

A LOCAL STUDY IN "MANIFEST DESTINY":
NEW ORLEANS AND THE CUBAN QUESTION DURING THE LOPEZ EXPEDITIONS
OF 1848-1851

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of History

By

C. Stanley Urban

B. A., B. S., Central Missouri State Teachers College, 1936
1938

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ET 101

	Page
INTRODUCTION	vi
CHAPTER I "MANIFEST DESTINY," ECONOMICS AND CURA	1
Definition of "Manifest Destiny."--Application of the doctrine to Cuba.--Factors in the desire for Cuba.--economic, political, slave, military.--Great popularity of "Manifest Destiny" in New Orleans in 1850.	
CHAPTER II IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND OF LOPEZ'S SOUTHERN EXPEDITIONS	15
Spanish consul at New Orleans accused of abduction of Garcia Rey.--Great hostility to the consul in the city.--Connection of affair with Cuban military venture.--Presidential action.--Denouncement.--Round Island expedition enlisted in New Orleans.--Suppression by government through the Neutrality Act of 1818.--Unpopularity of such action.--Threat of future Cuban expeditions.	
CHAPTER III THE CARDENAS EXPEDITION	34
Cuban patriot Lopez in New Orleans.--Invaluable American aid equips and launches expedition.--Filibusters carry state arms.--Failure at Cardenas.--The press and the Contoy captives.--Possible war with Spain over Cuba.	
CHAPTER IV THE CUBA STATE TRIALS	51
Lopez tried in New Orleans for violation of Neutrality Act.--Strong public sympathy for Lopez.--Sixteen filibustering indictments.--Henderson's three trials.--forensic quibbling, absence of public interest, hung juries, governmental dismissal of suits.--Quitman and the Cuban issue.	
CHAPTER V PREPARATIONS FOR AND EXCITEMENT OVER THE LAST LOPEZ EXPEDITIONS	65
Great excitement in city over news of Cuban revolts.--Expedition equipped and launched amidst general enthusiasm.--Residents of city with filibusters.--Favorable press attitude toward expeditionaries.	
CHAPTER VI THE NEW ORLEANS RIOTS	75
Immense grief in city over Crittenden executions.--Press agitates for revenge against Spain.--Other causes of riots.--Course and extent of riots.--Lack of police efficiency.--Nature of riots.--Analysis of affair.	
CHAPTER VII AFTERMATH OF THE RIOTS	90
Universal idea of revenge against Spain, and liberation of Cuba.--Public enthusiasm for revenge expedition, but lack of funds.--Gloom and despair over Lopez's death.--Abandonment of <u>révanche</u> expedition.--Freret's removal--reasons for, press defense of him, significance of affair.	
APPENDIX	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
BIOGRAPHY	113

378.76
L930
1938
C.2

346243

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks are extended to my major professor, Walter Prichard, for his helpful suggestions and co-operation in bringing this study to a completion. Grateful acknowledgment is rendered to John D. Barnhart who not only gave much valuable aid throughout this thesis, but who served as counselor and friend the past two years. The service of librarians at Hill Memorial, Howard Memorial, and the New Orleans City Hall Archives was at its usual high standard.

Submitted by

Walter Prichard

Abstract

A LOCAL STUDY IN "MANIFEST DESTINY": NEW ORLEANS AND THE CUBAN QUESTION DURING THE LOPEZ EXPEDITIONS OF 1849-51

The doctrine of "Manifest Destiny" as it existed in America during the 'forties and 'fifties of the last century was a combination of virile idealism, characteristic of an adolescent and vigorous country, plus an acquisitiveness for new land. According to this ideal, America was eventually to extend its sway over the whole North American mainland and its adjacent islands, such as Spanish Cuba. The south was interested in Cuba because of its proximity, wealth, trade, and successful exploitation of slave labor. Probably throughout the south by 1850, and certainly in New Orleans, there was almost a universal desire for the island. These factors are significant because the south's self-interest, and not its altruism, made possible the Narciso Lopez expeditions to liberate Cuba in 1849-51. This thesis is a local study in the causes and operations of "Manifest Destiny," for it portrays the reaction of New Orleans to the doctrine as applied to Cuba during the Lopez expeditions. It sketches the general factors whetting the desire for that island by 1850, and traces the immediate background of events occurring around New Orleans in 1849 which left this city receptive to the idea of Cuban liberation and annexation. When the Cuban patriot Lopez came to the city in 1850, his pitifully small band was not only tolerated, but local citizens pumped money, men, and life into the expeditions, giving them a distinctly southern cast. In spite of the will of the National Executive, two expeditions were surreptitiously launched from New Orleans against Cuba, and on the first occasion the filibusters carried arms from

the state arsenal. When Lopez and his benefactors were tried in New Orleans for violation of Federal neutrality, citizens refused to convict them because of sympathy for their aims. The second expedition, in the summer of 1851, was enthusiastically supported by New Orleans, and its object demise precipitated anti-Spanish riots in the city. A popular movement for an expedition of révanche against Spanish Cuba failed because of a lack of funds, thus terminating a colorful episode of American history.

INTRODUCTION

"Manifest Destiny" as it existed in America during the two decades prior to the Civil War was not only a strange phenomenon which offers a fascinating study today, but its virility and popularity contributed to make it an integral part of the America of that day. It is impossible for instance to comprehend thoroughly American diplomacy from the years 1844 to 1860 without a competent grasp of the causes, meaning, and significance of the "Manifest Destiny" doctrine. In recent years such American scholars as Julius W. Pratt, James F. Rippey, A. Curtis Wilgus, and Albert K. Weinberg have thrown much new light on that doctrine. Interpretations of "Manifest Destiny" vary from that of Samuel F. Bemis who thought it a policy of peaceful penetration, to that of Weinberg who declared it a combination of idealism, land hunger, and a fear of European encroachments on American soil. On the other hand the Narciso Lopez expeditions to Cuba of 1849-51 have also been the object of recent studies by competent historians, both in monographs and magazine articles. None of these however has shown the general social, political, and economic conditions existing in New Orleans which made that city the natural point d'appui for the military attempts against Cuba, or the important role played by the inhabitants of the city in organizing, equipping, and launching Lopez's expeditions. This study sketches the general factors and portrays the immediate background of events in the region of New Orleans which combined to produce a very favorable reception by that city of Lopez in 1850. It shows that the military ventures unquestionably owed their life and proportions to citizens of the city who also aided in surreptitiously launching them against Cuba in opposition to the will of the

National Executive; that citizens of the Crescent City refused to convict the filibusters when they were tried under Federal charges; that the great majority of the press and public there favored the acquisition of Cuba by the United States; and finally, that the "Manifest Destiny" spirit in the city and the immediate vicinity was considerably more aggressive than Bemis' interpretation of peaceful penetration implies.

Of the sources used in this study the most valuable were the New Orleans newspapers. Interestingly enough other writers on the Lopez expeditions have not adequately exploited this material. Full information as to the organization and ownership of these journals is included in the footnotes to Chapter I, and an analysis of their Cuban policy is made in the bibliography. By far the best repository for these sources is the New Orleans City Hall Archives. Those primary magazine articles found most helpful were contained in either the De Bow's Review (New Orleans, 1846-1880), or in the Democratic Review (Washington and New York, 1837-1859). While the Hill Memorial Library has a complete set of De Bow's Review for this period, there were no copies of the Democratic Review for the years 1849-1852 available here. The New Orleans libraries have most of the essential volumes, but others had to be procured from eastern universities. The most valuable contemporary military accounts of the expeditions are those of Lieutenant Richardson Hardy, The History and Adventures of the Cuban Expedition (Cincinnati, 1850), and O.D.N.O., The History of the Late Expedition to Cuba (New Orleans, 1850). Both these volumes are to be found in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. Government documents were not only revealing as to the organization of the Round Island and, to a lesser degree, the Cardenas expeditions, but exceedingly valuable on

the diplomatic correspondence between Spain and America over the actual expeditions, and the official reports of the New Orleans riots. These documents are divided between Hill Memorial Library, New Orleans Public Library, and Howard Memorial Library of that city. Concerning secondary materials it was found that magazine and periodical articles were of aid. With the one exception of an article by Melvin J. White, "The New Orleans Riot of 1861," in The Tulane Graduate Magazine (New Orleans, 1914), these articles are contained in the Hill Memorial Library. While published monographs on closely allied subjects were of great aid in some instances, secondary books aided very little in the preparation of this study. The omission of comments after such works in the bibliography may be construed to indicate that they were of little, if any, value.

CHAPTER I

"MANIFEST DESTINY," ECONOMICS, AND CUBA

"The North Americans will spread out far beyond their present bounds. They will encroach again and again on their neighbors. New territories will be planted, declare their independence and be annexed! We have New Mexico and California! We will have Old Mexico and Cuba! The isthmus cannot arrest--nor even the Saint Lawrence!! Time has all this in her womb." J. D. B. Debow, "The South American States," De Bow's Review, VI (1848), 9.

The "Manifest Destiny" or the "Spread Eagle doctrine"¹ developed in the United States in the late 'forties and the early 'fifties of the last century.² The motivating force of this doctrine was in part regional interest, especially in the south and west which felt the essential need of new land. In the south eyes fell upon desirable adjacent slave domains.³ To this fundamental land grabbing motive there was fused

¹New Orleans Daily Delta, June 29, 1851. This paper was a very bold, Democratic sheet which was consistently the champion of the Cuban cause. In 1849 it was owned by L. J. Sigur, former state senator, Denis Corcoran and M. G. Davis. In the fall of that year Davis retired as part owner because he opposed the extreme Cuban policy of the paper. Sigur and Corcoran continued as joint owners until the spring of 1851 when Sigur sold his interest to buy a ship for the Cuban filibusters. The editorial policy did not change as a result of this partial sale.

Origin of the term "Manifest Destiny" has been attributed to John L. O'Sullivan, editor of the Democratic Review, who is first thought to have coined the phrase in July, 1845. See Julius W. Pratt, "Origin of Manifest Destiny," American Historical Review (New York, 1895-), XXXII (1927), 795-98.

²A. Curtis Wilgus, "Official Expression of Manifest Destiny Spirit," Louisiana Historical Quarterly (New Orleans, 1917-), XV (1932), 486; M. E. Curti, "Young America," American Historical Review, XXXII (1927), 35; Albert K. Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, a Study of Nationalist Expansion in American History (Baltimore, 1935), 109-10.

³Weekly Delta, May 6, 1850; Daily Delta, July 22, 1851; Captain General Concha, Havana, March 31, 1851. Quoted in Robert G. Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1848-1851 (Princeton, 1915), 41; Carl Schurz, "Manifest Destiny," Harpers New Monthly Magazine (New York, 1850-), LXXXVIII (1893), 736; William O. Scroggs, "The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba," Mississippi Valley Historical Review (Lincoln, Nebraska, and Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1914-), III (1917), 403-04; James M. Callahan, Cuba and International

a new and vibrant idealism, having for its roots American egotism, and a firm belief in the superiority of the American people and their institutions. This new spiritual exultation had for its basic purpose the extension of the area of freedom for all but the negro.⁴ With the union of the material desire to the altruistic there was born a new mental attitude, crusading in spirit, which was to extend gratuitously, if not forcibly, its democracy upon oppressed neighboring peoples. This virile philosophy voiced the doctrine that it was America's destiny, by God's will, to control eventually the whole of the North American continent and the adjacent islands. It did not hesitate at the thought of forcibly ejecting decadent Europe from this hemisphere.⁵ In the late 'forties America was characterized by a restless spirit and driving energy that sought an outlet. Many adventuresome spirits had gathered in the southwest,⁶ but the Mexican War absorbed their energy for a time. The easy success of that conflict acted as a stimulus to national desire for expansion.⁷ That wish was whetted by a keen American suspicion of European aggression on the North American continent. Americans feared political corruption from too close contact with Old World absolutism, and was

Relations, a Historical Study in American Diplomacy (Baltimore, 1899), 221. See Wilgus, loc. cit., 486. He denied that the spirit of "Manifest Destiny" was at any time exclusively a sectional affair.

⁴Daily Delta, March 18, 1851; Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, 100-01, 121-22; Ephraim D. Adams, The Power of Ideals in American History (New Haven, 1913), 67; Wilgus, loc. cit., 486.

⁵Daily Delta, May 5, June 21, 1850; De Bow's Review (New Orleans, 1846-1880), VI (1848), 9. This periodical was published under such varying names as the Commercial Review of the South and West, De Bow's Commercial Review of the South and West, and De Bow's Review of the Southern and Western States. It will be cited as De Bow's Review; Courier de la Louisiane, August 17, 1849. The Courier was an Anglo-French paper, democratic in sentiment, and favorable to the Cuban cause. In 1850 its editors were James Thard, James Graham, and F. L. Nicomede.

⁶Justin H. Smith, The War with Mexico, 2 vols. (New York, 1919), 1, 123-24.

⁷Curti, loc. cit., 35; Wilgus, loc. cit., 492.

apprehensive lest European aggrandizement forestall her own.⁸

Cuba, the "Gem of the Antilles," was not to escape the desires of the south. Its proximity to Florida and New Orleans, favorable climate and fertile soil, successful exploitation of slave labor, and actual and potential wealth were factors not easily ignored.⁹ Although Cuba had been a part of Spain's colonial empire since 1763, the latter's decadence was apparent to America long before 1850. American expansionists had hoped to acquire Cuba by purchase, but this project had been frustrated when Spain refused to sell Cuba in 1848 and 1849 at any price.¹⁰ Shortly after this date the campaign for the annexation of Cuba began in earnest. To gain the support of the moderates, and to attract the eyes of the populace to Cuba, many expansionists printed articles condemning Spanish despotism in Cuba. The burden of taxation was affirmed to be overwhelmingly great,¹¹ the high tariff wall against American goods was condemned,¹²

⁸Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, 109-12; Adams, Power of Ideals, 80.

⁹See footnotes 24-25 of this chapter.

¹⁰Romulus Saunders, Minister to Spain, to James Buchanan, December 14, 1848, in House Executive Documents, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 121, 58; Callahan, Cuba and International Relations, 221.

¹¹New Orleans Crescent, September 1, 1849. The Crescent was a Whig sheet and on the whole was rather unfavorable to the Cuban movement although its editorial policy varied. In 1849 its editors were William Walker, later a filibuster to Nicaragua, and Samuel F. Wilson, formerly of the Mobile Register. At that time however it was owned by A. E. Hayes and J. E. McClure. In 1850 Hayes was the sole owner, but in 1851 John W. Crockett, commissioner of the new customs house, and John W. Frost, of the law firm Bullard and Frost, were the owners; Weekly Delta, September 24, 1849; Daily Delta, April 3, 1851; "Cuba," Democratic Review (Washington and New York, 1857-1859), XXV (1849), 198. This magazine appeared under the name of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review from 1837 to 1851. In 1852 the title was changed to the Democratic Review. It will be referred to as the Democratic Review.

¹²Crescent, September 1, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 24, 1849; Courier, August 17, 1849; New Orleans Bee, June 12, 1850; The Bee was an Anglo-French paper, and a moderate Whig journal. Its moderation was apparent in its policy on the Cuban question, although it often veered slightly in the direction of the radical left. From 1849 through 1851 the editors and owners were John Wagne, French editor, and G. F. Weiss, English editor. The Bee was the official journal for the First Municipality.

the absence of civil and administrative liberty was deplored,¹³ and oddly enough the heavy slave traffic was vigorously attacked, and was regarded as a valid reason for the annexation of the isle.¹⁴ Such propaganda was not without its effect. The sympathy of many Americans was enlisted and the idea found frequent expression by the middle of the century that it was "Manifest Destiny" that Cuba be annexed to the Union.¹⁵

Economic factors were very significant in the desire for Cuban annexation. Cuba's commerce had steadily progressed since 1820. During the ten-year period from 1838 to 1847, Cuba's annual average of imports and exports was approximately \$50,000,000.¹⁶ Her volume of business increased steadily and by 1851 was estimated at \$60,000,000.¹⁷ Trade between the United States and Cuba had sprung up very early and by 1836 this nation was importing yearly from Cuba 670,000 boxes of sugar weighing four hundred pounds apiece, and approximately 700,000 arrobas of coffee.¹⁸ In 1847 of

¹³Crescent, September 1, 1849, May 27, 1850; Weekly Delta, September 17, 24, November 5, 1849, May 20, 1850; Daily Delta, May 14, 1850, March 28, May 20, June 7, 1851; New Orleans Picayune, September 2, 5, October 19, 1849, June 6, 1851. The Picayune was known as a very conservative Whig journal, but it frequently assumed a radical Cuban attitude. From 1849 through 1851 the editors and owners were F. A. Lumsden and George W. Kendall.

¹⁴Crescent, July 30, 1849; Weekly Delta, July 8, 1850; New Orleans Commercial Bulletin, August 24, 1849. This paper was the news organ of the merchant class and was extremely conservative. It was consistently indifferent or hostile to the filibustering Cuban movement, although it would accede to the peaceful acquisition of Cuba by the United States. In 1849 the Bulletin was owned by William Hodge, but in 1850 he shared ownership with Isaac G. Seymour. The latter was sole owner in 1851, although the editorial policy did not vary as concerned the annexation of Cuba.

¹⁵Courier, August 17, 1849; Bulletin, August 24, September 5, 11, 1849, May 17, June 19, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 30, July 22, 1851; J. D. B. De Bow, "The Late Cuba Expedition," De Bow's Review, IX (1850), 173.

¹⁶"Commerce and Resources of Cuba," translated from the "Diario de la Marino," of Havana, January 2, 1849, quoted in Hunt's Merchant's Magazine and Commercial Review (New York, 1839-1870), XXI (1849), 39-40; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849.

¹⁷Daily Delta, May 18, 1850; Bulletin, August 17, 1849; A. W. Ely, "Cuba As It Is in 1854," De Bow's Review, XVII (1854), 229.

¹⁸Alexander Jones, Cuba in 1851; Containing Authentic Statistics of

total Cuban imports amounting to slightly more than \$32,000,000, approximately one-fifth came from the United States; Cuban exports for the same year were almost \$28,000,000, of which over \$12,000,000 went to the United

States.¹⁹ In 1849 trade between the two countries was "of great and rapidly increasing importance."²⁰ A year later it was stated that the trade of the United States with Cuba "vastly outstrips that of any other nation." Twice as many American as Spanish vessels traded with Cuba, and four times as many American as English and French craft combined conducted commerce with the island.²¹ Much of our nation's trade with Cuba was from and to the Mississippi Valley region by way of New Orleans.²² Commercial relations between the Mississippi Valley and Havana, via New Orleans, constantly assumed a more valuable aspect,²³ and it is not surprising that many persons in and around New Orleans interested themselves in the welfare of Cuba.

Cuba was represented as a veritable paradise, abounding in numerous minerals,²⁴ rich forests, exceedingly fertile agriculture lands, and fine harbors.²⁵ Yet these Cuban enthusiasts were careful to point out the destructive influences of Spanish trade restrictions in Cuba, and they affirmed that Cuban annexation to the United States would augment enormously Cuban wealth and trade.²⁶ Once Cuba was attached to the Union,

the Population, Agriculture and Commerce of the Island for a Series of Years with Official and Other Documents in Relation to the Revolutionary Movements of 1850 and 1851 (New York, 1851), 13.

¹⁹Crescent, August 31, 1849.

²⁰Picayune, August 30, 1849.

²¹James, Cuba in 1851, 13-14.

²²Picayune, August 30, 1849; James E. Winston, "Economic History of New Orleans," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XI (1924), 200.

²³Courier, August 17, 1849.

²⁴Bulletin, August 16, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Daily Delta, May 13, 28, 1850.

²⁵Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Daily Delta, May 13, 28, 1850.

²⁶Weekly Delta, September 17, 1849, May 27, 1850; Daily Delta, May 20, 28, 1850; Crescent, May 27, 1850.

prophesized the expansionists, the Mississippi Valley would be the recipient of the greatest benefits, for trade between that section and Cuba would increase ten-fold. New Orleans would be the Alexandria and Havana the Constantinople of America's empire.²⁷ Cuba would then become a great consuming market for the beef, flour, and pork of the Trans-Allegheny west.²⁸ These were the American products which had been virtually excluded from Cuba by the high Spanish tariff wall²⁹ at an estimated annual loss of about \$10,000,000.³⁰ With annexation all artificial tariff barriers would be discarded. It was estimated that Cuba's wealth and resources would enable the south to counteract northern wealth and power.³¹ Cuba was desired because it was believed that her absorption would be a prelude to the ultimate annexation of the rest of the Antilles.³²

By 1850 the uncomfortable competition given Louisiana sugar planters by importations of Cuban sugar had quite an influence upon the annexation question in New Orleans. Cuban planters had certain marked advantages over Louisiana growers in that their labor was cheaper,³³ climate more suitable, and their lands yielded about twice as much per acre.³⁴ When Louisiana had a very poor sugar crop in 1846,³⁵ it was observed that the

²⁷Crescent, October 1, 1849, May 24, 1850. See the Courier, August 17, 1849, May 29, 1850; Picayune, August 30, 1849; and the Crescent, January 15, 27, July 26, 1851, for trade arguments of the annexationists.

²⁸"Cuba," Democratic Review, XXV (1849), 198; Crescent, May 27, 1850; Bee, June 12, 1850.

²⁹Crescent, May 27, 1850; Bee, June 12, 1850.

³⁰Crescent, May 27, 1850.

³¹Weekly Delta, November 11, 1850, July 28, 1851.

³²Courier, August 17, 1849.

³³Jones, Cuba in 1851, 22-23; Bulletin, September 27, 1849.

³⁴Thomas W. Wilson, The Island of Cuba in 1850, Being a Description of the Island, Its Resources, Productions, Commerce, etc. (New Orleans, 1850) 7.

³⁵New Orleans Price Current, Commercial Intelligencer and Merchants Transcript, September 1, 1847. The Price Current was a weekly official trade journal which was published from 1849 through 1851 by Francis Cook

importation of 45,000 boxes of Havana sugar into New Orleans, and heavy importations elsewhere in the United States, had had an adverse effect upon the price of Louisiana sugars in the domestic market.³⁶ Although New Orleans imported less than 15,000 boxes of Havana sugar in 1848-49, by 1850-51 the Crescent City was receiving annually almost 30,000 boxes.³⁷ A drought and a November frost vitally effected the Louisiana sugar crop of 1850, and the deficiency accounted for the increased foreign purchases. By March, 1850, the Louisiana molasses output was nearly exhausted with high prices prevailing, and great Cuban importations of that product resulted.³⁸ Although it was estimated in 1850 that the yearly consumption of sugar in the United States was about 550,000 pounds, and that Louisiana and Texas could supply normally but 300,000 pounds,³⁹ Louisiana sugar growers were represented as being dissatisfied with the low sugar tariff on Cuban products.⁴⁰

Sentiment in New Orleans was divided over the prospect of duty-free sugar coming into the United States in the event of Cuban annexation. The expansionists asserted that annexation would give the United States a

and C. B. Young. Although it is very valuable for trade statistics, it is valueless as an indicator of public opinion for it did not concern itself with domestic affairs not related with trade; "Cotton and Sugar Trade in 1850 and 1851," De Bow's Review, XI (1851), 493; "Trade and Commerce of New Orleans," De Bow's Review, IV (1847), 398.

