a Boston agent in every issue of both newspapers; advertisements for his Boston clothing store were likewise frequent; and, finally, Walker wrote several articles for *Freedom’s Journal*. In other words, it is extremely unlikely that Sheridan was unfamiliar with Walker’s name.

But in downplaying his connection to the project of black radicalism, Sheridan reveals much about his role as a circulating agent. He writes, for instance, that he “unadvisedly” paid “$15 or $20” to the editor of *Freedom’s Journal*, and that he paid only “$10” to the editor of *The Rights of All*—and that merely because of Cornish’s “complaints of ill health and want of money.” These payments would have provided Sheridan with twelve annual subscriptions to the former newspaper and ten to the latter. *Freedom’s Journal* cost three dollars, but only half of that price had to be paid in advance. Moreover, for every five subscriptions ordered, the distribution agent was granted one free. For $15, Sheridan would have been sent two sets of five annual subscriptions, with an additional two annual subscriptions gratis. *The Rights of All* was cheaper. Cornish charged two dollars per year, with one dollar payable in advance. Sheridan might have sent ten dollars because he pitied Cornish’s poverty—or he might have simply intended to keep his ten subscriptions coming.

Moreover, Sheridan claimed that the newspaper was not secret at all and that “it was always open for the perusal of travellers and other persons” at his boardinghouse. At one level, this serves as a defense. He hardly appears to be the agent of a secret revolution if his seditious literature is publicly available. At another level, this practice reveals a means of distribution that would have greatly amplified the power of ten or twelve newspaper subscriptions. Wendy Gamber writes that African American–owned boardinghouses in the North played a powerful role in both the project of racial uplift and the project of emancipation. Travelers from various social classes could share news and discuss politics in these houses. For Sheridan to suggest that the newspaper was harmless because it was circulated through a black boardinghouse in a major North Carolina metropolitan area is a strange suggestion indeed. I am hesitant to speculate about Sheridan’s precise motives. Perhaps he hoped to obscure the subversive potential black print distribution. Alternatively, he might not have believed his actions were subversive at all. At the time, distributing a newspaper such as *Freedom’s Journal* was lawful. Nonetheless, Sheridan’s letter reveals how the newspaper circulated within an Elizabethtown subculture and how it would have enabled subversive reading practices regardless of Sheridan’s intent.
Russwurm and Cornish produced in their newspapers a mobile and inclusive space. They brought black enslavers into contact with literate and nonliterate black people in the South. They linked the movements of the cosmos to political movements in the past and future. They made visible their newspapers’ circulation by printing the names of their circulating agents. Of course, local politics were different in each city of distribution. Some agents were more radical than others. At least one agent was white. But unlike isolated mutual aid or literary societies in the North, *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* enabled a mobile network connecting North and South, slave and free, foreign and domestic, past and future. Couple these practices with a worldview that treats political hierarchy as changeable and in motion, and the stage was set for more radical acts of print distribution and slave resistance. This is not to suggest that Russwurm and Cornish promoted violent revolt or even less overt acts of resistance. Rather, inclusiveness was their goal. But in forging this inclusiveness, they revealed the possibility of black unity in motion across time—and, as a consequence of this unity, action.

**Ongoing Orbits**

The distribution agents and writers for *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* produced an emancipatory cosmology: a mobile network—revolutionary in multiple senses of the word—that linked the movements of textual and political bodies across geography and temporality. The present article suggests, in short, that scholars consider these newspapers as modeling through their circulation the historical patterns by which revolutionary transformation has occurred and will occur. We should consider this movement, moreover, alongside the revolutionary movements described in each newspaper’s pages.

Recognizing the intersection of the material and immaterial is important, first and most simply, because political transformation and communal solidarity did indeed wax and wane. The white abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison delivered his first issue of the *Liberator* on January 1, 1831, and in his first editorial he suggests that his newspaper will produce a “revolution in public sentiment.” He goes on to write that this “revolution” is required most particularly among New England whites, from whom “contempt [is] more bitter, opposition more active, . . . and apathy more frozen, than among slave owners themselves.” While Garrison spoke in a register similar to that of Cornish and Russwurm—he hoped to produce a “revolution”—he imagined a different audience, and his primary goal was not the suturing of a global, temporally interconnected black assemblage. Moreover, although Garrison initially relied
on African American agents to distribute his newspaper, he gradually turned to a distribution network of white agents. (This was a cause for distress among Garrison's black supporters, including James McCune Smith, who writes: “Out of the forty [black men] who had stood by the *Liberator* . . . in the day of its struggling adversity, was there no one fit for the office of agent when that office paid? There were dozens, but they were passed over.”)\(^7\) Moreover, Garrison had few ties to the South. In a letter to Joseph Gales and William W. Seaton, in September 1831, Garrison writes, “Unfortunately I have not a single subscriber, white or black, south of the Potomac.”\(^8\) None of this is to suggest that Garrison did not make mighty efforts to draw on black writers and to encourage a black readership. In 1834, for instance, 75 percent of the *Liberator*’s subscribers were black.\(^8\) Nonetheless, Garrison’s project simply could not fill the role played by the work of Cornish and Russwurm.

Second, and more significantly, attention to the revolutionary movements of black-authored print reveals what Cedric Robinson more than thirty years ago called a revolutionary black “world-consciousness” that stood as an alternative to the exclusionary politics of white, bourgeois society.\(^8\) The black assemblage brought into being through the transformative and transforming movement of print between 1827 and 1829 was not merely a response to white print culture but a separate formulation of temporal and geographic mobility. Nikhil Pal Singh suggests that a key problem in thinking about black civic engagement is that “it is axiomatic in discussions of American history and politics that the U.S. nation-state has a universalizing propensity at its origin” and that “civic nations like the United States are theoretically open to anyone.”\(^8\) The problem, according to Singh, is that a false narrative of civic inclusion defines black people as either inside or outside this system of Enlightenment liberalism. Yet the formation I have described here was fundamentally different from the print nationalism of the US nation-state. The circulation of *Freedom’s Journal* and *The Rights of All* brought into being an alternative imaginary in motion. The newspapers did not describe and bring about a nation modeled on the United States, or even a nation-within-a-nation, but an altogether different form of collective belonging—one that moved in arcs and orbits, connecting far-flung bodies through the power of unseen, inexorable forces.

A few years after *The Rights of All* folded, Maria W. Stewart responded to news of the first African American convention in Philadelphia. “The day-star from on high is beginning to dawn upon us,” she writes, “and Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hands unto God.”\(^8\) By suturing references to 2 Peter 1:19 and Psalms 68:31, Stewart bridges the past and the future, the mythic and the embodied, the celestial and the political. She connects, according to
Christina Henderson, the putatively private experiences of African American women and the print-public realm of abolitionist politics. And Stewart draws on, according to Stephen Hall, a cyclical, revolutionary understanding of history. In short, the rising day-star alerts Stewart’s readers to the mobility of bodies within a political and moral universe. And the promise that “Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hands unto God,” which would become a commonplace among antebellum black writers, reminds her readers that this future arc of emancipation and freedom emerges from the distant past. Stewart’s writing recalls Encke’s Comet. It recalls the promise by Freedom’s Journal that the horrors of Saint Domingue will come around again and again until the slave trade is finished. The political universe, antebellum black writers agreed, was in motion. And it was, finally, bending toward justice.
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