³⁶Price Current, September 1, 1849; "Trade and Commerce of New Orleans," loc. cit., 396, 398; "Former and Present Times and Trade in New Orleans," De Bow's Review, VII (1850), 432.

³⁷Price Current, September 1, 1851; "Cotton and Sugar Trade in 1850 and 1851," loc. cit., 493; De Bow's Review, XII (1852), 94.

³⁸Price Current, September 1, 1851; "Cotton and Sugar Trade," loc. cit., 492-94.

³⁹Ibid., 493; Price Current, September 1, 1851.

⁴⁰Bulletin, September 27, 1849.

world monopoly of sugar,⁴¹ and that it would result in the opening of new world markets.⁴² Some argued that it would immediately raise the price on American blacks so that Louisiana sugar planters could profitably transfer their slaves to new sugar plantations in Cuba.⁴³ Other proponents maintained that Cuban annexation would raise the standard of living and the cost of Cuban slaves so that sugar production costs in Louisiana and Cuba would be equalized.⁴⁴ Land values of sugar lands in Louisiana and Cuba would, according to their assertions, be equalized.⁴⁵ It was claimed that among the ardent devotees of the annexation movement were many wealthy Louisiana sugar planters.⁴⁶ However, the anti-expansionists repeatedly proclaimed that if Cuba were admitted to the Union, it could only result in the ruin of the Louisiana sugar planters, since they could not withstand the unequal competition of the duty-free Cuban sugar.⁴⁷

⁴¹Daily Delta, June 8, 1850; Weekly Delta, July 28, 1851; "Cuba," Democratic Review, 203.

⁴²Weekly Delta, July 28, 1851.

⁴³Ibid., June 12, 1850.

⁴⁴Jones, Cuba in 1851, 22-23.

⁴⁵"Cuba," Democratic Review, 203.

⁴⁶Daily Delta, July 25, 1851.

⁴⁷Bulletin, June 19, 1850; Crescent, July 25, 1851; New Orleans True Delta, May 25, 1850. After M. G. Davis withdrew from the Daily Delta, he and John Maginnis, formerly connected with the Picayune, founded the True Delta on November 18, 1849. The paper continued under their management through 1851. It was an ardent Democratic sheet, but it continued to be the most unrelenting opponent of the Cuban movement; New Orleans Orleanian, September 13, 1849, June 7, 1850. The Orleanian was an Anglo-French journal, having a Frenchman and an Englishman for its editors. The former was very much opposed to Cuban interference whereas the latter was an ardent expansionist. Consequently the editorial policy of the paper concerning the Cuban question frequently varied. J. C. Psanderkast was the proprietor in 1850 and 1851. The Orleanian was the official organ for the Third Municipality.

The issue of slavery was also involved in the controversy. Although Spain nominally owned Cuba, English and French economic influences predominated both in Spain and Cuba, and in the southern part of the United States the rumor was current that England and France were seeking to force Spain to liberate Cuban slaves.⁴⁸ This idea was repugnant to friends of slavery in the south who regarded the liberation of Cuban slaves as an economic and social threat to the south's peculiar institution.⁴⁹ It was affirmed that if the United States possessed Cuba, slavery there would become mild and inoffensive,⁵⁰ and at the same time the institution in the United States would be greatly stimulated.⁵¹ Interventionists vigorously denied that action on the part of the United States in Cuba would give European nations or the north a right to interfere with slavery in the south,⁵² and the issue of slavery was adjudged as very likely to hasten the acquisition of Cuba.⁵³ Much of the anti-expansionist program also centered around the welfare of slavery in the south. They contended that

⁴⁸Orleanian, May 15, 1850; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 31-32; Louis M. Seers, John Slidell (Durham, North Carolina, 1925), 107 et seq.

⁴⁹Crescent, May 27, 1850; Daily Delta, October 26, 1850; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 31-32. The south also feared that Spain might liberate slaves in Cuba and set them upon their former masters, thus making another Santo Domingo out of Cuba. See the Courier, May 3, 1850; Bee, May 4, 1850; Daily Delta, March 18, 1851; William L. Hodge, New Orleans, to Taylor, May 7, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 51; and John L. O'Sullivan to John C. Calhoun, August 24, 1849, in the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun. House Documents, 115 vol., 56 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 735 (Washington, 1900), 1202-03. This work will be cited hereafter as the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun.

⁵⁰Crescent, July 30, 1849.

⁵¹Bulletin, July 19, 1850.

⁵²Daily Delta, June 13, 1850, July 1, 1851.

⁵³Bulletin, September 5, 1849. At the same time it was expected that the north would oppose Cuban annexation because Cuba was a slave state, and its admission would thus augment the political strength of the south. Courier, August 13, 19, 1851.

interference in Cuba would open the possibility for Europe or the north to attempt to free southern slaves. The Daily Delta accused Judge Henry A. Bullard and the New Orleans Bulletin as being among leading exponents of this doctrine.⁵⁴ It was further maintained that if Cuba were admitted into the Union the result would be harmful to the south.⁵⁵ There would occur such a drainage of working slaves from the border states to Cuba that the institution of slavery in the south would disappear within twenty-five years. Thus many friends of slavery staunchly opposed the Cuban scheme.

Even in the military discussions which were given much thought in the controversy over Cuba, economic considerations for the Mississippi Valley may be perceived. It was voiced in many quarters that the United States could not allow any European power other than Spain to possess Cuba.⁵⁷ It was almost uniformly conceded in New Orleans that foreign possession of Cuba in time of war would be a vital threat to the United States,⁵⁸ and especially to the commerce and safety of the Mississippi Valley.⁵⁹ Dissenters to the Cuban scheme declared that the position of Cuba as a potential threat to the commerce of the United States in time of war had been overestimated.⁶⁰

Another prominent factor in the Cuban annexation program was politics.

⁵⁴Daily Delta, June 13, 1850. Judge Bullard had been a judge of the Supreme Court of Louisiana from 1834-1846 with the exception of a few months in 1839 when he served as Secretary of State. In 1850, he had been elected to Congress. V. H. Ivy, "The Late Henry A. Bullard," De Bow's Review, XII, 54-55.

⁵⁵Ibid., July 27, August 3, 1851.

⁵⁶Ibid., August 3, 1851.

⁵⁷Ibid., August 27, 1851; Bulletin, August 18, 1851; Crescent, May 15, 1850.

⁵⁸Crescent, May 24, 27, 1850; Courier, August 17, 1849.

⁵⁹Crescent, May 15, 1850; Picayune, September 6, 1851; Jones, Cuba in 1851, 10-II.

⁶⁰Thomas C. Reynolds, "Cuba, Its Position, Dimensions and Population,--Position with Reference to the United States Territorial Limits and Extent of the Island, Progress and Statistics of Population, etc.," De Bow's Review, VIII (1850), 513.

Expansionists argued that Cuba was needed for the political protection of the south since the balance of power between the north and the south had been upset in favor of the north by the Compromise of 1850.⁶¹ Shortly after the proposed annexation two slave states could be fashioned out of Cuba and the south's political power in the Union thus augmented.⁶² The opposition feared that the Cuban movement would reopen sectional feuds allayed by the Compromise of 1850,⁶³ and hesitated lest the north annex Canada as a counter stroke.⁶⁴

By 1850 and 1851 the "Manifest Destiny" doctrine, commercial motives, land lust, military and political forces had so interlocked that there was in New Orleans almost a universal desire for Cuba. The movement was recognized as a new version of the "Manifest Destiny" doctrine;⁶⁵ it was asserted that the American people were guilty of a lust for territory,⁶⁶ and that Cuba was considered "a delicate morsel" by expansionists.⁶⁷ Cuba would be regarded by them as only half free if she won her independence and then did not enter the Union. By the fall of 1849 some newspapers had declared themselves in favor of annexation with the least possible delay.⁶⁸ In 1850 the New Orleans Picayune reiterated its hope that Cuba would shortly become a part of the Union,⁷⁰ and a year later this paper was maintaining that

⁶¹Daily Delta, September 13, November 5, 11, 1850.

⁶²Ibid., November 5, 11, 1850.

⁶³Crescent, August 27, 1849, July 25, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851.

⁶⁴Crescent, July 25, 1851.

⁶⁵Bee, May 4, 1850.

⁶⁶Crescent, July 5, 1851.

⁶⁷Bulletin, June 19, 1850.

⁶⁸Crescent, July 25, 1851.

⁶⁹Courier, August 17, 1849; Picayune, October 19, 1849.

⁷⁰Picayune, May 23, 1850.

Cuba was a "fixed fiat in American politics," and that it must be given independence or annexed.⁷¹ The New Orleans Crescent advocated that senators of Louisiana constantly urge the annexation of Cuba,⁷² and regarded Cuban annexation as inevitable.⁷³ The Delta declared that it would support in the election of 1852 the candidate who declared himself in favor of the annexation of Cuba.⁷⁴ The moderates on the annexationist idea favored Cuban entrance into the Union, but opposed the idea of coercion. The Crescent admitted a strong predilection for Cuban annexation, but affirmed that more would be accomplished by compromise and conciliation with Spain than by war and bloodshed.⁷⁵ In 1851 the same paper opposed making the question of the annexation of Cuba a presidential issue in 1852, maintaining that such a course would stir up old sectional controversies between the north and the south, and thus sap the strength of the Union.⁷⁶ The New Orleans Bee and the Bulletin concurred in the desire for the annexation of Cuba, but advocated legitimate means, and opposed a war with Spain for this purpose.⁷⁷ The most serious and consistent opposition to Cuban annexation came from the New Orleans True Delta. This organ remained unaffected by the idea of Cuba and "Manifest Destiny,"⁷⁸ but looked with concern at the harm that would be done slavery in the south by the inclusion of Cuba in the Union,⁷⁹ and by the havoc that it would

⁷¹Ibid., September 6, 1851.

⁷²Crescent, May 24, 1850.

⁷³Ibid., May 27, 1850.

⁷⁴Daily Delta, November 13, 1850.

⁷⁵Crescent, August 27, 1849, July 26, 1851.

⁷⁶Ibid., July 25, August 18, 1851.

⁷⁷Bee, June 12, 24, 1850; Bulletin, September 11, 1849, June 19, 1850.

⁷⁸True Delta, August 3, 1851.

⁷⁹Ibid., July 27, August 3, 1851.

bring to Louisiana sugar planters.⁸⁰ The New Orleans Orleanian also opposed for a time Cuban annexation because of the harm it would cause to Louisiana sugar growers.⁸¹ Perhaps the clearest revelation of the depth and intensity of the desire in New Orleans for annexation is made apparent by opposition journals. The Orleanian affirmed that it was in Louisiana and New Orleans that people were most heartily in favor of the Cuban movement.⁸² The True Delta asserted that, in spite of the adverse economic conditions which it believed would accrue to Louisiana in the event of annexation, there could be no doubt that the people of Louisiana would pronounce for Cuban annexation by a large majority.⁸³ A well-informed critic reviewing the question in De Bow's Review concluded that, regardless of the motives, there was a "well fixed and almost universal conviction upon the minds of our people, that the possession of Cuba is indispensable...."⁸⁴

While feeling in New Orleans over the annexation of Cuba was intensely keen, Narciso Lopez and a few of his Cuban compatriots came to New Orleans in the spring of 1850. Much of the populace there quickly took these men and their filibustering Cuban designs to their hearts. Not only was this pitifully small foreign band tolerated and allowed to live, but the citizenry of New Orleans pumped money, men and life into the expeditions, giving them respectable proportions and a distinctly American cast. When the will of the National Executive decreed that these military expeditions were unlawful,

⁸⁰ True Delta, May 25, 1850.

⁸¹ See footnote 47 of this chapter.

⁸² Orleanian, June 7, 1850.

⁸³ True Delta, May 25, 1850.

⁸⁴ J. D. B. De Bow, "The Late Cuba Expedition. Military Spirit of Our Country; Its Dangers; Our Neutral Duties and the Questions Which Arise under Our Treaties, Etc., with Spain," De Bow's Review, IX (1851), 173.

and that they must be prevented, expansionists in the Crescent City proceeded to flout the presidential proclamations, and twice succeeded in surreptitiously launching filibustering expeditions against Cuba. When Lopez and his American benefactors were tried in the Federal courts in New Orleans, it was revealed that the populace would not condemn these men. In August, 1851, when news came to New Orleans that the last Lopez expedition, coming to a dismal failure, had resulted in the summary trial and execution at Havana of fifty-two men, many of whom were Americans, resentment at New Orleans quickly flared to a fever heat. Rioters there wrought their vengeance upon the office of the Spanish consul, and the business establishments of Spanish merchants, and burned the consul in effigy. It appears likely that such events, occurring in New Orleans from 1849 through 1851 and occasioned by the several phases of the Cuban question, offer a fertile field for an impartial observer to consider the causes and operations of the "Manifest Destiny" sentiment as it then existed in this country. The purpose of this study is to investigate that subject.

CHAPTER II

IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND OF LOPEZ'S SOUTHERN EXPEDITIONS

The Rey affair has naturally raised everywhere the question of the annexation of Cuba to the United States. Courier, August 17, 1849.

"We have been told that it [the Cuban expedition] is not yet dead; it only sleeps. And certainly if there is, or ever was, a will and a means for such an enterprise, we see nothing to prevent it." Crescent, September 19, 1849.

In the early part of July, 1849, two movements began in and around New Orleans which were to direct much attention to the Cuban question. The first of these was the Garcia Rey abduction case which concerned the mysterious disappearance of the foreigner, Juan Garcia Rey, from New Orleans. The populace there was soon convinced that Rey had been forcibly abducted by the Spanish consul at New Orleans, Don Carlos España. The entire affair including trial proceedings was to drag on for six months, but its frequent crises produced an intense ill-will on the part of the New Orleans populace toward the consul and the Spanish government itself. The second movement was the attempted formation near New Orleans of a military expedition against Spanish Cuba. This small band was the southern wing of the main body of expeditionaries under the direction of General Narciso Lopez, proscribed Cuban patriot, which was operating around the city of New York. Simultaneous attacks on Cuba from New York and New Orleans were planned in the fall of 1849, but the national government quickly suppressed both expeditions. The dispersion of the southern division was to arouse much opposition from the New Orleans press, and it was vigorously asserted that future expeditions would liberate Cuba in spite of governmental opposition. These two movements were to mirror the tempo of the times, to reflect the rising spirit of resentment against Spain,

and to make it possible for the stirring events of 1850 and 1851 to occur in New Orleans.

On July 5, Juan Garcia Rey, Spanish resident in New Orleans, was taken, under very strange circumstances, aboard a craft bound for Havana.¹ Rey's sudden disappearance aroused the suspicion of his landlord, Jose Morante, and it was not long before the news spread and certain newspapers were discussing the guilt of the Spanish consul at New Orleans, Carlos España, in connection with Rey's abduction.² Almost overnight speculation was rife, and the press was besieged for information.³ There was much talk about the violation done by España to American honor,⁴ and the affair created a general sensation.⁵ España quickly presented certain documents relative to the case to Recorder Joseph Genois of the First Municipality, and was pronounced innocent by the recorder.⁶ That act failed to appease several of the newspapers and a full trial was demanded.⁷ Morante swore out affidavits against the consul on July 21,⁸ and the Garcia Rey abduction

¹Rey had been a jailor at Havana, Cuba, but had aided in the escape of three prisoners in March, 1849. He had come to New Orleans and had since been under the surveillance of the Spanish consul at New Orleans. Daily Delta, July 17, 1849; Weekly Delta, July 23, 1849; "Cuba," loc. cit., 201; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 51-54.

²Picayune, July 19, 1849; Bee, July 19, 1849; Daily Delta, July 16, 1849; Crescent, July 20, 1849.

³Courier, July 20, 1849; Picayune, July 19, 1849.

⁴Picayune, July 19, 1849; Orleanian, July 20, 1849.

⁵Bee, July 19, 21, 1849.

⁶According to España's story, Rey had repented for his crime and wanted a pardon. Seeing that he could obtain one at Havana, Rey voluntarily left for that city. Crescent, July 20, 21, 1849.

⁷Orleanian, July 20, 1849; Daily Delta, July 17, 1849; Crescent, July 20, 1849; Picayune, July 21, 1849.

⁸Bulletin, July 23, 1849.

trial was called for July 27, in the court of Justice George Y. Bright.⁹

Prior to the trial certain journals, firmly convinced that the Spanish consul was guilty of a gross outrage, had condemned the inactivity and indifference of public officers to an investigation,¹⁰ and threatened dire consequences to the consul in the event he were proven guilty.¹¹ More moderate organs advised waiting for the evidence before making judgment.¹²

On the opening day of the trial the "excitement was intense, and the room and galleries were crowded to suffocation. Hundreds were unable to obtain admission, and a large crowd was assembled opposite, in front of Hewlett's Exchange, awaiting the result."¹³ In order to satisfy the desire of the city for immediate news the Courier announced an extra edition for the trial proceedings.¹⁴ The plaintiffs had selected Cyprien Dufour as counsel to bring the proceedings against España,¹⁵ and M. M. Reynolds, District Attorney for the state, also appeared for the prosecution. Robert Preaux and J. M. Laborde composed the defense counsel. When Reynolds asserted that he would use his great efforts to vindicate the Rey outrage, he was promptly applauded by the audience. Preaux protested at the public display of "strong passion," but Dufour stated that it was not the prosecution or the people who had strong passions, but the defense counsel, and he was wildly

⁹Bright was the Justice of the Peace for the second district of New Orleans. Picayune, July 21, 1849. Bright was assisted during the trial by the United States Commissioner for the state of Louisiana, M. M. Cohen. Bee, August 16, 1849; Crescent, August 15, 1849.

¹⁰Orleanian, July 21, 23, 1849; Daily Delta, July 16, 18, 19, 1849; Weekly Delta, July 23, 1849.

¹¹Courier, July 25, 1849.

¹²Bee, July 20, 21, 1849; Crescent, July 27, 1849. The Bulletin, July 20, 23, 1849, carried news of the case but took no editorial stand.

¹³Picayune, July 28, 1849; Bee, July 28, 1849; Orleanian, July 28, 1849; Bulletin, July 28, 1849; Daily Delta, July 28, 1849.

¹⁴Courier, July 28, 1849.

¹⁵Bee, July 21, 1849.

applauded by the audience.¹⁶

A densely crowded courtroom awaited the proceedings of the second day.¹⁷ When the question was raised as to whether the court had jurisdiction over the consul's case, and Reynolds affirmed that it did have such, the audience gave unmistakable indications of approval.¹⁸ When Justice Bright denied a request by Preaux for an adjournment on the ground of illness after a three-hour session in a hot atmosphere, the courtroom burst into loud applause which the court could not restrain.¹⁹ The interest in the trial seemed greater than ever on the third day,²⁰ and long before the appointed time the courtroom was crowded to overflowing.²¹ This public interest did not abate throughout the fourteen sessions of the court,²² and during the final days the excitement of the populace was at fever heat.²³ Frequently during the course of the trial the crowd gave vent to its emotions against the consul,²⁴ and lustily supported the prosecution by loud bursts of applause.²⁵ In one of his speeches Dufour observed that both the press and the people of New Orleans had demanded the trial of the consul.²⁶ The depth and intensity of the feelings of the populace were revealed during the closing speeches. Perry Warfield, of

¹⁶Bee, July 28, 1849. See the Bee, August 9, for a character analysis of all the attorneys involved in the trial.

¹⁷Orleanian, July 29, 1849; Bee, July 30, 1849.

¹⁸Daily Delta, July 30, 1849.

¹⁹Ibid., July 30, 1849; Bee, July 30, 1849.

²⁰Bee, July 31, 1849; Picayune, August 1, 1849.

²¹Picayune, July 31, 1849; Daily Delta, July 31, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 5, 1849.

²²The Bee however noticed a perceptible lag in the attendance of the trial during the proceedings of the seventh and eighth days. Bee, August 7, 1849. The Crescent, August 7, stated that its interest had languished although subsequent events were to force a change in this attitude.

²³Bee, August 15, 1849; Daily Delta, August 15, 1849; Picayune, August 15, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849.

²⁴Crescent, August 1, 1849.

²⁵Weekly Delta, August 6, 13, 1849.

²⁶Ibid., August 13, 1849.

counsel for the prosecution, observed that España's attorney had objected to the numerous cheers for the prosecution throughout the trial. When Warfield referred to the mean system of espionage and trickery carried on by the Spanish consul, warning that the people were not insensible to the insult, the audience broke into a loud burst of approbation.²⁷ J. C. Larue acknowledged that prior to and during the whole course of the trial all New Orleans was convinced of the guilt of España. One who dared to express a doubt of España's guilt was ridiculed by the populace which was in a fever of excitement.²⁸ Laborde confirmed Larue's admission as to the unpopularity of his client, but urged the court to judge the case on its merits and not to be influenced by strong public prejudices.²⁹ The closing speeches were made August 13, and the verdict of Justice Bright and Commissioner Cohen came the next day. While not clearly adjudged guilty of the charges, España was required to post a five thousand dollar bond to insure his appearance for further examination at the next term of the Circuit Court held in December of the same year at New Orleans.³⁰ As the message was concluded the courtroom made a loud demonstration of approval.³¹ The public was reported to be highly elated over the decision, thinking it very unfavorable to the Spanish consul.³² After the conclusion of the trial

²⁷Daily Delta, August 13, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849.

²⁸Bee, August 13, 1849; Crescent, August 13, 1849. On August 1, Larue had retired from the Crescent to defend España although for a short time previously he had been holding a position with that paper while acting as defense attorney. Criticism of his dual role played an important part in his decision to resign from the Crescent.

²⁹Bee, August 13, 1849.

³⁰Daily Delta, August 15, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849.

³¹Daily Delta, August 15, 1849; Picayune, August 15, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849. See the Crescent, August 15, which claimed that only faint applause accompanied the reading of the verdict.

³²Orleanian, August 16, 1849; Picayune, December 15, 1849. The Picayune asserted that nineteen-twentieths of the thinking people of New Orleans approved the decision.

there still existed the virtually unanimous opinion that España was guilty.³³

Press opinion throughout the Rey case was, with the exception of the Crescent, either lukewarm or hostile to the Spanish consul. The Courier, Delta, and the Orleanian presented a united front against España from the beginning and never ceased to proclaim his guilt.³⁴ The Courier urged Rey's immediate return to New Orleans to testify, and strongly pressed the national government to demand Rey's release so that his testimony might be obtained.³⁵ The Delta and the Orleanian were also quick to call for government interference in the Rey affair.³⁶ During the actual course of the trials, the Bee, the Picayune, and the Bulletin did not assume pronounced editorial policies. The burden of the Spanish consul's defense rested upon the Crescent. Both William Walker and J. C. Larue, editors of this paper, were very sympathetic to España,³⁷ and their journal persisted in labeling the charges against him trumped up and false.³⁸ These unfounded rumors had gained current belief and had been circulated by the press so that a great excitement had resulted.³⁹ The Crescent appealed to the court "not to be overawed by popular clamor, misled by public fervor, or make itself the instrument of a momentary excitement."⁴⁰

Upon the announcement of the verdict these papers which had abstained from sharp comment aligned themselves with the radicals. The Picayune was

³³Courier, August 15, 21, 1849; Orleanian, August 17, 1849; Crescent, August 24, 1849; Picayune, December 15, 1849.

³⁴Courier, July 30, August 1, 15, 1849; Orleanian, August 1, 3, 6, 17, 1849; Daily Delta, July 19, August 16, 21, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 6, 20, 1849.

³⁵Courier, July 30, 1849. The Picayune, July 31, thought this an excellent idea. The Orleanian, August 15, did not urge Rey's recall for it thought him already bought by Spanish gold. The Bee, August 28, was urging government action to have Rey recalled.

³⁶Orleanian, August 1, 1849; Daily Delta, July 17, August 21, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 6, 1849.

³⁷New Orleans Times, April 20, 1869.

³⁸Crescent, August 1, 2, 6, 10, 1849.

³⁹Ibid., August 2, 3, 6, 1849.

⁴⁰Ibid., August 13, 1849.

glad that it had called for a legal investigation, and announced that it was satisfied of the consul's duplicity. It charged that España had been acting under orders from the Spanish authorities and that Spain must answer for her unscrupulous conduct before a high tribunal. There must be "indemnity for the past and security for the future."⁴¹ The same paper called for the immediate interference of the national executive.⁴² The Bee, while giving full approval to the decision, joined in the call for government action to clear up the case.⁴³ The Bulletin, indifferent throughout the whole affair, came out in favor of the abductors,⁴⁴ joining in the demand for Rey's return.⁴⁵

The Crescent's position was decidedly unpopular on all sides, and accusations were made that it had accepted money from the consul to defend him.⁴⁶ The expansionist press was satisfied at the verdict,⁴⁷ although the Courier regretted the delay, thinking it not in keeping with national dignity to have to wait so long for reparation from Spain. It was believed that the United States should refuse henceforth to treat with España, and that the government should vindicate the outrage done it.⁴⁸ The Rey affair, it was asserted, has naturally raised everywhere the question of the annexation of Cuba to the United States.⁴⁹

⁴¹Picayune, August 15, 1849.

⁴²Ibid., August 15, 1849.

⁴³Bee, August 16, 1849.

⁴⁴Crescent, August 23, 1849.

⁴⁵Orleanian, August 22, 1849.

⁴⁶Ibid., August 20, 1849. The Bee, August 25, 1849, disapproved of the Crescent sponsoring suspicious causes. Perry Warfield accused certain subsidized newspapers of having campaigned to free España. Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849. Warfield's accusation must have been directed at the Crescent, since that paper was the only defender of España.

⁴⁷Daily Delta, August 15, 16, 1849; Orleanian, August 20, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849.

⁴⁸Courier, August 15, 1849.

⁴⁹Ibid., August 17, 1849. The Bee, September 1, concluded that the Rey affair would hasten a Cuban expedition although one had been meditated before Rey disappeared.

The sole paper protesting against the decision was the Crescent which thought the verdict was out of keeping with reason.⁵⁰ It was charged that the Taylor administration wished to capitalize on the Rey crisis, and had let its intention be known to its close friends of the Picayune, the Bee, and the Bulletin. These previously moderate journals had then gone into the camp of the radicals, and were urging government interference.⁵¹ Administrative action over the case was diametrically opposed to the wishes of the Crescent.⁵² Press and public sentiment for Rey and against España was attributed to the fact that the people wanted Cuba, and the Rey abduction case furnished a good pretext.⁵³ Cuban annexationist schemes were declared to be entangled in the Rey affair.⁵⁴

For the next two weeks after the termination of the trial the public and press of New Orleans anxiously awaited news from Cuba as to the Rey affair.⁵⁵ The United States government had taken action by this time and Robert Campbell, United States consul to Cuba, visited Rey in the presence of the Captain General of Cuba, El Conde Alcoy, notary publics, and soldiers. At this time Campbell heard Rey absolve the Spanish authorities from blame.⁵⁶ A few days later however he received a letter from Rey stating that his confession was false and made under duress.⁵⁷ These true, but conflicting stories came to New Orleans along with others of a less substantial basis. But by August 25 virtually the entire New Orleans

⁵⁰Crescent, August 16, 1849.

⁵¹Ibid., August 23, 1849.

⁵²Ibid., August 6, 1849.

⁵³Ibid., August 10, 1849.

⁵⁴Ibid., August 13, 1849.

⁵⁵Ibid., August 24, 1849; Picayune, August 24, 1849; Bulletin, August 25, 1849; Bee, August 25, 1849.

⁵⁶Daily Delta, August 24, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 27, 1849; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 52-53.

⁵⁷Picayune, August 25, 1849; Bee, August 25, 1849; Daily Delta, August 24, 1849.

press declared the consul to have been guilty of the abduction charges,⁵⁸ and many journals demanded a firm vindication of national honor regardless of the outcome.⁵⁹ It was admitted by the Crescent that its stand was in opposition to "a strong popular feeling," but it hoped that public judgment would ultimately right itself.⁶⁰ The same organ predicted that after a few months New Orleans would realize its mistakes in linking up its honorable Cuban movement with the fate of the despicable Rey. The abduction controversy had obstructed rather than advanced the annexation of Cuba to the United States. If however it were proved that American laws had been violated by España and his accomplices, there would be no limit to the resentment of the American people. Unless Spain made an atonement, war would be endorsed by acclamation and "...the conquest of Cuba [would] be made a national object."⁶¹

In the interim the administration had taken action and in accordance with the formal demand it made, Spanish authorities surrendered Rey,⁶² and he arrived at New Orleans in the brig Salvadara on August 28.⁶³ His unlooked for return produced an excitement which "...could not have been

⁵⁸Bulletin, August 25, 1849; Bee, August 25, 1849; Picayune, August 25, 1849; Orleanian, August 24, 1849; Courier, August 25, 1849; Daily Delta, August 21, 23, 25, 1849.

⁵⁹Picayune, August 25, 1849; Orleanian, August 28, 1849; Bee, August 24, 1849; Daily Delta, August 21, 28, 1849.

⁶⁰Crescent, August 24, 1849.

⁶¹Ibid., August 24, 1849. The Weekly Delta, September 3, urged the subordination of the annexationist program to the uniting in demanding satisfaction from Spain over the Rey affair.

⁶²President's Message to Congress, December 27, 1849, in House Executive Documents, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 5, 5; President Taylor instructed J. M. Clayton, Secretary of State, on August 29, 1849, to enter a formal demand for Rey's return. Clayton Manuscripts, in the Manuscripts Department, Library of Congress. Quoted in Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 53; Picayune, September 9, 1849; Bee, September 8, 1849; Orleanian, August 31, 1849. See the Crescent, September 11, which maintained that our government made only an unofficial request for Rey's return.

⁶³Bee, August 29, 1849.

greater if a bombshell had fallen and exploded in the midst of one of our thoroughfares. It was quite an event in the history of the times, and became the all-absorbing topic of conversation in every circle."⁶⁴ Shortly after his landing Rey had an interview with Mr. Bradford and Commissioner Cohen at the office of the United States District Attorney. A large crowd congregated outside in the street and appeared "intensely excited." When Rey came out of the building he was promptly cheered by the crowd.⁶⁵ The ex-Mexican jailer became the lion of the hour.⁶⁶ However he was bonded for one thousand dollars to insure his appearance as a witness in the December trial of España.⁶⁷ Rey's story, which definitely accused España, was made known that day and it aroused public opinion still further.⁶⁸

Much of the press pronounced in favor of Rey's integrity and honesty in the matter,⁶⁹ and pressed for the prompt conviction and punishment of the Spanish consul and his cohorts. Further they desired the dismissal of El Conde Alcoy, and full apologies and reparations.⁷⁰ Without committing itself the Bulletin called for a fair and full trial.⁷¹ The Crescent still protested the innocence of España although it admitted that if he were proven guilty, he must be punished and an apology made to the United States.⁷²

⁶⁴Picayune, August 29, 1849. See also the Daily Delta, August 29, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Bee, August 29, 1849; Bulletin, August 29, 1849.

⁶⁵Daily Delta, August 29, 1849; Picayune, August 29, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849.

⁶⁶Bee, September 1, 1849.

⁶⁷Ibid., August 29, 1849.

⁶⁸Courier, August 29, 1849; Daily Delta, August 29, 1849.

⁶⁹Bee, August 30, 1849.

⁷⁰Daily Delta, August 29, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Courier, August 29, 1849; Picayune, August 29, 1849. See the Orleanian, September 3, which noted that the conservative journals were demanding reparation from Spain. The Picayune, October 19, 1849, threatened Captain General Alcoy with punishment for neutrality violations in the Rey affair.

⁷¹Bulletin, August 29, 1849.

⁷²Crescent, August 30, September 27, 1849.

The dénouement of the crisis began to unfold on December 12, when the Grand Jury, after a two-day secret session conducting the España examination, at which Rey himself was heard, quashed the indictment against España on the ground of conflicting evidence.⁷³ However the jury was reported to have been equally divided on the question of the consul's guilt.⁷⁴ The summary dismissal of the case came as quite a surprise to the public and press,⁷⁵ and many journals still unalterably convinced of España's complicity⁷⁶ called for an explanation to be given the public by Logan Hurton, United States District Attorney.⁷⁷ While surprised at the sudden termination of the trial, more conservative journals concluded that the entire Rey affair might be likened to the labors of a mountain bringing forth a mouse.⁷⁸ Naturally the Crescent regarded the decision as a triumph for its editorial policy.⁷⁹ España's triumph was but short-lived, for the notorious publicity given the case and the ill-feeling aroused in New Orleans had a not unnatural culmination when on January 4, 1850, Zachary Taylor published his refusal to recognize España as the Spanish consul at New Orleans, and forced him to withdraw.⁸⁰

⁷³Picayune, December 13, 1849; Crescent, December 13, 1849. The Daily Delta, December 14, 1849, said that the jury deliberated three days.

⁷⁴Daily Delta, December 13, 1849; Crescent, December 14, 1849; Weekly Delta, December 17, 1849. The names of the jurors were listed in the Weekly Delta, December 17, 1849.

⁷⁵Picayune, December 15, 1849; See, December 13, 1849.

⁷⁶Weekly Delta, December 17, 1849; True Delta, December 13, 1849; The Picayune, December 15, did not abandon its belief in the guilt of the consul.

⁷⁷Courier, December 13, 1849; Orleanian, December 13, 1849.

⁷⁸See, December 13, 1849; Bulletin, December 13, 1849.

⁷⁹Crescent, December 13, 1849.

⁸⁰Daily Delta, January 17, 1850; Picayune, January 17, 1850. The Courier, as early as August 15, 1849, thought that the United States should refuse to treat with España, and it was shortly joined in that stand by the Daily Delta, August 30, 1849.

An irregular enlistment of men in New Orleans for a great unknown expedition was occurring simultaneously with the Rey affair. The destination of this expedition was unknown although, according to speculation, it was bound for California or Mexico.⁸¹ Throughout the town placards and handbills were posted. These called for volunteers, each of whom was promised money and land for a service which should be terminated in a year.⁸² Despite this activity, city and state authorities and the press were silent as to the formation and intent of the expedition.⁸³ Meanwhile the volunteers gathered at Round Island, a small island in the Gulf of Mexico, about three miles from Pascagoula, Mississippi.⁸⁴ Although many journals were careful to disclaim any knowledge of the expeditionaries' intent,⁸⁵ they discredited the circulating rumors of an attack on Cuba, and thought that the expedition was probably aimed at some Central American country.⁸⁶ The Round Island expedition was in reality the southern part of a general expedition which was to be directed against Cuba about September 1, 1849. The Round Islanders and another expeditionary force from New York city were to launch simultaneous attacks on Cuba at

⁸¹Orleanian, July 26, 1849. The Orleanian, July 27, doubted if the volunteers knew where they were going.

⁸²Ibid., August 7, 25, 1849.

⁸³Ibid., July 31, 1849. The Picayune, September 6, 1849, noted that Colonel [G. W.] White was then enlisting men in New Orleans.

⁸⁴P. Hamilton, United States District Attorney at Mobile, to Clayton, August 4, 1849, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 4.

⁸⁵Orleanian, August 25, 1849. Prior to August 18, 1849, the Bee contained no comment of the expedition since it thought the affair a mere rumor. On September 1, the Bee noted that the New Orleans press had maintained a discreet silence concerning the Round Island expedition. The Weekly Delta, October 8, 1849, denied that it ever knew anything of the preparations against Cuba.

⁸⁶Orleanian, August 25, 1849; Bee, August 18, 1849; Weekly Delta, August 20, 1849.

that time.⁸⁷ The radicals hoped that the landing of a thousand men under General Narciso Lopez would be enough to incite the Cuban population against the hated Spanish tyranny.⁸⁸

In spite of the attempted secrecy the government at Washington became acquainted with the organization and designs of the expeditionaries.⁸⁹ Notwithstanding the feeling that the government would not act in the matter,⁹⁰ Zachary Taylor on August 11, 1849, issued his proclamation directed against military expeditions to Cuba. The president warned that all persons associating themselves with such an expedition were liable to a three thousand dollar fine, and "an imprisonment of not over three years." No person enlisting in such an expedition might expect any interference of the government in their behalf, regardless of their plight after leaving this country.⁹¹ Taylor had based his action upon the Neutrality Act of 1818.⁹²

⁸⁷Rose Greenhow, wife of Robert Greenhow, translator to the Department of State, 1828 to 1850, to John C. Calhoun, August 29, 1849, in Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, 1203-04. Mrs. Greenhow wrote the letter because of her husband's illness. For proof of the direct connection between the expeditions of New York and New Orleans, see H. R. Hunter to V. M. Randolph, September 18, 1849, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 90.

⁸⁸John L. O'Sullivan to John C. Calhoun, August 24, 1849, in Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, 1202-03. For information on the early career of Narciso Lopez see chapter three of this thesis.

⁸⁹It was unquestionably established that Colonel G. W. White, resident of New Orleans, former Mexican War officer and Yucatan filibuster, was the leader of the expedition at Round Island, and that he and a Captain Driggs had enlisted many men in New Orleans. Somewhat over 550 men were on the island at one time. See P. Hamilton to Clayton, August 4, 1849, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 4; Samuel J. Peters, Collector of New Orleans, to William M. Meredith, Secretary of the Treasury, in ibid., 118-19; Peters to V. M. Randolph, Commander of the United States Albany, August 23, 1849, in ibid., 125-24; W. W. Hunter, Dan B. Ridgely, and F. Nowell, officers on board the Albany, to William B. Preston, Secretary of the Navy, September 19, 1849, in ibid., 101-04.

⁹⁰Rose Greenhow to John C. Calhoun in Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, 1203-04; Anderson C. Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1850 and 1851 (Louisville, Kentucky, 1906), 31.

⁹¹James D. Richardson, editor, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1902, 10 vols. (Washington, 1903), V, 7.

⁹²The Neutrality Act forbade military expeditions, which contemplated attacks on powers at peace with the United States, from being begun or set on foot in this country. It further empowered the president to employ the

Taylor's Proclamation encountered a mixed reception from the New Orleans press. The Picayune and the Crescent made no initial comment.⁹³ The ultra-Democratic journals soon deprecated the issuance of the proclamation. The Courier saw in it a typical Whig doctrine of anti-expansion,⁹⁴ and thought Taylor's naming of Cuba as an object of attack would be harmful to the United States when that government sought reparation from Spain over the Rey abduction. It was concluded that the proclamation was "ill-timed" and "impolitic."⁹⁵ The Delta, at first accepting the doctrine as a matter of form,⁹⁶ later ridiculed the necessity of such a proclamation.⁹⁷ Some papers however defended Taylor's stand, for the Bee,⁹⁸ Orleanian,⁹⁹ and the Bulletin gave the document their full approval.¹⁰⁰

The proclamation was soon followed by vigorous government action. Commodore V. M. Randolph of the United States Albany was dispatched to intercept the expedition on Round Island. After some investigation of conditions on the island, Randolph ordered the men gathered there to disperse at once. All arms, ammunition, and provisions going into the island were to be cut off although men leaving were to be given aid, provided they did not leave in seagoing vessels.¹⁰¹ Although the order was not immediately

army and navy to prevent such illegal expeditions from leaving the United States in vessels. Revised Statutes of the United States, second edition (Washington, 1873), 1025-26.

⁹³Picayune, August 17, 1849; Crescent, August 18, 25, 1849.

⁹⁴Courier, August 17, 1849.

⁹⁵Ibid., August 22, 1849; The Courier, September 4, 1849, charged that Taylor's document had been received throughout the south with great indignation.

⁹⁶Weekly Delta, August 30, 1849.

⁹⁷Ibid., August 27, 1849.

⁹⁸Bee, August 18, September 1, 1849.

⁹⁹Orleanian, August 24, 1849.

¹⁰⁰Bulletin, September 3, 1849.

¹⁰¹This order was given about August 23, 1849. At that time there were about 550 men on Round Island. Privates and even many officers were said to be in total ignorance of the destination of the expedition. Four-fifths of the men were reported to be foreigners. Randolph to Preston, August 28,

complied with, resistance was soon made impossible, and the expedition was dispersed around mid-September.¹⁰² Randolph's ultimatum to the Round Islanders aroused a storm of protest from the New Orleans press. It was almost uniformly asserted that the assemblage of men was a peaceful gathering, that no arms or ammunition were on the island,¹⁰³ and that the government was acting only on suspicion when it arbitrarily commanded the expedition to disperse.¹⁰⁴ The order of Randolph was condemned as exceedingly insolent and arrogant,¹⁰⁵ and it was declared that if the actions of Randolph and his assistant, Lieutenant Totten, were made independent of government orders that these naval commanders ought to be punished.¹⁰⁶ The suppression of the expedition was concluded to have been illegal and ill-advised.¹⁰⁷

By virtue of the suppression of the expedition, government authorities had violated certain abstract rights, and were to suffer much criticism for this. The government had thereby denied the doctrine of expatriation which would allow individuals to leave voluntarily their native land

1849, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 76-79. For the complete governmental correspondence relative to the Round Island expedition, see Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57. Bee, September 1, 1849. According to a later statement Randolph affirmed that the supplies were never cut off, but that the threat was issued because of the government's desire. Weekly Delta, September 17, 1849; Picayune, September 9, 1849.

¹⁰²Crescent, September 18, 1849; Courier, September 18, 1849.

¹⁰³Orleanian, August 30, 1849; Crescent, September 3, 1849; Picayune, September 4, 1849. General D. E. Twigg investigated conditions on the island and found no arms there. Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849.

¹⁰⁴Courier, August 31, 1849; Bee, September 1, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Crescent, September 3, 1849.

¹⁰⁵Courier, August 31, September 4, 6, 1849; Orleanian, August 30, 1849. The Picayune, September 4, thought Randolph's orders "ill-advised" and illegal.

¹⁰⁶Orleanian, August 30, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Crescent, September 3, 1849. The Bee, September 1, thought that Randolph and Totten had exceeded their orders and hoped that they would be reprimanded.

¹⁰⁷Orleanian, August 30, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 1849; Picayune, September 4, 1849; Crescent, September 5, 1849.

to participate in foreign quarrels, whatever their motive.¹⁰⁸ Expansionists argued that the president should have contented himself with a mere declaration against the expeditionaries, allowing them to sail. It was admitted however that, by sailing in such an expedition, these men forfeited the protection of their country.¹⁰⁹ The only journal immediately denying the right of expatriation was the Bulletin, which argued that the government was within its legal rights in taking vigorous action against the expeditionaries since the latter were contemplating a violation of our nation's treaty obligations.¹¹⁰ Since Round Island was within the state of Mississippi, and the authorities had blockaded this island to break up the expedition, the government was portrayed as having invaded the sovereign territory of a state, thus violating state's rights. The right of the Federal Government to lay a blockade on the coast of a state was proclaimed a "hideous principle."¹¹¹ The state of Mississippi was urged to contest the right of Federal officers to enter its domain and make aggressions.¹¹² Although the Crescent abandoned its objection to government action a short time later,¹¹³ the Delta continued for a long period to urge Mississippi senators to bring the question before the United States

¹⁰⁸ Crescent, September 3, 1849; See, September 1, 1849, would allow the expeditionaries to go in armed groups to Cuba, although it recognized that the volunteers would be putting themselves momentarily outside of the law; the Weekly Delta, September 10, claimed that the men might go to Cuba singly or in groups as long as it was not an armed expedition. The Weekly Delta, September 17, 1849, reaffirmed the right of expatriation. See Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, 116, for an estimate of the popularity and appeal of the doctrine of expatriation.

¹⁰⁹ Pisayune, September 4, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 17, 1849, believed that the proclamation should have sufficed, and that no direct action should have been taken. The Courier, September 11, 1849, argued that Taylor should have closed his eyes to the expedition since it was intended to liberate Cuba from the oppressive yoke of Spain.

¹¹⁰ Bulletin, September 3, 1849.

¹¹¹ Crescent, September 4, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 3, 10, 1849.

¹¹² Weekly Delta, September 5, 6, 1849; Weekly Delta, September 10, 1849.

¹¹³ Crescent, September 17, 1849.

Senate,¹¹⁴ and avenge the sovereignty of Mississippi.¹¹⁵

But the dispersion of the expedition assumed broader aspects than mere quibbling over the abstract rights of individuals and states. The press candidly discussed the suppression of the expedition as a fait accompli and many journals expressed pronounced editorial opinions. The Delta and the Courier were again the most outspoken critics of government intervention. It was asserted that amidst the general joy prevailing at New Orleans at the news of the Cuban revolution which had broken out in the latter part of August,¹¹⁶ it would be a source of mortification for Americans to know that the suppression of the Round Island expedition was exceedingly harmful to the Cuban cause.¹¹⁷ The Courier charged that certain Whig journals at first supported Taylor's Proclamation, and the suppression of the Round Islanders, but that their position had veered after perceiving that public opinion was sympathetic toward the expeditionaries. Not daring to attack the president, the Whig press was placing the blame upon naval authorities whom they claimed had exceeded their authority.¹¹⁸ It was alleged that most press opinion had condemned the suppression of the expedition,¹¹⁹ and that Taylor had added to his unpopularity as a result of it.¹²⁰ By mid-September it was conceded that the Round Island venture was dead, but its advocates affirmed that other and better prepared expeditions to Cuba would come later,¹²¹ and that Cuba would yet be free.¹²² The

¹¹⁴Daily Delta, January 14, 21, 1850.

¹¹⁵Weekly Delta, January 21, 1850.

¹¹⁶Ibid., September 10, 1849; Pioneeer, September 3, 1849; Orleanian, September 3, 1849. The Bee, September 3, 1849, reminded its readers that it had predicted the Rey affair would precipitate a Cuban uprising.

¹¹⁷Weekly Delta, September 3, 10, 1849.

¹¹⁸Courier, September 1, 1849.

¹¹⁹Ibid., September 1, 1849.

¹²⁰Ibid., September 11, 1849.

¹²¹Crescent, September 18, 1849; Courier, September 18, 1849.

¹²²Courier, September 18, 1849; Daily Delta, December 19, 1849.

sympathy of the people was declared to have been with the expeditionaries,¹²³ and the Crescent concluded that the whole undertaking would have been successful had New Orleans alone been depended upon for the furnishing of men, and the means to attack Cuba.¹²⁴ The opposition to the radical press was unorganized. The Orleanian, prior to this time a strong sympathizer with the Cuban movement, made a complete and sudden reversal of policy, and declared its approval of Taylor's courage in suppressing the expedition of conquest.¹²⁵ The Bulletin disapproved of the questionable morality of forcing a change of government upon a people, and was willing to see the movement dispersed.¹²⁶ The Bee remained quiet throughout the crisis, but months later noted that as a result of the prompt and vigorous action of the executive, the first expedition aimed at Cuba resulted in a "splendid failure."¹²⁷

Thus from July to December, 1849, the Cuban question in one form or another had been given considerable attention by the populace of New Orleans. The Garcia Rey abduction had been quickly seized upon by the radical press which hoped to make the affair loom as a national insult to the United States in order that, in a consideration of the reparation due America from Spain, the transference of Cuba to the United States could be consummated. This radical press frequently during the Rey crisis included practically all the journals of New Orleans. The Crescent alone remained opposed to the affair being vigorously handled by the national government. However this paper was careful to point out that it favored Cuban annexation.

¹²³ Daily Delta, December 19, 1849.

¹²⁴ Crescent, October 2, 1849.

¹²⁵ Orleanian, September 13, 1849. The suddenness of this editorial change is made evident when it is perceived that as late as September 5, the Orleanian expressed the wish that the Round Islanders were in Cuba aiding in a struggle for freedom.

¹²⁶ Bulletin, September 11, 1849.

¹²⁷ Bee, May 4, 1850.

tion, but that it regretted the Rey-Cuban association since this policy retarded rather than aided the annexation of Cuba. It was conceded by all that virtually the entire city was convinced of the guilt of España in the abduction, and the populace was not hesitant to display its bitter animosity toward the consul and his Spanish associates for their underhanded methods. It was perceived that España's espionage system, as well as his abduction of Rey, had been ordered by the Spanish government, and this aggravated the anti-Spanish feeling in the city. The exceedingly keen resentment to Spain's representative at New Orleans, and the notorious publicity given the affair eventually culminated when President Taylor early in January, 1850, forced España to withdraw from his official post. Meanwhile an unknown expedition of men was being developed in and around New Orleans. As time passed it became the current rumor that this Round Island expedition, which was probably hastened as a result of the animosity toward Spain over the Rey affair, had for its object an attack on Cuba. The government thought that it had definite proof of the Round Island group's military nature and intent, and by moving quickly it completely suppressed the abortive attempt. This act aroused a storm of protest from the New Orleans press which thought that the expedition should have been permitted to sail, since it had intended to liberate the oppressed Cubans. It was further asserted that the expeditionaries had the sympathy of the populace of New Orleans. The warning note was sounded when it was declared that better prepared expeditions to Cuba would come later, and that Cuba would yet be free. Although the Round Island expedition was dead, the demand for the conquest of Cuba and subsequent annexation to the United States was but latent.

CHAPTER III

THE CARDENAS EXPEDITION

"The Lopez expeditions were due in a very slight degree to Cuban enterprise; they were in essence--and in their execution--a Southern movement for the annexation of the island, and would probably have occurred had Lopez never existed...." L. M. Perez, "Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1850-51, Betrayal of the Cleopatra, 1851," Publications of the Southern History Association, X (Washington, 1906), 345-62.

The utter failure of the Cuban filibustering activities in the east convinced Lopez that he ought to shift the base of his operations to the Lower Mississippi valley region,¹ and early in 1850 he abandoned Washington city and by April he and three or four fellow Cubans were attempting to organize a Cuban expedition in and around New Orleans.² Lopez and his small band of compatriots encountered a warm reception at the Crescent City which was probably still embittered over the events of 1849. Many Americans there proved themselves invaluable in aiding Lopez to organize, equip, and launch an expedition against Cuba.³ This attack however was to be repulsed at Cardenas, Cuba, after a temporary triumph there. Lopez with a few hundred of his followers escaped and returned to the United States.

¹Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 58.

²The precise date of Lopez's first arrival in New Orleans could not be determined. The New Orleans press was silent upon this point. According to testimony given by Lopez's American benefactors at his trial in New Orleans in June, 1850, L. J. Sigur thought that Lopez arrived about March 15, whereas John Henderson spoke of a first interview with Lopez near New Orleans about May 1. See the Crescent, June 11, 13, 1850; Daily Delta, June 11, 1850; Courier, June 10, 11, 1850; Picayune, June 11, 1850. According to the testimony of Ambrosia J. Gonzales, Lopez's lieutenant, Lopez was at Vicksburg, Mississippi, the first part of April. Daily Delta, January 14, 1851.

³For two years Lopez lived at the home of L. J. Sigur in New Orleans. Sigur was the joint proprietor of the Daily Delta and a former state District Attorney. Daily Delta, September 22, 1858. Sigur was to contribute about \$80,000 of his personal fortune to aid the Cuban expeditions. Daily Delta, September 21, 1858. John Henderson, ex-Mexican war officer, C. R. Wheat, a member of the New Orleans bar, and G. W. White, adventurer and newspaper man, were other citizens who proved exceedingly helpful to Lopez. It was asserted that New Orleans furnished about four hundred men for Lopez's Cardenas expedition. True Delta, May 7, 1850.

but a considerable portion of his command was captured. The long detention and potential punishment of these men heightened the ill-will of Americans toward Spain, and furnished the basis for further diplomatic friction with that power.⁴

Narciso Lopez, chief figure of the Cuban drama of 1849-51, had been born about 1798 in Venezuela.⁵ In his manhood Lopez had an imposing appearance, a sturdy physique, an affable personality,⁶ and was a great favorite with soldiers.⁷ He had served as a commissioned officer in the Spanish army, and as governor of Madrid and Trinidad. Because he allowed his liberal tendencies to become manifest, he had lost wealth and influence after 1843 and, becoming bitter against the reactionary government, he planned a revolution in Cuba in June, 1848. It proved to be an abortive attempt and he was immediately forced to flee to the United States. He arrived at New York city and almost immediately joined a small Cuban Junta which was attempting to raise money and men in this country in order to liberate Cuba from Spanish oppression. After the fiasco of 1849 Lopez decided to abandon New York and Washington as the center of filibustering activity. He and a few companions proceeded by easy stages to the Mississippi Delta via the Ohio and Upper Mississippi valley regions. Along the route Lopez paused to confer with a few Americans, notably Lieutenant Richardson Hardy at Cincinnati, and John A. Quitman, governor

⁴For the diplomatic correspondence relative to these captured filibusters, see the Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong. 2 Sess., No. 41.

⁵Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 43.

⁶Lieutenant Richardson Hardy, The History and Adventures of the Cuban Expedition, from the First Movements down to the Dispersal of the Army at Key West and the Arrest of General Lopez. Also: An Account of the Ten Deserters at Isla de Mujeres (Cincinnati, 1850), 79; O.D.D.C., The History of the Late Expedition to Cuba, with an Appendix, Containing the Last Speech of the Celebrated Orator, S. S. Prentiss, in Defence of Gen. Lopez (New Orleans, 1850), 27; See, June 6, 1850.

⁷Louis Schlesinger, "Personal Narrative of Louis Schlesinger, of Adventures in Cuba and Penta," Democratic Review, XXII (1852), 210.

of Mississippi, at Jackson on the prospect of American aid to Cuba. Hardy then proceeded to raise a volunteer filibustering company of Kentuckians. Although Quitman refused the command of the expedition offered him by Lopez, he remained strongly sympathetic to the Cuban idea and helpful to the Lopez expeditionaries.⁸

The dominating characteristic about the preparation for and participation in the Cardenas expedition was its American stamp and cast. Filibustering activities for the expedition apparently began in and around New Orleans about April 1.⁹ Spanish agents were on the alert and notified the national government of suspicious military activity in New Orleans on April 2, and thereafter for the next month.¹⁰ On April 11, a few hundred filibusters from Kentucky landed near New Orleans and were lodged near Lafayette.¹¹ Some means had to be found to equip and transport these men, as well as others who were then enlisting in New Orleans and Louisiana. It was in meeting these problems that John Henderson and L. J. Sigur proved themselves the mainsprings of the venture. The idea of raising money by the sale of Cuban bonds originated after Ambrosia J. Gonzales saw Henderson at New Orleans. One or two million dollars worth of bonds were printed there and turned over to Henderson who proceeded to sell four or five hundred thousand dollars worth at ten cents on the dollar. In this wise forty or fifty thousand dollars was raised to equip the expedition.

⁸Weekly Delta, August 4, 1851; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 43 et seq.; John F. Claiborne, Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, 2 vols. (New York, 1860), II, 55-57, 383-85. For a report on the organization and activity of the Cuban Junta in New York and Washington, see A. Calderon de la Barea, Spanish minister at Washington, to Clayton, January 19, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 19-20. Probably the best volume on Lopez's early life is that of Herminio Portell Vila, Erciso Lopez y Su Epoca, I (La Habana, 1930). Also consult articles in the Daily Delta, May 10, 11, 1850, for material on Lopez's early life.

⁹According to Gonzales' testimony at the Cuba State Trials, he contacted Henderson for the first time about this date. Daily Delta, January 14, 1851.

¹⁰Calderon to Clayton, May 8, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 24.

¹¹Hardy, The Cuban Expedition, 9-11; Caldwell, Lopez Expedition, 59.

Henderson himself bought ten or fifteen thousand dollars worth of the bonds. The bonds, redeemable in the name of the Republic of Cuba and signed by Lopez,¹² furnished the entire source of funds for the expedition.¹³ The sale of these bonds gave rise to serious charges against speculators who were accused of having invested ten cents on the dollar in the hope that a successful Cuban expedition would bring tremendous profits to them.¹⁴ Henderson, with the proceeds from the sale, approached Robert Geddes, joint owner of the ship, the Creole, and purchased the vessel for \$16,000. The Creole was then made available to carry a part of the expeditionaries to Cuba.¹⁵ Arms and ammunition for the filibusters were obtained through the efforts of L. J. Sigur. He approached Major Louis Gally on May 1 and requested eight or ten thousand cartridges, but only a few of these were ever delivered.¹⁶ Sigur also contacted

¹²Testimony of Gonzales at the Cuba State Trials. Weekly Delta, January 20, 1851; Crescent, January 13, 1851; Bulletin, January 13, 1851.

¹³Gonzales' testimony. Crescent, January 13, 1851. Judah P. Benjamin, counsel for the prosecution in the Cuba State Trials, charged that Cubans had not contributed a dollar toward the outfitting of the Cardenas expedition, but that the sale of Cuban bonds had supplied the sole source of revenue. Crescent, January 14, 1851.

¹⁴Benjamin's speech at the trials. Crescent, January 14, 1851; James F. Rhodes, History of the United States (from the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration), 9 vols., new edition (New York, 1928), I, 216-17. The True Delta, June 23, 1850, observed that current rumor had it that a few of the organizers of the Cardenas expedition had reaped thousands of dollars worth of profit from the sale of Cuban bonds since \$80,000 had been collected and only half that much spent on the expedition.

¹⁵Of this sum \$10,000 was paid in cash and a personal note was given for the rest. The transaction was conducted in the name of William H. White, and the purchased vessel was registered in his name. Testimony of Robert Geddes in the Cuba trials. Crescent, January 13, 1851; Bulletin, January 13, 1851; Daily Delta, January 12, 1851. Geddes' testimony was confirmed by Henderson himself. Crescent, January 13, 1851.

¹⁶Testimony of Louis Gally at Lopez's trial. Weekly Delta, June 17, 1850; True Delta, June 16, 1850; Bee, June 17, 1850. Gally was the commander of the Battalion of Artillery of the Louisiana militia. Cohen's New Orleans and Lafayette Directory (New Orleans, 1851), 216.

Donatien Augustin, commander of the Louisiana Legion, and succeeded in having the latter order a quantity of arms on April 23 from C. N. Rowley, commander of the Louisiana State arsenal.¹⁷ Sigur posted a \$7,500 bond as surety for the arms and the bond was delivered to Rowley.¹⁸ The bond was to be cancelled if the arms were later returned intact, but otherwise it would be collectible.¹⁹ In some mysterious way then the arms of the state of Louisiana were supplied the filibusters and served them in the Cardenas attack. Yet in spite of this unquestioned fact the responsibility for this action could not be directly attributed to any particular state official.²⁰ As the testimony in this regard was given in June, 1850, at Lopez's trial for neutrality violations, the New Orleans press was unanimous in acknowledging that the evidence established conclusively that the filibusters had procured state arms for their venture,²¹ and some journals charged that high state officials were implicated in the plot.²²

Meanwhile the first of the expeditionaries were ready to sail from New Orleans for Chagres, Panama, where they would wait for the rest of the

¹⁷ According to Rowley's official requisition which was read in court, 398 muskets, 46 percussion pistols, 16 flint pistols, and 60 cavalry sabres were ordered and delivered. Rowley certified that this was correct and true. True Delta, June 18, 1850.

¹⁸ The following names and sums posted for forfeit on L. J. Sigur's arms bond were as follows: William Monaghan, \$500; Theo. O. Stark, \$1,000; Albert Fabre, \$500; John M. Bell, \$1,000; John Henderson, \$500; Theo S. Sigur, \$2,500; and A. Baudoin, \$1,500. Bee, June 18, 1850; True Delta, June 18, 1850; Courier, June 17, 1850. Three of these men were residents of New Orleans. A. Baudoin and John Bell were commission merchants, and William Monaghan was a general agent for military claims in the city. See Cohen's New Orleans City Directory, 1850.

¹⁹ True Delta, June 18, 1850.

²⁰ The testimony given at Lopez's trial was too vague to prove an open case against any individual. Augustin in particular gave much conflicting testimony, and refused to answer some questions on the ground that it might incriminate him. True Delta, June 16, 1850; Bee, June 17, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 17, 1850.

²¹ True Delta, June 18, 1850; Bulletin, June 17, 18, 1850; Orleanian, June 19, 1850.

²² True Delta, June 18, 1850; Orleanian, June 19, 1850. According to Gonzales' testimony fifty rifles were also procured directly from a state official in Mississippi. Weekly Delta, January 20, 1851.

command. A few days before sailing the Kentucky filibusters insisted on marching in an orderly fashion through the streets of New Orleans, thus attracting the attention of the Spanish consul. It was asserted however that this notoriety did the expedition no harm "...for our object and destination was then as well known in New Orleans as it could be. We had been the subject of several newspaper notices, and the Cuba expedition was the bar-room conversation all over the city."²³ On April 25, Colonel J. W. Breedlove gave 225 filibusters tickets to Chagres, and that evening they sailed from Lafayette. A large crowd congregated there helped shove the barque Georgiana from the dock and gave the departing men three cheers. Lopez, Gonzales, and Henderson were the last to remain at the dock waving adieu.²⁴ On April 30, Lopez in company of several associates swore before a notary public to pay to each Cuban volunteer within five years two thousand dollars at six per cent interest. The public property of Cuba was pledged as security.²⁵ In the meantime Colonel C. R. Wheat was gathering a troop of about 160 Louisianians which sailed on the Susan Loud, May 2, 1850.²⁶ Lopez, Gonzales and their command were the last to leave. About 350 half-bags of powder stored by Charles and Harris at the United States arsenal were ordered removed to the levee the night before the expedition

²³Hardy, The Cuban Expedition, 11-12, 17. Spanish agents in New Orleans were also aware of other filibustering activity. Calderon to Clayton, May 8, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 24.

²⁴Hardy, The Cuban Expedition, 16. Breedlove was accused by Spanish agents of secretly working with the filibusters. Calderon to Clayton, May 8, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 24.

²⁵Cotesworth Pinckney Smith, state official of Mississippi, was the only American present. Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 28.

²⁶Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 61. Colonel Wheat was a member of the New Orleans bar. Daily Delta, May 23, 1850; Bee, May 24, 1850. The personnel of the Second Regiment from Louisiana was given in the Daily Delta, May 23, 1850.

left and the kegs were picked up by the filibusters.²⁷ About 650 men, presumably bound for California by way of Chagres, left New Orleans May 7 on the Crook.²⁸ During the night boxes of arms were taken aboard the vessel somewhere between New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi river.²⁹ This bit of strategy was resorted to so that the filibusters might evade government prosecution under the Neutrality Law of 1818 by the shadowy claim that in leaving the United States they had not constituted an armed or a military expedition.³⁰

The successful launching of the expedition gave rise to many serious charges against state and federal officers in New Orleans. Although a few journals acknowledged that the expedition had been surrounded by secrecy,³¹

²⁷Testimony of F. Garrigues, keeper of the powder magazine at the United States arsenal, at Lopez's trial. Picayune, June 18, 1850; Daily Delta, June 18, 1850.

²⁸Samuel J. Douglas, Collector at Key West, to Zachary Taylor, May 22, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 43; William L. Hodge, New Orleans, to Taylor, May 7, 1850, in ibid., 50; Daily Delta, January 14, 1851. Chagres, Panama, was then ideally situated for easy access to either California or Cuba. Cuban bound expeditionaries via Chagres could pose as immigrants to California and thus avert much suspicion from themselves. To note the importance of Chagres in that day see The Encyclopaedia Britannica (New York, 1929), V, 138.

²⁹See the testimony given in the Cuba State Trials by the volunteer filibusters. Crescent, January 11, 1851; Daily Delta, January 11, 12, 13, 1851; Weekly Delta, January 13, 1851; Bulletin, January 13, 1851.

³⁰This was to be the crux of the defense of the filibusters throughout the Cuba State Trials. For the classic examples of this argumentation by those sympathetic with the expeditionaries see J. D. B. De Bow, "The Late Cuba Expedition," De Bow's Review, IX (1850), 172; "The Neutrality Law: What Does It Mean, What Prohibit, and What Permit?" Democratic Review, XXX (1851), 505, 507-08; "Late Cuba State Trials," Democratic Review, XXX, 310-12; Weekly Delta, June 10, 1850. Also consult the Crescent, May 15, 1850, on the lack of military organization of the Cardenas expedition when leaving the United States. For a refutation of this argument see the Bulletin, June 8, 1850.

³¹See, May 14, 24, 1850; Bulletin, May 13, 1850; Crescent, July 2, 1850.

many newspapers very strongly declared that both federal and state officials in the city knew all the facts of the openly prepared venture and that they had looked on in silence, and some in "winking encouragement."³²

Secretary of State Clayton was called upon to conduct a rigid investigation to determine which federal officers had aided the Cuban party.³³

Meanwhile the United States District Attorney at New Orleans, Logan Hunton, had defended himself and other federal officials there by writing to Clayton that, although he was certain that many individuals bound indirectly for Cuba had left the city, no overt act had been committed by them which would justify the intervention of the government.³⁴

In spite of governmental orders to prevent the filibusters from landing at Cuba,³⁵ the Creole landed at Cardenas, Cuba, on May 19. After a temporary victory there the filibusters abandoned Cuba because the Cuban populace had not flocked to their standard as it was believed they would. The Creole then made for and successfully reached Key West with the Spanish in hot pursuit. There the vessel was seized by customs officials in behalf of the Neutrality Law, but the 600 expeditionaries were unmolested and

³²Daily Delta, June 30, July 2, 1850, January 14, 1851; Weekly Delta, July 8, 1850. See also the Courier, June 6, 18, 1850; True Delta, June 18, 21, 22, 1850. The Delta alleged that the Cuba expedition was the topic of conversation of many barrooms and other public places, and that federal authorities were cognizant of all filibustering preparations being made. Daily Delta, June 30, 1850. It was also asserted that Hunton's inactivity was the sole reason why the expedition was able to get under way. Daily Delta, July 2, 1850; Weekly Delta, July 8, 1850. The Bee, May 28, 1850, thought that the government was not unfriendly to the expedition, and believed that this accounted for the fact that the government took no notice of the venture for a long time after the press was full of news concerning it. See the Crescent, July 1, 2, 1850, which expressly denied that federal or state authorities knew anything of the expedition.

³³True Delta, June 18, 21, 1850; Bulletin, June 26, 1850.

³⁴Hunton to Clayton, May 14, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 25. This letter was also to be used by the filibusters in their defense in the trials. Late Cuba State Trials, Democratic Review, XXX, 313; Weekly Delta, July 1, 1850.

³⁵Preston, Naval Department, to Tattal, Commander of the United States Saranac, May 16, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 54; Preston to F. A. Parker, Commander of the Ross Squadron, May 16, 1850; in ibid., 56.

allowed to return to the United States.³⁶ Prior to the descent on Cuba, about a hundred men had refused to participate in attack, and were presumably returning to the United States in the Georgiana and the Susan Loud when they were captured by the Spanish at the island of Contoy off Mexican Yucatan.³⁷ Thus the Cardenas expedition had not only resulted in a complete failure, but a large portion of the command was in the hands of the enemy.

Press opinion in New Orleans concerning the Cardenas venture fell into two divisions with the final news on the reembarkation of Lopez for the United States furnishing the dividing line. From the first the opposition to the scheme was led by the True Delta which stoutly maintained that an expedition of less than five thousand men would be one of the most insane and Quixotic undertakings of the age.³⁸ The Bee soon echoed this idea and predicted gloomy disaster for the attempt. It was declared by some news organs that the expedition was an unlawful undertaking,⁴⁰ and that it was one of questionable morality since it was invading the territory of a friendly power,⁴¹ attempting to force a different government upon a

³⁶W. R. Hackley, United States District Attorney, South District of Florida, to the Solicitor of the Treasury at Washington, May 22, 1850, in ibid., 48; Calderon to Clayton, May 31, 1850, in ibid., No. 41, 41; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 74; Samuel J. Douglas, Collector at Key West, to President Taylor, May 22, 1850, in ibid., No. 57, 43.

³⁷The island of Contoy was also under the jurisdiction of Mexico. Robert B. Campbell, United States Consul at Havana, to Clayton, May 22, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57; 36; D. M. Barringer, legation of the United States at Madrid, to the Marquis Pidal, Minister of State, August 27, 1850, in ibid., No. 41, 14. For the Spanish report on the captured filibusters see Calderon to Clayton, June 28, 1850, in ibid., 56-57. Also see the Daily Delta, June 1, 1850.

³⁸True Delta, April 18, May 5, 1850. Even some friends of the expedition were to concede this point after the failure of the expedition. J. D. B. De Bow, "The Late Cuba Expedition, loc. cit.", IX, 169.

³⁹Bee, May 4, 1850.

⁴⁰Bulletin, May 20, 1850; Orleanian, May 11, 14, 18, 1850.

⁴¹Bulletin, May 20, 1850; Bee, May 4, 1850.

people who had manifested no desire for it.⁴² It was not long before this opposition was virtually dissipated. The Bulletin, although reaffirming its disapproval of the expedition, avowed that it took a "deep interest" in the gallant band. It was predicted that if these men were successful they would be joined by thousands of others from the United States,⁴³ and, after a nominal Cuban independence, Cuba would be annexed to the Union.⁴⁴ The Orleanian, a bitter foe of the Cardenas venture as long as its editorials were written by the French editor,⁴⁵ assumed a sudden reversal of policy upon the return of the English editor to the affairs of the paper. It then highly praised the expeditionaries and fervently wished for their success in Cuba.⁴⁶ The Bee was also to veer sharply to the left. It noted that the Cuban attempt was widely supported by "many men of note," that it was a liberating expedition, and not an invading force, and that the movement found favor with most Americans because it promised further acquisition of territory. "Our administration will disown all participation in it [the Cuban expedition] as a matter of right, justice and good faith; but the design appeals with almost irresistible power to the great heart of the nation, and enlists the interest of the masses."⁴⁷ The True Delta was virtually left alone in continually opposing the expedition.⁴⁸

⁴²Bulletin, May 20, 1850; Orleanian, May 16, 18, 1850.

⁴³Bulletin, May 20, 1850; Bee, May 24, 1850, and the Daily Delta, May 11, 1850, asserted that thousands of Americans would rush to Cuba as soon as Cubans struck the blow for independence in a determined manner.

⁴⁴Bulletin, May 17, 1850.

⁴⁵Orleanian, May 11, 14, 16, 1850.

⁴⁶Ibid., May 18, 21, 1850.

⁴⁷Bee, May 14, 1850.

⁴⁸True Delta, May 28, 1850. This paper on May 25, 1850, asserted that the ill-feeling of the Spanish over the Cardenas expedition had retarded the peaceful annexation of Cuba.

The most ardent champions of the expedition were the Daily Delta and the Courier. Until the expedition was under way the Delta persistently denied that any attack on Cuba was being contemplated, and declared that there was an entire absence of preparations for such in New Orleans.⁴⁹ Once however the expeditionaries were under way the Delta praised them all highly, especially Lopez.⁵⁰ In its intense zeal over the Cuban venture the Delta hung from its window a Cuban flag. This emblem, declared to have been made by some ladies of New Orleans, was to remain in the window of this paper for several weeks.⁵¹ The Courier defended the filibusters as a liberating party,⁵² and wished them the best of luck in their campaign.⁵³ This same sentiment was also manifested by the Crescent,⁵⁴ and the Picayune.⁵⁵ After the expedition had gotten under way and before the news reached New Orleans of its disastrous repulse at Cardenas, press opinion there was almost uniformly in favor of the filibusters and their aims.

Once the attacking party had left New Orleans, the city tensely awaited news of the result. From May 13 to May 23, when final reports began to come to the city, the anxiety continually grew until the Cuban question was thought to have absorbed all the populace, and New Orleans

⁴⁹Daily Delta, March 29, April 25, 1850; Weekly Delta, April 29, 1850.

⁵⁰Daily Delta, May 10, 17, 24, 26, 27, 1850.

⁵¹Daily Delta, May 26, 1850. In response to a threatening letter from "Muchos Espanoles" concerning the lowering of the flag, the Daily Delta, May 29, 1850, announced that its office force would vigorously defend the Cuban emblem. When the flag was finally lowered on July 9, 1850, it was publicly saluted by the Washington company of artillery by the firing of thirty-one guns in Lafayette square. Calderon to Webster, July 26, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 51 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 41, 63; Daily Delta, July 10, 1850. The Delta on this date promised to save the Cuban flag until Cuba was free, at which time it would fly it again.

⁵²Courier, May 11, 14, 1850.

⁵³Ibid., May 14, 1850. The Courier, May 10, 1850, declared for quick annexation in the event of success.

⁵⁴Crescent, May 15, 1850.

⁵⁵Picayune, May 23, 1850.

was frightened from its propriety.⁵⁶

When word was received of the complete dispersion of the expedition, the New Orleans press almost unanimously conceded that the venture had ended in a deplorable and mortifying failure.⁵⁷ Some journals seriously questioned the advisability of future expeditions to Cuba.⁵⁸ The radicals charged that opponents of the attempt were happy over its failure. Prior to the final news they, the ultra-conservatives, had concealed their sentiments to conform with public opinion, but with the failure at Cardenas the anti-expansionists displayed their elation.⁵⁹

Serious charges against the leaders of the Cardenas expedition grew out of the affair. It was alleged that the volunteers were deceived by their leaders into thinking that the Creoles of Cuba desired freedom from Spain when they did not.⁶⁰ Lopez was severely criticized because in abandoning Cardenas, he had left many captured filibusters behind.⁶¹ As a result of this Lopez's character suffered many aspersions.⁶² However when fuller reports coming to New Orleans all confirmed Lopez's bravery and military talent, the Cuban general regained much prestige with the press.⁶³ In the

⁵⁶Consult the Courier, May 13, 16, 23, 1850; Bulletin, May 20, 22, 28, 1850; Picayune, May 23, 1850; True Delta, May 26, 1850; See, May 24, 26, 1850.

⁵⁷Orleanian, May 29, 1850; Picayune, May 29, 1850; Crescent, May 28, 1850; Bulletin, May 29, 1850; Courier, May 28, 1850.

⁵⁸Courier, June 4, 1850; See, May 29, 1850; Bulletin, May 30, 1850. The Courier, June 5, 1850, contrary to all its previous policy, claimed that it was glad that other expeditions over the country had been dispersed.

⁵⁹Courier, May 29, 1850.

⁶⁰Bulletin, May 30, 31, 1850; Courier, May 30, 1850; Orleanian, May 29, 1850.

⁶¹Courier, May 29, 1850; Bulletin, May 27, 28, 29, 1850. On the other hand some journals lauded the filibusters for withdrawing from Cardenas after they perceived that the Creole population would not aid them. True Delta, May 29, 1850; Orleanian, May 30, 1850.

⁶²True Delta, May 31, 1850; Courier, May 28, 1850; Bulletin, May 27, 1850.

⁶³Courier, June 1, 1850; Bulletin, June 3, 1850; Crescent, June 1, 1850; See, June 3, 1850.

subsequent reaction many journals defended the patriotic and unselfish motives of the expeditionaries,⁶⁴ and the Delta even championed the legality and conduct of the affair.⁶⁵

A sharp editorial conflict also ensued over the orders that Taylor gave to the commanders of the nation's naval squadrons to the effect that they should prevent the expeditionaries from landing in Cuba. The Delta strenuously objected to the right of the national government to proffer its services to Spain,⁶⁶ and the Courier thought that the act flouted the public will.⁶⁷ On the other hand the Bulletin vigorously defended the presidential action.⁶⁸ Other journals took a more moderate stand. The Bee concluded that, although such action must have been distasteful to the administration, any other course was impossible.⁶⁹ The Crescent concurred in this stand but added that Taylor's action was extremely repugnant to a large majority of the citizens of New Orleans and the southern states.⁷⁰

Undoubtedly one of the biggest issues growing out of the Cardenas expedition was the one raised by the capture of the one hundred Contey filibusters by Spain.⁷¹ The Spanish government insisted on the detention and trial of these men. With the exception of the True Delta, the New Orleans press was indignant at Spain's attitude. It was vigorously maintained that those aboard the Georgiana and the Susan Loud were not guilty of an attack against Cuba and thus were not liable to capture.⁷²

⁶⁴Crescent, June 4, 1850; Bee, June 12, 1850; Daily Delta, June 4, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 3, 1850.

⁶⁵Weekly Delta, June 3, 1850.

⁶⁶Daily Delta, May 27, 28, June 5, 7, 16, 1850.

⁶⁷Courier, May 24, June 15, 1850.

⁶⁸Bulletin, May 24, 1850.

⁶⁹Bee, May 28, 1850.

⁷⁰Crescent, May 24, 1850.

⁷¹See footnote 37. Also consult the Picayune, June 12, 1850.

⁷²Orleanian, June 2, 1850; Courier, June 1, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 10, 1850; Bulletin, May 31, June 10, 1850; Daily Delta, June 11, 1850;

The only offense committed by the Contoy captives was that when they left New Orleans they had possibly intended to attack Cuba. If so however they had repented of their design and abandoned the expedition at the island of Contoy.⁷³ The press was uniform in its position that it was the duty of the federal government to demand the release of the captives and to protect them.⁷⁴ It was further declared that if Spain executed these men America would quickly declare war on Spain as a retribution,⁷⁵ and Cuba would be freed.⁷⁶ Some few journals cautioned against war because they thought such a sentiment was largely determined "by desires of territorial acquisition."⁷⁷ The national administration, probably influenced in some measure by a united public opinion, entered a formal demand for the return of the prisoners.⁷⁸ Spain however insisted upon the trial of all the captives, and only slowly freed them as they were singly acquitted.⁷⁹

⁷³Bee, June 4, 1850. The True Delta, May 30, 1850, sponsored the idea of having the unnaturalized Spanish in New Orleans present a petition to the Captain General of Cuba praying for clemency toward the Contoy prisoners.

⁷⁴Bee, June 4, 1850. The Daily Delta, June 11, 1850, thought that the only crime committed by the Filibusters was in sailing some distance with men who were accused of having participated in an unlawful attack. The attitude of the national administration was identical to that taken by the Bee. See Clayton to Commodore Charles Morris, June 29, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 41, 5; Barringer to Clayton, August 7, 1850, in ibid., 7; Clayton to Calderon, June 3, 1850, in ibid., 47.

⁷⁵Bee, June 5, 1850; Orleanian, June 2, 1850; Courier, June 1, 1850; Crescent, June 19, 1850; Daily Delta, June 3, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 10, 1850; Picayune, June 12, 1850; Bulletin, June 4, 10, 1850.

⁷⁶Bulletin, May 31, June 1, 19, 1850; Bee, June 4, 5, 1850; Crescent, June 3, 1850; Courier, May 30, 1850; Picayune, June 2, 1850.

⁷⁷Crescent, June 3, 1850; Bulletin, June 1, 1850; Courier, May 30, 1850; Picayune, June 2, 1850.

⁷⁸Picayune, June 18, 1850. The same journal on June 29, 1850, hoped that the United States could make a peaceful purchase of Cuba. The True Delta, May 30, 1850, accused ultra-expansionists of wishing to see the Contoy prisoners severely punished or executed so that an excellent pretext for war on Spain could be found.

⁷⁹Clayton to Morris, June 29, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 41, 4-5; Barringer to Fidal, August 7, 1850, in ibid., 8-9.

⁷⁹The first group of forty-two Contoy captives were released in mid-July. Count of Alcoy to Calderon, July 18, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 41, 66-67. By mid-September Spain officially announced that the largest portion of the prisoners had been liberated. Barringer to Fidal, September 19, 1850, in ibid., 23.

As time passed and many of the prisoners had not been released, a few papers in New Orleans continued to express confidence in Taylor's firm policy and predicted that America's honor would be preserved.⁸⁰ Gradually more dissatisfaction was manifested and even the usually conservative press altered its tone. The True Delta criticized the administration for doing nothing,⁸¹ and the Crescent declared that if the administration retracted its demand for the return of the Contoy prisoners, it deserved to be "hissed out of office."⁸² The radical press was again led by the Delta which severely criticized the government for its conduct of the whole affair.⁸³ The immediate release of the captives was also insisted upon by the Courier.⁸⁴ After months of delay the Spanish government finally released the remaining men who were allowed to return to the United States, and the diplomatic crisis was averted for a time.⁸⁵

An event growing directly out of the Cardenas expedition which was to carry both a domestic and diplomatic significance was the determination of the national government to arrest Lopez and bring him to trial for his alleged violation of the Neutrality Law of 1818. Lopez was first arrested at Savannah, Georgia, in accord with the instructions of the authorities, but no evidence could be found against him there and he was released.⁸⁶

⁸⁰Crescent, June 28, 1850; See, July 9, 1850.

⁸¹True Delta, July 9, 1850.

⁸²Crescent, July 9, 1850.

⁸³Weekly Delta, July 1, 1850; Daily Delta, July 11, October 3, 1850.

⁸⁴Courier, June 25, 1850. The Bulletin, June 26, 1850, asserted that the Contoy prisoners must be released regardless of the trial at Havana.

⁸⁵The Queen of Spain signed a pardon for the remaining captives on October 13, 1850, and dispatched an order for their release to Havana on the same day. Barringer to Webster, November 8, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 41, 33.

⁸⁶Henry Williams, United States District Attorney, to Clayton, May 26, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 46.

The government had also demanded that Lopez be arrested and tried if he were to appear in New Orleans.⁸⁷ The Cuban's subsequent appearance in New Orleans on June 7, 1850,⁸⁸ and his immediate trial there furnished the basis for the Cuba State Trials which were to occupy the attention of the public in that city until the spring of 1851.⁸⁹

In the spring of 1850 Narciso Lopez and three or four fellow Cubans came to the region of New Orleans and attempted to organize a filibustering expedition against Spanish Cuba. They encountered an enthusiastic reception there and some few Americans were almost entirely responsible for organizing, equipping, and launching a military expedition against Cuba. Because of the sympathy of state officials for the aim of the venture, the filibusters were able to obtain arms and ammunition from state agencies of Louisiana. There was also much reason to believe that the federal authorities at New Orleans were not unfriendly to the project and allowed it to get under way without molesting it.

The early opposition to the Cuban expedition by some newspapers was soon dispelled after the filibusters had sailed from the city. Then the press was almost unanimously in favor of the venture and its aims. The ultimate failure of the expeditionaries produced a temporary reaction, and for a time the leaders suffered much censure, and further expeditions to Cuba were discouraged.

Not only had the filibusters failed but about a hundred men were captured by Spain off the coast of Mexican Yucatan. These persons had not

⁸⁷ Clayton to Hunter, May 27, 1850, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 31 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 57, 46.

⁸⁸ Bee, June 8, 1850.

⁸⁹ For an account of the Cuba State Trials, consult chapter four of this thesis.

participated in the attack on Cuba, but had probably intended to do so when leaving New Orleans. After abandoning those who did make the Cardenas attack, the Contoy filibusters were presumably returning to the United States in American vessels when captured. The Spanish government insisted upon the retention and trial of these men, but this policy was strenuously protested against by the United States. Spain's procrastination heightened the anti-Spanish feeling in New Orleans, and led the press there to agitate for war with Spain and the freedom of Cuba. Moderate journals perceived desires for territorial acquisition in the demand for war. After months of delay Spain freed all of the prisoners and the diplomatic crisis was temporarily averted.

The decision of the national authorities to arrest and try Lopez for his alleged violation of the Neutrality Law was to lead directly to the Cuba State Trials. These trials carried both a domestic and a diplomatic significance. It was during the course of these trials that there was revealed much of the American aid that had been given Lopez. It was also to be displayed that it was impossible for the government to convict persons accused of participating in the Cardenas expedition, because public opinion would not support these convictions.

CHAPTER IV

THE CUBA STATE TRIALS

If the evidence against Lopez were a thousand fold stronger, no jury could be impaneled to convict him because public opinion makes a law, and public opinion is in favor of Lopez's striving for Republican institutions. Orleanian, June 8, 1850.

The government's prosecution of Lopez in June, 1850, was to reveal the vital aid given to the Cardenas expedition by residents of New Orleans and other Americans. It also afforded Cuban sympathizers in the city an opportunity to forestall a conviction by refusing to testify against Lopez and by vigorously supporting his defense. Notwithstanding, the results of Lopez's trial brought sixteen indictments against alleged participators in the expedition. John Henderson was the only one actually brought to trial, but his three trials were so full of forensic quibblings that the public and the press soon lost interest in them. The indictment and arrest of John A. Quitman, Governor of Mississippi, afforded a more colorful affair and it occupied the interest of the public and the press for a few months. After Henderson's third trial had resulted in a third hung jury, the government dismissed all sixteen indictments and the filibusters had won a victory.

Shortly after it became known in New Orleans that the government intended to prosecute Lopez for his alleged violations of the Neutrality Law of 1818,¹ some journals there boldly declared that the government could under no circumstances convict Lopez because public opinion was too

¹See footnotes 86-89 of the preceding chapter of this thesis.

sympathetic in his behalf.² The only paper openly in favor of the government's prosecution was the Bulletin.³ From the outset there was a great public interest in Lopez's trial. On May 7, when Lopez had his first hearing before Judge T. R. McCaleb in the United States court,⁴ there was not only an immense throng of anxious people present in the court room, but the avenues leading to the building itself were crowded.⁵ Lopez's counsel was composed of S. S. Prentiss and John C. Larue.⁶ After the preliminary hearing Lopez was forced to give a three thousand dollar bond which was signed for by James Caldwell, Recorder of the Second Municipality.⁷ As Lopez and his friends left the court room a crowd surrounded them in the hall and gave a great cheer for "Lopez and Cuba."⁸ As the party made their way to the commissioner's office on the third floor of the building to sign the bond the large crowd quickly made way for Lopez and again cheered him.⁹ A great number of persons escorted Lopez to the St. Charles Hotel,¹⁰ where the crowd again cheered him and called for a speech. After his talk, which was given in Spanish and translated by Sigur,¹¹ several persons assured the Cuban of their sympathy.¹² The following day McCaleb plead physical

²Orleanian, June 8, 1850; Courier, June 5, 1850; Bee, June 6, 1850.

³Bulletin, June 5, 1850.

⁴Bee, June 8, 1850.

⁵Daily Delta, June 9, 1850; Courier, June 8, 1850; Orleanian, June 9, 1850; Bee, June 8, 1850.

⁶Daily Delta, June 8, 1850. After the first week of the trial Colonel Field, Randall Hunt, and E. W. Moise replaced S. S. Prentiss who was ill, and J. C. Larue who was made the new judge of the First District Court. Daily Delta, June 14, 1850.

⁷Daily Delta, June 9, 1850; Bulletin, June 10, 1850; True Delta, June 20, 1850. The Bulletin, June 10, sharply questioned the propriety of a high city official offering himself as security for Lopez's bond.

⁸Daily Delta, June 9, 1850.

⁹Orleanian, June 9, 1850; Courier, June 8, 1850; True Delta, June 9, 1850; Piogune, June 9, 1850.

¹⁰Courier, June 8, 1850; Orleanian, June 8, 1850.

¹¹True Delta, June 9, 1850; Daily Delta, June 9, 1850.

¹²Daily Delta, June 9, 1850.

inability and transferred the case to Joshua Baldwin, United States Commissioner.¹³ Again a large crowd accompanied Lopez from the court room to the St. Charles Hotel, making great demonstrations.¹⁴ On May 9, hundreds of young men from Louisiana, accompanied by a band of musicians, went to the residence of L. J. Sigur where Lopez was residing and gave him a serenade.¹⁵ After this Lopez gave a speech and then the doors of Sigur's home were thrown open and the crowd drank to the future freedom of Cuba.¹⁶ At this time Lopez was also being invited to theatre performances by private persons in New Orleans,¹⁷ and the Orleans House named a drink for him.¹⁸

The chief importance of Lopez's trial was that it served to reveal the great support lent to the Cardenas expedition by Americans residing in New Orleans, and thus it paved the way for later filibustering trials.¹⁹ It was very evident that the leading witnesses summoned to testify against Lopez refused to answer many questions on the ground that they might incriminate themselves, or because they thought they would be violating a trust.²⁰ Because of this fact the prosecution was greatly crippled.²¹ In spite of this procedure the piecemeal evidence when put together made a strong case not only against Lopez but also against many of his American

¹³Picayune, June 9, 1850; Bee, June 10, 1850.

¹⁴Bee, June 10, 1850.

¹⁵Ibid., June 10, 1850; Daily Delta, June 9, 1850.

¹⁶Bee, June 10, 1850. The serenade of Lopez was approved by the Courier, June 28, but deplored by the Bulletin, June 10.

¹⁷Daily Delta, June 10, 1850; Courier, June 8, 1850.

¹⁸Daily Delta, June 12, 1850.

¹⁹See footnotes 12-22 of chapter three of this thesis.

²⁰Picayune, June 11, 15, 1850; Bulletin, June 13, 1850; Daily Delta, June 14, 1850; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 78-79. The most prominent Americans who refused to answer many of the prosecution's questions were J. L. O'Sullivan, Alexander Walker, L. J. Sigur, John Henderson, Donatien Augustin, and Colonel M. McAlpin.

²¹To note the embarrassment caused the prosecution by this procedure see the Daily Delta, June 11, 15, 20, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 17, 1850; Crescent, June 15, 1850; True Delta, June 15, 1850; Bee, June 15, 1850; Picayune, June 15, 1850; Bulletin, June 13, 1850.

colleagues. As a result of Lopez's hearings, bills of indictment were returned against sixteen men, all but two of whom were Americans, and most of these were prominent. Their trials were ordered held over until December of that year.²²

Public and press opinion concerning the filibusters during the course of the trial was not uniform. Throughout the trial the crowd gave unmistakable evidences of its sympathy for the defense by cheering the various speeches of Lopez's counsel.²³ The most ardent champion for the defense was the Delta, which staunchly opposed the prosecution.²⁴ The Crescent observed that a great majority of citizens in New Orleans regretted the prosecutions and hoped that there would be no convictions,²⁵ and the Courier wished Lopez "a safe deliverance."²⁶ These journals thought that Lopez and his supporters had not violated any federal law in the Cardenas expedition because they had had such good legal advisers.²⁷ Many journals, however, severely criticized the defense, and it was termed by one journal as "tedious, obstinate, cavilling, and interposing [the] technical to [for]

²²The most prominent Americans indicted were Governor John A. Quitman of Mississippi, Judge Cotesworth P. Smith of the Mississippi Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals, John L. O'Sullivan, Editor of the Democratic Review, Adjutant General C. N. Rowley, Commander of the Louisiana State Arsenal, G. W. White, commander of the Round Island expedition, Donatien Augustin, commander of the Louisiana legion, and John F. Pickett, former consul at Turk's Island.

See the "Late Cuba State Trials," loc. cit., 307; Daily Delta, June 22, 1850; Picayune, June 22, 1850; Bulletin, June 22, 1850; Claiborne, Quitman, II, 74-75. The True Delta, June 20, named December, 1850, as the date for Lopez's re-examination but the Daily Delta, June 20, stipulated November.

²³Daily Delta, June 15, 19, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 17, 1850; Crescent, June 11, 15, 1850; Bee, June 11, 1850.

²⁴Daily Delta, June 18, 20, 1850; Weekly Delta, June 17, 1850.

²⁵Crescent, June 15, 1850. The Crescent, June 8, 1850, avowed that it was not sympathetic with the aspirations of the government prosecution.

²⁶Courier, June 14, 1850.

²⁷Daily Delta, June 27, July 2, 1850; Crescent, July 1, 1850; Bulletin, June 17, 1850.

evidence...."²⁸ Because of the legal quibbling and the continual refusals of witnesses to answer the prosecution's questions, the whole affair began to assume in the eyes of the press the proportions of a farce,²⁹ and the termination of the affair was welcomed.³⁰

The complexity of the Cuba State Trials had changed somewhat when they were again renewed in December, 1850, for the government's prosecution was then directed at John Henderson instead of Lopez. Before McCaleb's court in mid-December Henderson had asked to stand trial at once, and his request had been granted.³¹ Since all other prosecutions, including that of Lopez, had been set aside, Henderson's trial became a test case. If Henderson were not convicted it could not be hoped that the prosecution could succeed against any of the others since all of the filibustering cases turned upon the Neutrality Law of 1818, its construction, meaning, and application to the Cardenas expedition, and not upon any question of participation in the expedition itself.³² Thus throughout Henderson's three trials from January through the first part of March, 1851, the facts of Henderson's participation in the Cardenas expedition were not deemed nearly as important as the application of the law to the entire expedition. The great question which arose out of the affair was whether or not the Cardenas venture was a military expedition in a legal sense. If it were proven so

²⁸Bulletin, June 17, 18, 1850. The True Delta, June 21, 1850, declared that the timidity of the defense was covering it with ridicule.

²⁹Picayune, June 15, 1850; Bulletin, June 14, 15, 1850; Courier, June 12, 13, 18, 1850; Orleanian, June 18, 19, 1850; True Delta, June 13, 1850.

³⁰Courier, June 18, 1850; Orleanian, June 19, 1850.

³¹The Henderson trials were held before McCaleb, United States District Judge of the Southern District of Louisiana, who was presiding in the Circuit and not in the District Court. "Late Cuba State Trials," *loc. cit.*, 307-08; Daily Delta, December 17, 1850.

³²All other cases of the government, including that of Lopez, were founded on precisely the same charges as those formulated against Henderson. "Late Cuba State Trials," *loc. cit.*, 308, 313. For a summary of the content of the Neutrality Law of 1818 see chapter two, footnote 92 of this thesis.

Henderson, as well as all the other participants in it, was guilty of violating the Neutrality Law; but if not, a conviction of any of the men was impossible.³³ Since the case was deemed of importance, powerful efforts of the government were expected to be launched for a conviction, and Judah P. Benjamin, noted attorney, was named to assist the District Attorney in his prosecution.³⁴

The three Henderson trials were marked by a striking similarity in that there was so much difficulty found in impaneling juries,³⁵ each trial was full of forensic quibbling, and finally there was little public interest in the trials. The first jury was finally impaneled and began its sessions on January 2.³⁶ After hearing the legalistic battle of words the jury retired on January 20, but was unable to come to an agreement and was discharged.³⁷ The vote was generally understood to have been from first to last eight for conviction and four for acquittal.³⁸ The True Delta

³³The debate over whether the Cardenas expedition was or was not a military expedition when it left the United States caused the trials to result in an endless forensic quibbling. The public and press quickly lost interest in the affair because of this fact.

³⁴Pierce Butler, Judah P. Benjamin (Philadelphia, 1907), 179-80; "Late Cuba State Trials," loc. cit., 308.

³⁵The difficulty was due to two causes. First, the jury was restricted to the residents of the parish in which the court sat. Daily Delta, February 14, 1851. Second, most of the persons summoned for jury service professed previous opinions on the merits of the case. Of the several persons discharged for this reason, perhaps the best known was Alexander C. Bullitt of the Picayune who admitted holding very favorable views to the expeditionaries. True Delta, January 5, 1851; Daily Delta, January 5, 1851. See the Daily Delta, January 4, 5, 1851, the True Delta, January 5, 1851, and the Bulletin, January 4, for the names and opinions of the various prospective jurors who were discharged.

³⁶Daily Delta, January 3, 1851. For the personnel of this jury see the Daily Delta, January 5, 1851. It was stated that this jury was composed almost solely of Administration men, that they were also merchants and only one was known to be a Democrat. "Late Cuba State Trials," loc. cit., 313.

³⁷Daily Delta, January 21, 1851; Bulletin, January 22, 1851.

³⁸Bulletin, January 22, 1851; Daily Delta, January 22, 1851. To note the fashion in which the individual jurors were reported to have voted see the True Delta, January 22, 1851.

was not surprised at this, for it declared it was common knowledge that odds of ten to one were bet that a hung jury could have been had at any time since the impaneling of the jury.³⁹ The government, however, soon moved for a second trial, and encountered juror difficulty again.⁴⁰ After three days had passed and five venires had been called, the jury was completed and hearings begun about the first of February.⁴¹ After the evidence was reheard, the jury was out about thirty hours but was unable to agree and was discharged on February 11.⁴² This time the voting was declared to have been six for acquittal and six for conviction.⁴³ After the conclusion of the second trial there was evident a growing hopelessness of the government's prosecution. Hutton, District Attorney, told the court that there had been exhausted a panel of more than six hundred jurors for the preceding Henderson cases, and that he saw no hope of getting another jury.⁴⁴ Although Hutton was in favor of postponing further trials of Henderson until the court's next term, Henderson insisted upon an immediate trial. Since John A. Quitman, Governor of Mississippi, waived his right for trial to Henderson, the way was paved for the third and final trial.⁴⁵ Some journals then charged that a conviction of Henderson would be impossible on a third trial,⁴⁶ and the government was accused of

³⁹True Delta, January 22, 1851.

⁴⁰A typical example of this may be found in one venire of 48 jurors summoned. Only 29 were present and 23 were rejected as having previously formed opinions. Only three out of the remaining six were accepted. Bulletin, January 28, 1851.

⁴¹Bulletin, January 31, 1851; Bee, February 1, 1851. For the personnel of this jury consult the Bulletin, January 31, and the Daily Delta, January 30, 31, 1851.

⁴²Bee, February 12, 1851; True Delta, February 12, 1851; Bulletin, February 12, 1851.

⁴³Bulletin, February 12, 1851; Bee, February 12, 1851. To note the way in which the individual jurors were reported to have voted, see the True Delta, February 12, 1851.

⁴⁴Daily Delta, February 14, 1851.

⁴⁵Bee, February 14, 1851.

⁴⁶Picayune, February 15, 1851; Courier, February 27, 1851.

persecuting instead of prosecuting him.⁴⁷ Preceding the trial there was an extreme difficulty in forming a jury.⁴⁸ Out of one venire or panel of forty-eight men summoned, not a single juror was accepted and sworn in.⁴⁹ On February 26, another panel of ninety-six names was called but only twenty-eight appeared in court. Of these the majority were not citizens and the remainder declared that they had formulated opinions on the case. Out of this panel of ninety-six only one was sworn in.⁵⁰ After two weeks only eight jurors had been accepted.⁵¹ Finally the jury was completed and the hearings begun on March 1.⁵² A week later the jury was discharged after being unable to agree on a verdict.⁵³ This time the filibusters had virtually the unanimous support of the jury, for only one man was reported to have stood for conviction.⁵⁴ After this verdict Huntton proceeded to dismiss all suits against the filibusters,⁵⁵ and the friends of Cuban liberty in the city gathered at Lafayette Square and fired thirty-one salves of artillery for the Union and one additional for Cuba.⁵⁶

⁴⁷Courier, February 27, 1851. The Picayune, February 15, 1851, thought that in the event of another hung jury the government should dismiss the Henderson case else it would appear as a persecution.

⁴⁸The Crescent, February 17, 1851, doubted that another jury could be obtained in the city.

⁴⁹Bulletin, February 17, 1851; Daily Delta, February 18, 1851.

⁵⁰Daily Delta, February 27, 1851. The Crescent, February 28, 1851, concurred with the Delta when it declared that almost every man who was summoned had made up his mind or was incompetent to serve from other causes.

⁵¹Courier, February 27, 1851.

⁵²Daily Delta, March 2, 1851. For the composition of this jury see ibid., March 5, and the Bulletin, March 3, 1851.

⁵³Bulletin, March 7, 1851.

⁵⁴Bulletin, March 8, 1851; Daily Delta, March 8, 1851.

⁵⁵"Late Cuba State Trials," loc. cit., 308.

⁵⁶Daily Delta, March 8, 1851.

Press and public interest was never aroused over the Henderson cases and as they slowly dragged along the defense drew the scorn of some journals.⁵⁷ Many others asserted that they found the whole affair tedious and totally lacking in interest,⁵⁸ and it was added that the public as well as the press took no interest in the proceedings.⁵⁹ When the charges were finally dropped against all persons after the third Henderson suit, a relief was acknowledged.⁶⁰ Excitement over the Cuban expedition was declared to have ceased everywhere.⁶¹

Far greater public attention was to be focussed on the John A. Quitman issue in the filibustering indictments than in the actual Henderson trials. Quitman had been indicted along with fifteen others in June, 1850, for his connection with the Cardenas expedition.⁶² At that time he was governor of Mississippi and when notified of his indictment he subsequently refused to stand trial until the expiration of his term of office. Any other course, he announced, would be degrading to the sovereign state of Mississippi.⁶³

⁵⁷True Delta, January 22, 1851; Orleanian, January 10, 1851; La Union, January 10, 1851, as quoted in the Courier, January 10, and the Daily Delta, January 18, 1851. La Union was the only Spanish newspaper in New Orleans at that time. It was founded in the early months of 1851, and was edited tri-weekly by V. Aleman, E. J. Gomez, and I. A. Irisarri. Cohen's New Orleans Directory (1851), 223. The paper followed an ultra pro-Spanish policy and was vitriolic toward the whole Cuban movement. No copies of this paper were available for research on this thesis.

⁵⁸Bee, January 8, 10, February 4, 1851; Courier, January 7, 1851; Orleanian, January 10, 1851; True Delta, January 7, 1851.

⁵⁹True Delta, January 7, 22, 1851; Orleanian, January 10, 1851.

⁶⁰Bulletin, March 8, 1851.

⁶¹Courier, January 23, 1851.

⁶²In the spring of 1850 Quitman had entertained Lopez for several days at his official mansion at Jackson, Mississippi, and had been seen later associating with Lopez in New Orleans. The Cuban had often referred to Quitman as the "American General" who was to command future expeditions to Cuba. Lastly Quitman confessed that he knew the Cardenas expeditionaries had also procured arms from the Mississippi arsenal, but declared that he was not actually implicated in it. H. S. Foote, in the Weekly Delta, August 4, 1851.

⁶³Quitman to H. J. Harris, United States Attorney, November 9, 1850, in Claiborne, Quitman, II, 71. Quitman's term ended in January, 1852. Crescent, December 28, 1850.

Quitman's action was to precipitate a heated press battle in New Orleans. His position was vigorously defended by the Delta which merely enlarged on the governor's arguments.⁶⁴ Both the Courier and the Delta thought Quitman's enemies were persecuting him, and they were outspoken in his defense.⁶⁵ Conversely there were many other journals which were indignant at Quitman's refusal to submit to arrest before the expiration of his term.⁶⁶ Quitman's violation of the federal law in Louisiana and subsequent claim to immunity from punishment by virtue of his state office was decried by some papers as being contrary to the theory that all men were equal before the law.⁶⁷ However, when the writ of Quitman's arrest was issued and served on him at Jackson, Mississippi, on February 3, 1851, he resigned his post the same day. He also addressed a proclamation to the people of Mississippi giving the reason for his resignation.⁶⁸ The content of the proclamation called forth more editorial conflict from the New Orleans press. The Delta again lauded Quitman's action and gloried in his self-sacrifice.⁶⁹ Other journals, however, highly disapproved of the wording of the proclamation which they thought carried highly dangerous sectional

⁶⁴Daily Delta, February 7, 1851.

⁶⁵Daily Delta, January 21, 1851; Courier, February 6, 8, 1851. The Courier, February 8, blamed President Fillmore for Quitman's persecution.

⁶⁶The True Delta, February 14, 1851, carried the most caustic refutation of Quitman's position.

⁶⁷Picayune, February 5, 1851; Crescent, July 8, December 26, 1850; Bulletin, February 10, 1851. The True Delta, July 3, 1850, thought that Mississippi could hardly be supposed serious in its ridiculous stand that its governor was inviolable to the laws of another state, or of the nation.

⁶⁸Claiborne, Quitman, II, 65-66, 74-75. The text of his proclamation is given in ibid., 65-66. Quitman resigned in spite of the request of many of his friends in Mississippi that he refuse arrest and thus precipitated a conflict between state and federal authorities which would soon involve other southern states. Ibid., 64-65.

⁶⁹Daily Delta, February 8, 1851; Weekly Delta, February 17, 1851.

doctrines, contrary to national ideals.⁷⁰ Upon Quitman's arrival in New Orleans, the Courier stated that the comedy of the Cuba State Trials took a more grandiose turn when Quitman faced the court.⁷¹ Quitman soon yielded his right for trial to Henderson⁷² and the latter's final trial began. It was asserted that public sympathy was for Quitman and that he was the object of the crowd's special attention when he left the courtroom.⁷³ Shortly thereafter an immense crowd gave Quitman a serenade at Hewlett's Hotel which he graciously acknowledged from the balcony.⁷⁴ Soon after the dismissal of all the suits by Hunton, numerous friends of Quitman's in New Orleans gave a banquet in his honor at the St. Louis Hotel.⁷⁵ One of the three city recorders, and several aldermen of New Orleans, were present and gave toasts, as were several other prominent citizens of the city.⁷⁶ In Quitman's test he was very sympathetic toward the Cardenas liberators of Cuba and he received loud applause for his statements.⁷⁷

Shortly after the government suits against the sixteen men had been dismissed, President Fillmore, believing that the Cuban movement in America

⁷⁰True Delta, February 8, 14, 1851; Bulletin, February 10, 1851. The Pisayune, February 9, 12, 1851, objected to the wording of Quitman's proclamation but was not so vigorous in its disapproval of it.

⁷¹Courier, February 8, 1851.

⁷²See footnote 45 of this chapter.

⁷³Claiborne, Quitman, II, 75-76.

⁷⁴Daily Delta, February 8, 1851; Courier, February 8, 10, 1851.

⁷⁵Daily Delta, March 11, 13, 14, 1851; Weekly Delta, March 17, 1851; Pisayune, March 13, 1851; True Delta, March 14, 1851. About a hundred persons were present at the Quitman dinner. Daily Delta, March 14, 1851. The limited number was ascribed to the crowded condition of New Orleans, the brief notice given, and the high price of the tickets. True Delta, March 14; Daily Delta, March 14, 1851.

⁷⁶The Recorder was Joseph Genois of the First Municipality, and the Aldermen were L. E. Hooper, C. D. Yancey, William Laughlin, and John Sewall. The other guests of greatest prominence were Alexander Walker and J. D. B. De Bow who also gave toasts. Daily Delta, March 14, 1851.

⁷⁷Daily Delta, March 14, 1851.

had not ceased, issued a proclamation against participation in such activity.⁷⁸ Fillmore's proclamation, even as that of his predecessor, Taylor, was to encounter a none too favorable reception at New Orleans. True it was unqualifiedly endorsed by the Bulletin, the Crescent and La Union,⁷⁹ but the ultra-conservative True Delta was uncertain "whether to condemn the proclamation or to deplore its necessity." This paper remained true to its policy when it concluded that the president's course was both worthy and required of him.⁸⁰ At the time the Picayune contented itself with merely reproducing the document,⁸¹ but its subsequent editorial policy indicated decisively that it disapproved of the president's proclamation.⁸² It was observed by the Orleanian that the president was over-alarmed, and unnecessarily so, because a mountain had been made out of a molehill.⁸³ The two radical Democratic journals left little doubt as to their viewpoint. The Courier, pursuing a more moderate policy of the two, was willing to respect treaties, but argued that treaties were not violated if Cubans bought arms in this country and then left to liberate their country, or if generous Americans followed them of their own free will. Treaties were only broken if military expeditions were organized on American soil. The Courier conceded Fillmore's right to disperse these. However when a majority of Cubans had engaged in a struggle for freedom against despotism, Americans would justly give them active aid.

⁷⁸The proclamation was issued April 25, 1851. It was essentially aimed at foreigners who were declared to be agitating for such a movement, and their motives were asserted to be ones of robbery and plunder. The penalty for engaging in such an expedition was to be a fine of not more than three thousand dollars, and an imprisonment of not more than three years. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, V, 111.

⁷⁹Bulletin, August 16, 1851; La Union as quoted by the Daily Delta, May 24, 1851; Crescent as quoted by the Daily Delta, May 17, 1851.

⁸⁰True Delta, May 6, 1851.

⁸¹Picayune, May 3, 4, 1851.

⁸²See footnotes 31, 38 of chapter five of this thesis.

⁸³Orleanian, May 6, 1851.

Fillmore's indictment of foreigners in his proclamation was deemed narrow and ungenerous.⁸⁴ The opposition of the Delta to the document was as unrelenting as it was caustic. The president's unfavorable mention of the activity of foreigners and his assertion that the expeditions were for purposes of robbery and plunder drew the unceasing hostility of this organ.⁸⁵ Fillmore was proclaimed a "would-be despot" who was an enemy to the south⁸⁶ in that his policy would convert Cuba into a second St. Domingo.⁸⁷ As the administration continued its stringent opposition policy toward expeditionary activities in the spring and summer of 1851, the Courier and the Delta remained its most bitter critics,⁸⁸ while the New Orleans Whigs, officially at least, praised Fillmore's conduct of affairs.⁸⁹

Thus it was that the Gerdemas expedition led directly to the Cuba State Trials of 1850-51. These trials not only revealed much of American aid that had been given Lopez in the previous expedition by such persons as Sigur, Henderson, Augustin, and others, but they were also to demonstrate that the filibusters had retained much public support in New Orleans, and that there was at least a very active minority in the city which was interested in preventing any convictions. The actual trials of Lopez and Henderson dragged out from June, 1850, to March, 1851, and they soon degenerated into legalistic interpretations and quibbling. This quickly lost its appeal for the press and public. Quitman's indictment

⁸⁴Courier, May 3, 1851.

⁸⁵Daily Delta, May 7, 14, 1851; Weekly Delta, May 12, 1851.

⁸⁶Daily Delta, May 6, 1851.

⁸⁷Daily Delta, May 3, 5, 1851.

⁸⁸See footnote 35 of chapter seven of this thesis.

⁸⁹At the Second Congressional District meeting of the Whigs, held at Donaldsonville, Louisiana, with the New Orleans caucus present, the party fully endorsed Fillmore's policy by resolution. Daily Delta, August 13, 1851.

under the Neutrality Law publically aligned the Mississippi governor with the expeditionaries, and lent more significance to the affair. When the government dismissed all indictments after the third unsuccessful trial of Henderson, that action was taken as a distinct victory for Quitman and the expeditionaries, and friends of Cuban liberty in New Orleans and elsewhere rejoiced. Fillmore's proclamation against Cuban filibustering activity only kept alive the controversy among New Orleans journals.

CHAPTER V

PREPARATIONS FOR AND EXCITEMENT OVER THE LAST LOPEZ EXPEDITION

"We shall be glad to see Cuba free. We should prefer that her emancipation from foreign dominion were effected peaceably by purchase and annexation to the United States, but if her people will or cannot wait, . . . we cannot raise a voice to discourage them, or to keep from them such succor as men fully appraised of the hazards they encounter, and the responsibilities they assume, are willing to tender them." Picayune, August 21, 1851.

After a quiet summer New Orleans was projected into a great state of excitement and speculation in late July, 1851, over the news of a new Cuban revolution. Immediately a jubilant populace held large mass meetings, speakers urged that aid be sent Cuba, Cuban bonds were printed and sold, hundreds of expeditionaries enlisted, many of whom were residents in New Orleans, a ship was purchased, and a general enthusiasm was prevalent. Again American aid, much of it given by individuals in New Orleans, was the most instrumental factor in enabling Lopez's last expedition to organize. L. J. Sigur was the directing spirit behind the venture. By virtue of a warning from a member of the Custom House in New Orleans, the expedition was enabled to get underway without government interference. In spite of the government's professed ignorance of the departure, a large crowd knew of it and cheered the filibusters as they embarked. After some weeks of suspense over the fate of the expeditionaries, the joyful news was received that they had landed in Cuba.

The Cuban question was to languish during the spring and early summer of 1851 although an attempt was made by Cuban patriots in the city to raise a military spirit. Several volunteer uniform organizations were formed in

the city,¹ and military parades were held.² The movement was indirectly aided as the result of an act of the Louisiana legislature in 1850 when that body had declared that a yearly sum of \$5,000 for the next two years was to be paid the Louisiana Legion of New Orleans, and all the volunteer companies to be formed in that city.³ The Delta was strong in its praise of the military revival,⁴ and L. J. Sigur was said to have been the guiding spirit of it.⁵ On May 19, there had been a large and tumultuous celebration of the anniversary of the landing of the Cardenas expedition at Cuba.⁶ This celebration was countered by a Spanish parade in New Orleans which was quite large. The procession headed by a band marched through the streets of the city shouting, "Death to Lopez!"⁷ But in spite of these undercurrents, the Cuban question did not occupy the populace at the time.

On July 22 and 23, the city was startled and thrown into a great excitement, almost a delirious joy, over the news of a Cuban revolution.⁸

¹The Emmet Guards, Jackson Rifles, Tracy Blues, Emeralds, and the Melpomenians were among those volunteer companies organized. See the Daily Delta, April 23, May 8, May 10, July 9, 1851.

²Daily Delta, May 2, July 6, 1851.

³Official Journal of the Proceedings of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, First Session--Third Legislature, March 20, 1850, 176-77. See also Acts Passed by the Third Legislature of the State of Louisiana at Their Session Held and Begun in the Town of Baton Rouge on the 21st Day of January, 1850 New Orleans, 1850, 245.

⁴Daily Delta, April 23, May 6, July 6, 1851. The Crescent however disapproved of the military movement. Daily Delta, May 6, 1851.

⁵Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 68.

⁶Daily Delta, May 16, 20, 1851.

⁷Ibid., May 25, 1851.

⁸Bulletin, July 23, 1851; Bee, July 23, 1851; Daily Delta, July 23, 1851; Picayune, July 23, 1851; Orleanian, July 24, 1851. The Daily Delta, July 23, asserted that the enthusiasm of the city was as strong as when favorable military tidings used to reach the city during the Mexican War. The Orleanian, July 24, stated that it heard of no one who did not approve of the Cuban revolt.

In their jubilation some young men obtained a cannon and fired numerous salutes while waving the flag of free Cuba.⁹ The Delta issued an extra and within an hour three thousand copies of the paper were distributed.¹⁰ Toward evening without any preconcerted arrangement,¹¹ a great public mass meeting, presided over by M. M. Cohen,¹² was held at Lafayette Square.¹³ Other prominent citizens were elected honorary officers,¹⁴ and still others composed the committee on Cuban resolutions.¹⁵ The resolutions which were drawn up and adopted quite definitely endorsed the Cuban revolution and favored dispatching Cuban aid.¹⁶ The speakers, General Felix Houston and Mr. Daly, endorsed and urged the resolutions.¹⁷ After the termination of the affair, a crowd of "great magnitude" marched down St. Charles street to the tune of Yankee Doodle, while waving Cuban flags.¹⁸ Numerous Cuban

⁹Daily Delta, July 23, 1851; Orleanian, July 24, 1851.

¹⁰Daily Delta, July 23, 1851.

¹¹Ibid., July 23, 24, 1851.

¹²Courier, July 24, 1851; Daily Delta, July 24, 1851; True Delta, July 24, 1851; Picayune, July 24, 1851. Cohen had been United States Commissioner for the state of Louisiana in 1849 and had assisted Justice Bright in the Rey abduction trials in July of that year. See footnote 9 of chapter two of this thesis.

¹³Daily Delta, July 23, 1851; Courier, July 24, 1851. The True Delta, July 24, asserted that almost two thousand persons were present.

¹⁴William Monaghan and Benjamin Campell were elected vice-presidents, and Durant da Ponte was the most prominent secretary elected. Daily Delta, July 24, 1851; True Delta, July 24, 1851; Picayune, July 24, 1851. Monaghan was an agent for military claims in New Orleans, and he was one of the seven men who had contributed toward Sigur's \$7,500 arms bond for the Cardenas venture. See footnote 18 of chapter three.

¹⁵The most prominent member of the committee on resolutions was Perry S. Warfield. True Delta, July 24, 1851; Picayune, July 24, 1851. Warfield was a prominent New Orleans barrister who had assisted in the prosecution of Espansa for the alleged abduction of Garcia Rey. See footnote 46 of chapter two of this thesis.

¹⁶The resolutions were as follows: the Cuban revolution is deeply sympathized with; the American people will not tolerate any interference by European powers in the political affairs of America; it is the "social right and imperative duty" of Americans "to give aid and comfort by all legal means" to the "oppressed Cubans. Daily Delta, July 24, 1851; Picayune, July 24, 1851; True Delta, July 24, 1851.

¹⁷Picayune, July 24, 1851.

¹⁸Ibid., July 24, 1851.

mass meetings followed,¹⁹ prominent speakers urged that aid be sent to Cuba,²⁰ and several well-known men in city and state politics served on the various Cuban committees.²¹ A committee appointed to raise funds for the cause of Cuba was said to have had encouraging success.²² The excitement and speculation raised by the first tidings of the Cuban revolt were to increase in tempo by the first days in August.²³ It was in the midst of this enthusiasm that Lopez's last expedition sailed on August 3, 1851.²⁴

The press in New Orleans took a very keen interest in the Cuban revolution from the outset and assumed decided positions on the progress and scope of the revolt, the right and advisability of dispatching aid to Cuba, and even candidly discussed the motives of the leaders of the filibusters and the composition of that body. Several journals were at first skeptical about the scope of the revolt and thought it not widespread.²⁵ But as July drew to a close, this skepticism was not so pronounced, and it was over-

¹⁹Daily Delta, July 25, August 3, 1851. The Daily Delta, August 3, stated that thousands attended the Cuban meeting of August 2, whereas the Orleanian, August 3, observed that the meeting was not well attended, due perhaps to the inclement weather.

²⁰Perry S. Warfield, D. I. Ricardo, and Colonel Field agitated for Cuban aid. Pierre Soule, Alexander Walker, and Randall Hunt were scheduled to make speeches on August 2, but they failed to put in an appearance. Daily Delta, August 3, 1851.

²¹Isaac Johnson, Attorney General for the State of Louisiana; M. M. Cohen, United States Commissioner for the State of Louisiana in 1849; Joseph Genois, Recorder for the First Municipality of New Orleans; D. Corcoran, part owner of the Delta; Alexander Walker, prominent lawyer, journalist, and contributor to the Delta; Cyprion Dufour, prominent New Orleans lawyer; Durante da Ponte, editor of the Courier; Felix Houston, Kentuckian and ex-Mexican War general; Cuthbert Bullitt, commission merchant in the city; and J. F. H. Claiborne, New Orleans newspaper editor, were the most prominent men serving on Cuban committees. See the Daily Delta, July 29, 1851; Courier, July 29, 1851; Daily Delta, August 3, 1851.

²²Daily Delta, July 31, 1851.

²³Crescent, July 25, 1851; Picayune, August 1, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 4, 1851; Schlesinger, loc. cit., 212, alleged that when he arrived in New Orleans on July 28, 1851, he found all in a blaze of excitement about Cuba. Cuban flags and placards were reported to have been everywhere. "Cuba was the topic of the newspapers, the Exchange, the street corners, and the barrooms. It even ascended into the pulpit."

²⁴See footnotes 51, 52 of this chapter.

²⁵True Delta, July 23, 1851; Crescent, July 23, 1851; Bulletin, July 23, 1851; La Union as quoted in the Bee, July 24, 1851; Bee, July 24, 1851.

weighed by the enthusiastic opposition.²⁶ On the contrary many journals from the beginning credited the Cuban revolution as being bona fide and well-supported,²⁷ and their stand was reinforced by more cautious organs.²⁸ The only papers opposed to sending armed aid to Cuba were the Crescent²⁹ and the True Delta.³⁰ Many journals in the city agitated almost immediately to launch a filibustering expedition to Cuba, declaring that volunteers for such an expedition must be regarded as patriots and liberators.³¹ Even conservative organs did not look with indifference at the appeal of Cuba for aid.³² After Lopez's expedition had gotten underway some journals concerned themselves in part with such questions as the right of the expeditionaries to sail and the duty of the government to prevent them from aiding Cuba.³³ The Bulletin advocated giving aid to Cuba as far as it could be done in keeping with our national relations, but denied the doctrine of the right of expatriation under which the expeditionaries

²⁶The Bee, August 2 and 11, 1851, still retained its doubt as to the extent of the revolution. The Crescent, August 12, 1851, was not at all optimistic about the chances for filibustering success. The Orleanian, August 16, was dubious about the probability for the expeditionaries' success. It is significant that press warnings with one exception were issued after the expedition had sailed on August 3. At that time the city was apparently optimistic as well as enthusiastic.

²⁷Courier, July 23, 26, 31, 1851; Picayune, July 22, 26, August 1, 1851; Daily Delta, August 6, 1851.

²⁸Bee, July 28, 1851; Orleanian, August 1, 1851; Bulletin, August 1, 6, 1851.

²⁹The Crescent, July 23, 1851, thought that another filibustering expedition would stamp America as a "land of lawless freebooters."

³⁰The True Delta, July 29, August 3, 1851, viewed the expedition as one gotten up by "unprincipled speculators," and hence opposed it.

³¹Picayune, July 22, 23, August 1, 1851; Bee, July 28, 1851; Courier, July 28, 31, August 1, 1851; Orleanian, July 23, 24, 1851.

³²The Bee, July 28, advocated helping Cuba by all possible means short of personal aid until it was verified that an expedition would have reasonable prospects of success. If America saw that the Cuban rebels could sustain themselves for some months there would be no lack of personal aid. The True Delta, July 27, August 9, 1851, carried the same general tenor of argument as the Bee, July 28, 1851.

³³The Daily Delta, August 20, 1851, thought these questions the most important of the day. The debate over these issues found their way into politics. At a meeting of the Whig delegation at Donaldsonville, Louisiana, resolutions were adopted which approved Fillmore's plan of suppressing the Lopez expedition. New Orleans Whigs were present at this meeting. Picayune, August 13, 1851.

defended their actions.³⁴ The True Delta thought Lopez's expedition was a violation of our national laws even though it was launched with the "tacit approval" of our government.³⁵ Conversely some journals favored "active sympathy" with Cuba,³⁶ and counseled against governmental interference with the expedition.³⁷ The conservative Bee declared that the government would doubtless close its eyes to the expedition, because the movement was so popular and because many government officials shared the public sympathy for the Cuban movement.³⁸ Some journals declared little sympathy with the expedition because they believed the majority connected with the Cuban venture to be adventurers, lovers of excitement,³⁹ and speculators.⁴⁰ Some of the leaders, they asserted, had been carried away by the idea of a Cuban mass insurrection and the ease with which Cuba could be captured, and had in turn deceived others wittingly or unwittingly.⁴¹ Conversely many journals staunchly defended the filibusters. Not only had Lopez and Sigur been the objects of general interest in the city before the expedition sailed,⁴² but after it left the city many journals preferred to

³⁴Bulletin, August 6, 16, 1851.

³⁵True Delta, August 9, 1851.

³⁶Courier, August 6, 1851.

³⁷Ibid., August 6, 13, 1851; Picayune, August 7, 21, 1851.

³⁸Bee, August 8, 1851, affirmed that popular sentiment for the expedition would probably take precedence over the moral obligation of the government. The Picayune, August 7, 1851, advocated a very soft application of the Neutrality Law since that law was declared to be in opposition to the rights of the individual man, and the instincts of the people.

³⁹Orleanian, July 30, 1851. The Picayune, August 7, 1851, cautioned young men against going to Cuba simply for the adventure to be found there.

⁴⁰Orleanian, July 30, 1851; True Delta, July 29, August 3, 1851. The True Delta, August 17, 1851, declared speculators in revolutions, holders and sellers of Cuban bonds, and parties furnishing the equipment for the venture were interested in launching the expedition to Cuba. This paper also admitted that men distinguished by "truth and integrity" also supported the Cuban expedition.

⁴¹Orleanian, July 30, 1851; Picayune, August 21, 1851; La Union, as quoted by the Daily Delta, August 14, 1851.

⁴²Schlesinger, loc. cit., 212; Boletin, Havana, 1904, 19, quoted by Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 90; Herbert Ashbury, The French Quarter, an Informal History of the New Orleans Underworld (New York, 1936), 177, 181.

call the expeditionaries liberators,⁴³ and their motives were championed.⁴⁴

In the meantime final preparations were being made for the expedition. In order to raise funds for the venture Cuban bonds were again issued and these were sold as script.⁴⁵ Many of these bonds were purchased in New Orleans.⁴⁶ After selling his share in the Delta, Sigur personally purchased the ship, Pamporo, for \$40,000 and placed it at the disposal of the expeditionaries.⁴⁷ Volunteers were not lacking and it was asserted that a force of thousands could have been raised if the requisite transportation had been available.⁴⁸ Lopez and his men left New Orleans earlier than they had intended because of the favorable Cuban tidings of the revolution,⁴⁹ and the warning received on August 1, from a Custom House official, that the Pamporo was to be seized by the government the following Monday, August 3.⁵⁰ Accordingly the men were hastily assembled, coal and supplies were taken aboard, and the Pamporo left Lafayette at four o'clock Monday

⁴³Courier, August 8, 20, 1851; Bulletin, August 18, 1851. The Courier, August 15, called the expeditionaries "heroic volunteers."

⁴⁴Courier, August 8, 20, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 18, 1851. The Orleanian, August 4, 1851, wished the filibusters well as long as they were in the service of freedom.

⁴⁵These bonds bore interest at the rate of six per cent and were redeemable after the independence of Cuba had been established. They were secured by the public lands and property of Cuba. John S. Fendall, History of New Orleans, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1922), I, 170; Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions, 32; Asbury, French Quarter, 181. The bonds issued at this time were similar in every respect to those issued to finance the Cardenas expedition. See footnotes 12-14 of chapter three of this thesis.

⁴⁶Kendall, History of New Orleans, I, 170; Asbury, French Quarter, 181. Both Kendall and Asbury attributed part of the interest in the expedition to the Cuban bond investments made by citizens of New Orleans.

⁴⁷Daily Delta, September 25, 1851; Schlesinger, loc. cit., 213. Sigur had sold his interest in the Delta in June, 1851, to John P. Weiss, newspaper man. Daily Delta, September 15, 1851. At this time Lopez was still residing at the home of Sigur while final preparations were being made. Schlesinger, loc. cit., 213.

⁴⁸Schlesinger, loc. cit., 213; Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions, 72-73.

⁴⁹Jones, Cuba in 1851, 35. Asbury, French Quarter, 183, asserted that the favorable news was purposely disseminated by Governor General Coucha of Cuba so as to inveigle the expedition into starting before their full strength had been gathered.

⁵⁰William L. Crittenden was the official who gave the warning. Schlesinger, loc. cit., 213.

morning.⁵¹ A large crowd had assembled to see the ship off and the expeditionaries were cheered loudly when they embarked.⁵² Due to the overcrowded state of the vessel, Lopez landed the expedition at Balize and thinned out the members so that 435 men remained.⁵³ Their ship continued to the mouth of the Mississippi, where an anchor was dropped, and repairs were made.⁵⁴ It was not until Wednesday, August 5, that the Pampero left the mouth of the river for Cuba.⁵⁵ When the ship finally sailed for Cuba it carried at least fifty residents of New Orleans,⁵⁶ several of whom were serving as officers.⁵⁷ There were also three ex-employees of the Custom

⁵¹Schlesinger, loc. cit., 213. The Pampero had arrived in New Orleans on July 29, 1851, entered the Custom House the next day, reporting that her boilers had burnt out. The ship left the night of August 2, without clearance papers. Picayune, September 7, 1851.

⁵²Schlesinger, loc. cit., 214. Schlesinger alleged that all Lafayette seemed up and awake, and that a crowd of from ten to twelve thousand was at the wharf to see the expeditionaries leave. See also Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 91; Kendall, History of New Orleans, I, 170; Asbury, French Quarter, 183; Jones, Cuba in 1851, 35.

⁵³W. Scott Haynes Memorial to Congress, January 7, 1852, in Congressional Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXIV], 217. The Boletin, Havana, 1854, quoted by Caldwell, Lopez Expedition, 92, cited the number as 434. Schlesinger, loc. cit., 214, stated that slightly more than four hundred remained.

⁵⁴It was necessary to repair defective machinery, tranship arms, clear the decks of equipment, etc., because the hurried departure had prevented this. Schlesinger, loc. cit., 214.

⁵⁵Ibid., 215. This fact would indicate that the government authorities at New Orleans were either delinquent in the discharge of their duties because public opinion favored the launching of the expedition, or that they lacked the necessary forces to follow and suppress the expedition.

⁵⁶See the appendix for the names of the individual filibusters. This number was derived after a careful check of New Orleans newspapers, government documents, and other sources. See the Ree, September 5, 1851; Courier, August 23, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851, October 11, 1859; Picayune, September 4, 20, 1851; Presidio Departmental de la Habana, Havana, September 23, 1851, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 37; Haynes Memorial, Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXIV], 217; Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions, 126-30. The city of New Orleans and the State of Mississippi were declared to have contributed the bulk of the expeditionaries to the Cuban venture. Daily Delta, August 21, 1851. Captain Jackson's whole company of volunteer rifles, all individuals of which were residents of New Orleans, was persuaded to leave the Pampero because of its overcrowded state. They were to follow in the next expedition. Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 91.

⁵⁷W. Scott Haynes and W. L. Crittenden were colonels, J. A. Kelly and Victor Kerr were captains, R. G. Summers and James G. Owen were lieutenants, and Robert Ellis commanded the Sigur Guards.

House at New Orleans among the filibusters.⁵⁸

When Lopez and his men left New Orleans the city was greatly excited and speculation was rife about the probability of success of the Cuban revolution.⁵⁹ As the excitement grew daily,⁶⁰ the "public mind divided between hope and fear,"⁶¹ until the Cuban topic absorbed all other questions.⁶² When favorable news concerning the Cuban revolts reached New Orleans in mid-August the Courier ran off an extra edition of two thousand copies and its office was crowded with a large number of persons eager to obtain the latest Cuban news.⁶³ In spite of the intention to launch other expeditions from New Orleans soon after Lopez sailed,⁶⁴ the city settled down to an anxious watchful waiting for further news from Cuba sufficient to show that the people there were in the struggle.⁶⁵ In the absence of definite news over the fate of the Pampero, a painful uneasiness and uncertainty was acknowledged in the city.⁶⁶ Finally New Orleans on August 20

⁵⁸Victor Kerr and W. L. Crittenden had been in the Surveyor's department of the Custom House in New Orleans. R. C. Stanford had also been an official there. Cohen's New Orleans Directory, 1851, 224; Crittenden was a nephew of the Attorney General of the United States. He had served in the Mexican War with distinction, and since that time had been a resident of New Orleans. See the True Delta, August 24, 1851; Quisenberry, Lopez Expedition, 70, 73; Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 92.

⁵⁹Schlesinger, loc. cit., 582; Weekly Delta, August 5, 1851; Picayune, August 5, 1851.

⁶⁰Bulletin, August 6, 1851; Picayune, August 7, 1851; Courier, August 16, 1851; Orleanian, August 13, 1851.

⁶¹Schlesinger, loc. cit., 212.

⁶²Picayune, August 7, 1851; Orleanian, August 13, 1851. The Daily Delta, August 20, 1851, was so engrossed in the Cuban subject that it declared every man's views in that regard ought to be made public, be he Democrat or Whig. The Courier, August 15, stated that the press was besieged for information, and that Cuba was the topic of conversation in the barroom, parlor and street. Asbury, French Quarter, 183, stated that much of the excitement sprang from the Cuban bondholders who had been promised confiscated sugar plantations, and the wives of the common soldiers who had been offered substantial cash remunerations after Cuba had been conquered.

⁶³Courier, August 16, 1851.

⁶⁴Schlesinger, loc. cit., 582.

⁶⁵Picayune, August 7, 1851; Daily Delta, September 6, 1851.

⁶⁶Courier, August 15, 1851; Daily Delta, August 21, 1851; Bulletin, August 21, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851.

received definite assurance that the Pampero had landed at Cuba.⁶⁷ The news was received with relief by all classes of persons,⁶⁸ and the "sanguine and enthusiastic were out of all bounds...."⁶⁹

The organization and dispatch of the last Lopez expedition sharply revealed the general enthusiasm for the Cuban movement in New Orleans. From the time when the news of the Cuban revolution was first received on July 22 and 23, 1851, the project of an armed expedition to aid Cuba had the support of a majority of the press, and many prominent men in city and state politics identified themselves with the Cuban cause. Sigur sold his share of the Delta to buy a ship, the Pampero, for the filibusters, many persons in the city purchased Cuban bonds, and numerous residents there enlisted in the expedition. Three ex-officials of the Custom House at New Orleans were also to accompany Lopez to Cuba, and, interestingly enough, the filibusters evaded government suppression in the city through a warning given them by one of these Custom officers. Although the authorities professed to be unaware of the departure of the filibusters, a large crowd cheered them as they embarked. Governmental inertia was further displayed by the fact that after it was publicly known in the city that the expedition had left, the Pampero laid over for two days at the mouth of the Mississippi without any molestation whatever. After the expeditionaries had sailed a majority of the press in the city continued to regard them as liberators, and much concern was felt for their safety. The news of their arrival in Cuba gave a sense of relief to all thinking persons in New Orleans, and great joy to many ardent spirits.

⁶⁷The news was brought by persons on the brig Mary Elizabeth.

⁶⁸Bulletin, August 21, 1851. The True Delta, August 21, opposition paper to the whole Cuban movement, carried a rather favorable notice on the expeditionaries when it learned that the Pampero had landed.

⁶⁹Crescent, August 21, 1851. See also the Daily Delta, August 21, 1851; Idem, August 21, 1851; Courier, August 20, 1850; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851.

CHAPTER VI

THE NEW ORLEANS RIOTS

Thousands in this city clenched their fists and cried for revenge after receiving the news of the Crittenden executions. The information ran like wildfire through the city and everywhere cries of the deepest indignation were heard. Courier, August 23, 1851.

New Orleans was electrified on August 21, 1851, by the information that W. L. Crittenden and his command of fifty men, a small detachment from Lopez's main body in Cuba, had been captured by the Spanish, condemned by order of Captain-General Concha, executed, and their dead and dying bodies left to the mercies of an infuriated Havana mob. The press in the city immediately fanned a spirit of revenge against Spain and, aided by some unfortunate incidents, riots against Spanish sympathizers broke out in the city that afternoon. The local authorities were unprepared for the emergency and remained paralyzed and impotent before the fury of the mob. In addition the indifferent or encouraging attitude of most of the citizenry made it possible for the rioters to wreak destruction almost at will on many Spanish establishments in the city, including La Union, ultra Spanish newspaper, and the Spanish consulate. After about eight hours of violence and vandalism had been perpetrated, the authorities finally moved with concerted action and quelled the disorders. The city press universally deplored the riots, and declared that the rioters were almost entirely composed of the more ignorant and desperate classes of persons. All the journals were firm in their conviction that the impotence of civic authorities was responsible for the extent and duration of the riots.

At an early hour on Thursday, August 21, 1851,¹ the appalling news was brought to New Orleans that W. L. Crittenden and his command of fifty Americans² had been captured off the island of Cuba while attempting to escape in boats,³ had been taken to Havana, given a summary trial, condemned, and shot.⁴ After the execution the dead and dying men were reported to have been left to the fury of an irate Havana mob which performed acts of violence upon them.⁵ The press reaction was one of profound shock for the brutality of the affair,⁶ mingled with a grief for the dead.⁷ Immediately there resounded an overwhelming desire for revenge on Spain,⁸ and it was predicted

¹According to Calderon de la Barca's report the information came at eight A.M. Calderon to William S. Derrick, Acting Secretary of State, September 5, 1851, in Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXV], 34. The Empire City carried the news. Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Piscayune, August 22, 1851.

²A. D. Crossman, Mayor of New Orleans, to Logan Hunton, September 18, 1851, in Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXV], 35; Crescent, August 22, 1851.

³Webster to Calderon, November 13, 1851, Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXV], 38; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851. Crittenden's command had been separated from Lopez's main body so as to serve as a guard for provisions and arms. After the Spaniards cut them off from Lopez's command, Crittenden's men became disheartened by a lack of food and a knowledge of the country. They retreated to the shore and attempted to escape from Cuba in boats, but were captured the second day out. Caldwell, Lopez Expedition, 96, 101.

⁴Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 35.

⁵Ibid., 35; Crossman to Council of Municipality No. 2, August 26, 1851, Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., [XXV], 36; Piscayune, August 21, 1851; Crescent, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 23, 1851.

⁶Bulletin, August 22, 1851; Piscayune, August 21, 22, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851; True Delta, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, August 22, 1851; Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36. The Bee, August 23, and the Crescent, August 22, did not object so much to the executions as they did to the indignities done to the dead and dying by the mobs.

⁷There were forty Americans in Crittenden's command who were executed. Piscayune, August 21, 1851. Most of these men were well-known in New Orleans. Webster to Calderon, loc. cit., 32; Orleanian, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851. W. L. Crittenden, Victor Kerr, F. Hersey and Charles Smith, residents of New Orleans, were among the victims. Daily Delta, August 22, 23, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851.

⁸Crescent, August 22, 1851; Courier, August 21, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Piscayune, August 22, 1851.

on many sides that the government would be powerless to prevent the many expeditions for revenge to Cuba which would quickly follow.⁹ The recital by the press of the gruesome details of the execution, and the subsequent indignities, aroused the emotions of the people to "the highest pitch of excitement,"¹⁰ until many journals confessed that they had rarely if ever seen the populace as profoundly moved.¹¹ The Courier flung forth the banner of the United States with the name of Cuba emblazoned on its fold.¹² Hundreds appeared on the streets with crepe upon their arms, bells tolled,¹³ and from early in the morning until evening minute guns were fired in honor of the heroic dead.¹⁴ All this excitement brought an immense throng on the streets which gathered in groups and became "exceedingly excited" at the Spanish government for its brutal acts.¹⁵

Other incidents occurring the same day contributed to the furor and heightened the anti-Spanish feeling. Mr. Brincio, secretary of the Spanish consul, arriving on the Empire City from Havana, had in his charge letters from the executed prisoners directed to their friends in America.¹⁶ At first the consul intended to forward the letters to the State Department at Washington as was the usual case for persons dying abroad.¹⁷ However many persons in New Orleans called for their letters at the post-office

⁹Courier, August 21, 1851; Crescent, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851.

¹⁰Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36; Logan Hutton to Derrick, September 25, 1851, Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXV], 34-35. Hutton's letter was written in his name by E. A. Bradford, Acting District Attorney at New Orleans.

¹¹Courier, August 21, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Crescent, August 22, 1851.

¹²Courier, August 22, 1851.

¹³Crescent, August 22, 1851.

¹⁴Courier, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Crescent, August 22, 1851.

¹⁵Picayune, August 22, 1851; Courier, August 22, 1851.

¹⁶Hutton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

¹⁷Picayune, August 22, 1851.

and uttered threats against the consul when they learned he had not deposited the letters there.¹⁸ These angry protests finally influenced the consul and he deposited the letters at the New Orleans post-office in mid-afternoon of the same day,¹⁹ but by that time the riots had gotten under way.²⁰

The immediate signal for the New Orleans riots of August 21, 1851, was furnished by the Spanish newspaper, La Union. That organ during its short existence had been an "intemperate and injudicious" sheet²¹ which had consistently levied abuse on beloved Americans and American institutions. Because of its general tactics it had previously drawn the censure of almost every other journal in the city.²² Even on the morning of the day of the riots threatening placards had been posted against La Union.²³ Learning of the mob sentiment against the paper, city officials called on the Spanish consul to induce him to suppress La Union's extra edition which that paper planned to devote to the executions at Havana. Although the consul gave his secretary these instructions in the presence of the Mayor of the city,²⁴ the extra appeared about 2:30 P.M. Its editorial remarks were reported to have justified the execution of Crittenden's men and exulted

¹⁸Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 36; Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35; Courier, August 22, 1851.

¹⁹The letters were received at 3:30 P.M., August 21. The following persons in New Orleans received letters from the filibusters: Stanton and Company, Colonel Robert W. James, Mrs. P. Allen, Daniel Heard, Edmund Doyle, Lucien Hensley, John McGuin, Mrs. Isabella Waters, Lewis J. Tourniquet, Colonel James G. Bryce, Mrs. J. Farzois, James Bulling, Henry Lanes, and Mr. Bunell. See Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 59.

²⁰The riots had begun about three P.M. Picayune, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851; Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

²¹Bulletin, August 22, 1851.

²²Oceanian, August 22, 1851; Bulletin, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851.

²³Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

²⁴Mayor Crossman and Joseph Genois, Recorder of the First Municipality, were the officials. Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 35.

over their fate.²⁵ The chief causes of the New Orleans riots may be ascribed to the following events: the news of the brutal indignities done to the Crittenden command, and a recital of these facts by the press with a loud demand for revenge on Spain; the failure of the Spanish consul to deposit immediately letters from the dead men at the New Orleans post-office; and finally, the vitriolic policy of La Union for the whole Cuban movement in addition to its ill-advised extra edition concerning the executions.

La Union was the first Spanish establishment to feel the fury of the mob. It had been rumored that the office of this paper would be attacked in the evening, but the authorities were informed of this plan and moved to forestall any violence.²⁶ The leaders of the riot then determined to attack the place in the afternoon,²⁷ and at about three P.M.²⁸ a crowd gathered at the establishment.²⁹ About twenty-five or thirty persons³⁰ entered the shop and proceeded to destroy all the forms, presses, and furniture, threw the type into the street,³¹ and scattered paper for a contemplated edition to the winds.³² The rioters went at their work in a cool and determined fashion,³³ and, although no police were there and no arrests made,³⁴ the participants received the "openly avowed sympathies of

²⁵Picayune, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, August 22, 1851. Hunton thought that La Union's extra edition was fuel on the flame. Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

²⁶Bee, August 22, 1851.

²⁷Ibid., August 22, 1851.

²⁸Bee, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851. Hunton's report stated that the attack came between three and four o'clock. Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

²⁹The office was in Exchange Alley below Conti street.

³⁰Bee, August 22, 1851. The Picayune, August 22, 1851, said that it was a small party.

³¹Picayune, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35; Calderon to Hunton, loc. cit., 33.

³²Daily Delta, August 22, 1851.

³³Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 36.

³⁴Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35.

many citizens" who were spectators.³⁵ No violence was committed on the persons in the establishment,³⁶ although some accounts assert that the editor narrowly escaped severe bodily harm.³⁷ The destruction of La Union was largely motivated by a feeling of revenge, but that which followed during the disorder of the day was due in a large measure to the spirit of plunder.³⁸

The general and disorderly rioting which continued almost at will the rest of that day and until late in the evening, and which resulted in much destruction of property belonging to Spaniards in the city, occurred in the First and Second Municipalities.³⁹ The greatest excitement was in the latter municipality.⁴⁰ The Third Municipality remained quiet but was apprehensive because the firing of cannon and ringing of bells produced a

³⁵Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 34-35.

³⁶Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 34-35; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, August 22, 1851; See, August 22, 1851.

³⁷The presence of the editor's wife and family were reported to have saved him from injury. Courier, August 22, 1851; Calderon's report, loc. cit., 33. The Crescent, August 22, claimed that the editor barely escaped with his life after Mayor Crossman interceded for him.

³⁸Bulletin, August 23, 1851.

³⁹Courier, August 23, 1851. Due to the miscellaneous population of New Orleans, the State Legislature in 1836 imposed a curious charter on the city. New Orleans was divided into three separate municipalities, each of which had a distinct government, police force, etc. However the three municipalities had a common Mayor and General Council. William J. Howe, "Municipal History of New Orleans," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, VII (Baltimore, 1889), 159-187; A. Oakley Hall, The Manhattaner in New Orleans, or Phases of 'Crescent City' Life (New York, 1851), 34-35. Such an arrangement lasted until April, 1852, when the three municipalities and the suburb of Lafayette were consolidated and given a new charter. Kendall, History of New Orleans, I, 172; Howe, loc. cit., 159-187.

⁴⁰Orleanian, August 22, 1851. The First Municipality was the old narrow and dirty city left to the French and Creoles. The Second Municipality was the American section and was inhabited by Anglo-Saxons and Irish. The Third Municipality was half a village, half a city. It was peopled by Dutch, Irish, and Spanish. Hall, Manhattaner in New Orleans, 35-36; Crescent, April 8, 1850.

belief that the cannon was being discharged by the rioters.⁴¹ During the day there was much confusion as the rioters paraded unsystematically from place to place, and small detachments separated themselves from larger bodies. The fact that disturbances were simultaneously occurring in different parts of the city, coupled with the indifference or encouragement given the rioters by many of the citizenry, made it extremely difficult for the police to suppress them.⁴² The only note of method observed about the rioting was that all demonstrations and destruction were committed at business establishments of Spaniards, some of whom were notoriously friendly to Spain. Not all of the places which the crowd visited were even partially destroyed,⁴³ but this fact was due to the pleadings of private citizens,⁴⁴ the Mayor and city officials,⁴⁵ and occasional police interference.⁴⁶ But very few arrests were made throughout the day,⁴⁷ and the crowd, after good-naturedly listening to the pleadings of officials,⁴⁸ visited and destroyed

⁴¹Orleanian, August 22, 1851.

⁴²See footnotes 96 and 97 of this chapter.

⁴³Crossman to Hutton, loc. cit., 36, stated that not one-fourth of the places visited were attacked.

⁴⁴Courier, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851. J. M. Caballero publicly thanked Judge Alexander Walker "of the Delta" for preventing the destruction of his property. Picayune, August 30, 1851.

⁴⁵Mayor Crossman and Sheriff Lewis forestalled the destruction of a Spanish coffee-house at the corner of Poydras and Tchoupitoulas by urging the mob to respect the law. Crossman to Hutton, loc. cit., 36; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851. Recorder Genois and Major-General Lewis dissuaded the crowd from violating Spanish White Hall. Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851.

⁴⁶The military partly dispersed the crowd after Hernandez's cigar store was "completely devastated." Daily Delta, August 23, 1851. The police interfered successfully to prevent violence at the Two World's Exchange. Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

⁴⁷Picayune, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; True Delta, August 23, 1851. The classic example of the inefficiency of the authorities occurred when Genois, Recorder of the First Municipality, and the police found seven or eight persons doing violence to the Spanish consulate and persuaded them to withdraw. No arrests were made. See footnote 60.

⁴⁸Picayune, August 22, 1851.

other Spanish business establishments throughout the city.⁴⁹ Violence occurred when Gonzales' cigar store was visited,⁵⁰ and both Gonzales and an unruly crowd lost their tempers.⁵¹ After this attack the crowd increased to a "countless multitude."⁵² There was also some bloodshed when a large crowd invaded and destroyed the Spanish vegetable market of the First Municipality.⁵³ Before the riots had run their course virtually a dozen Spanish coffee-houses, ale shops, and cigar stores were partially or entirely destroyed.⁵⁴ The total damage done to this property was officially estimated to have been from twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars.⁵⁵

The office of the Spanish consul was also to feel the full force of the riots. The consul, J. J. Laborde, asserted that his call to Mayor Crossman and Recorder Genois for military protection "was evaded in various ways," and, believing himself abandoned by the authorities and a militia reported to have been very hostile toward Spain, he left his post to hasten to the home of a friend.⁵⁶

⁴⁹Ibid., August 22, 1851; Courier, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

⁵⁰Gonzales was one of those Spaniards known to be bitter against the filibusters. Hutton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35; Picayune, August 22, 1851. His store was on the corner of Gravier and St. Charles in the Second Municipality. Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851.

⁵¹Hutton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁵²Bee, August 22, 1851.

⁵³Four persons were reported to have been wounded in the fray. Orleanian, August 22, 1851. The Daily Delta, August 23, made no note of any violence done to persons.

⁵⁴Calderon de la Barca included the fullest and probably most accurate report of the extent of the total damage done by the rioters. See Calderon to Derrick, loc. cit., 34. Also consult the Bee, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 23, 1851.

⁵⁵Property damage in the First Municipality was estimated to have been from \$6,000 to \$7,000 and that of the Second Municipality from \$10,000 to \$20,000. Hutton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁵⁶Laborde claimed that he was advised to leave his office by Mayor Crossman and Recorder Genois. Calderon to Hutton, loc. cit., 34. Mayor Crossman subsequently asserted that he had not seen Laborde after the riots had broken out. Crossman to Hutton, loc. cit., 36. Before the outbreak he had assured Laborde that he need have no fear for his safety. Picayune, September 23, 1851.

Between five and six P.M. Recorder Genois learned that the Spanish consulate was being threatened by a mob.⁵⁷ Arriving there he found a great crowd in the street outside the consulate,⁵⁸ the doors to the office broken open, and a group of seven or eight persons inside breaking the furniture. With great difficulty Genois at last persuaded the rioters to desist and withdraw without having done any serious damage. No arrests were made, and the place was merely nailed up and left without police guard. While the police went to other scenes of disorder,⁵⁹ the crowd seized the consul's sign and the Spanish flag and publicly burnt them at Lafayette square.⁶⁰ Meanwhile a headless effigy of the Spanish consul was borne through the principal streets.⁶¹ Within an hour after the repulsion of the first attack the rioters returned to the consulate and proceeded to wreck the place completely.⁶² The archives were destroyed or dumped into the street, the furniture was demolished, and portraits of the Captain General of Cuba and the Queen of Spain were defaced.⁶³ This time there was no interference at all from the police, and no despoiler of the consulate was later identified.⁶⁴ So great was the violence offered to the place that the Courier concluded that not even bayonets would have prevented the outburst against the consulate.⁶⁵

⁵⁷Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁵⁸The consulate was in the First Municipality on Bourbon street near St. Louis street. Hunton, loc. cit., 35; Bee, August 22, 1851.

⁵⁹Hunton, loc. cit., 35.

⁶⁰Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Calderon to Hunton, loc. cit., 33-34, stated that Genois himself tore down the sign to appease the mob. Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35, declared that the flag was torn to bits during the second attack on the consulate.

⁶¹Daily Delta, August 22, 1851. The Spanish consul at Mobile reported Laborde was burnt in effigy. Spanish consul at Mobile to Calderon, August 22, 1851, in Cong. Globe, 32 Cong., 1 Sess. [XXV], 33.

⁶²Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁶³Ibid., 35; Calderon to Hunton, loc. cit., 33-34; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

⁶⁴Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁶⁵Courier, August 22, 1851.

Due to the spontaneous riots and continued general disorder at eleven P.M.,⁶⁶ the city authorities at last took decisive steps to quell the outbreaks.⁶⁷ Mayor Crossman issued a proclamation calling on all law-abiding citizens to aid the authorities in restoring order,⁶⁸ the military was called out,⁶⁹ force was used, and the riots broken up by midnight.⁷⁰ It was accounted significant that in no instance was resistance offered the police and that quiet returned as soon as arrests were made.⁷¹ The military remained under arms Thursday night, August 21. The following day Crossman invited citizens to join special police for patrol duty,⁷² and again the military was on duty all night.⁷³ Certain citizens and establishments who had appealed to the Mayor for protection received it.⁷⁴ On Friday evening large crowds gathered at Municipal Hall and at King's Pavilion. They seemed anxious for further revenge, but private citizens and city officials half-persuaded and half-forced the crowds to disperse.

⁶⁶Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36.

⁶⁷Early in the afternoon provision had been made to have the military in readiness, but they were not called into service until Crossman's action at eleven P.M., at which time the riots had almost spent themselves. Picayune, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851.

⁶⁸Proclamation by Mayor Crossman, Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 56; Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁶⁹Crossman to Henry Frano, High Constable of Municipality No. 2, August 21, 1851, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 55; Crossman to Major-General G. L. Lewis, Commander of Louisiana Militia, in ibid., 56.

⁷⁰Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 36. The last arrests were made at midnight. See footnote 84 of this chapter.

⁷¹Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35; Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851.

⁷²Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36; Crossman to J. N. Hawthorn, Acting Recorder of Second Municipality, in Sen. Ex. Docs., 32 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, 56; Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁷³Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36; Crossman to Forno, August 22, 1851, loc. cit., 57.

⁷⁴Crossman to Hawthorn, loc. cit., 56; Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 36. The office of the True Delta was patrolled by request. Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36; Crossman to Forno, loc. cit., 57.

Small groups then wandered around the city piercing the night by their wild cries.⁷⁵ Although the revenge motive was still present in the minds of many no further damage was done, and any danger of renewal of the riots was precluded.⁷⁶

The New Orleans press was unanimous in its conviction that by far the greatest portion of destruction committed during the riots was attributable to the lower and more desperate classes of persons. The press was uniform in its assertion that the several hundred filibusters in the city were innocent of any participation in the riots,⁷⁷ and it was pointed out that the Kentucky filibusters served as special constables to maintain the peace.⁷⁸ All journals declared that few if any citizens of standing in New Orleans had engaged in the melée.⁷⁹ It was asserted that a floating population⁸⁰ of ruffians and thieves⁸¹ had taken advantage of the national feeling of insult felt in the city⁸² to plunder and steal.⁸³ A

⁷⁵Courier, August 23, 1851.

⁷⁶Crossman thought that if it were not for the very decided measures which he took the next day and the hearty response made by the citizens to them, there would have been a renewal of the riots of the previous day. Crossman to Hunton, loc. cit., 36.

⁷⁷Bulletin, August 23, 1851; True Delta, August 23, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851. The Picayune, August 22, 1851, noted that the police were determined to keep the filibusters out of the melée and searched for them in the crowd, forcibly taking away the two or three who were engaged in the riots.

⁷⁸Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 23, 1851; Quisenberry, Lopez Expeditions, 71.

⁷⁹Picayune, August 23, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Bee, August 23, 1851. J. M. Caballero, Spaniard whose property was saved in large part by Judge Walker, printed his conviction that but few of the permanent population in the city had participated in the riots. Picayune, August 29, 1851.

⁸⁰Picayune, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 23, 1851; True Delta, August 26, 1851.

⁸¹Picayune, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35. The True Delta, August 26, claimed that the disturbances were created by ruffians who had made their headquarters at New Orleans since the Mexican War and the discovery of gold in California.

⁸²Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁸³Picayune, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851; True Delta, August 26, 1851. Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35, noted that after the attack on the consulate, thieves and vagrants had committed all the damage. The Picayune, August 22, stated that spectators assured them that "the damage was done by a comparative few...."

check on persons jailed for rioting revealed that the only arrests effected were those of persons recognized as undesirable citizens. In the Second Municipality a group of forty rioters was apprehended at twelve o'clock midnight while many of them were actually in the act of destroying property.⁸⁴ These men of whom there was a large Irish element were sent to Aldermen Hawthorn's court and there recognized as vagrants and "old offenders."⁸⁵ Thirty-three of these men who were seen destroying property were sent to Judge Larue's court for final disposition.⁸⁶ Forty-seven arrests were made in the Second Municipality and these were discovered to be persons of the lower element who were charged with theft.⁸⁷

The scope and duration of the riots were attributed by the press to the paralysis and inertia of the local authorities. This fact, coupled with the indifference or amusement of the public, made it possible for the rioters to parade at will over the entire city, breaking their destruction wherever they chose. Unquestionably the outbreak of the riots had caught the civic authorities unprepared.⁸⁸ Their first action was to swear in special constables, but of all sworn in few felt the obligation to act.⁸⁹ Although the militia was ordered to hold itself in readiness at five P.M., it was not called out until eleven P.M. when the force of the riots had almost spent itself.⁹⁰ The press was further of the opinion

⁸⁴Picayune, August 22, 1851. The arrests were made at the corner of Julia and Magazine.

⁸⁵Bulletin, August 23, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851. None of the forty was a Fillbuster. Picayune, August 22, 1851. For the names of the rioters see the Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

⁸⁶Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁸⁷See the Daily Delta, August 23, 1851, and the Courier, August 22, 1851, for the names of these men. There was also a considerable Irish element in this group of rioters.

⁸⁸Picayune, August 22, 1851; Hunton to Derrick, loc. cit., 35.

⁸⁹Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁹⁰See footnote 67 of this chapter.

that no organized attempt was made to stop the riots,⁹¹ and believed that a concerted action early in the day would have quelled the disorders.⁹² The civic authorities from the Mayor to the police drew severe censure for their inefficient action during the crisis.⁹³ Although some clear-thinking citizens did dissuade the mob from violence at isolated points in the city,⁹⁴ the majority of the spectators were either disaffected, or amused and encouraged the rioters.⁹⁵ This public attitude was said to have greatly hampered effective action by the police.⁹⁶

Every journal in the city unequivocally condemned the disgraceful riots which violated property rights, and law and order,⁹⁷ and some papers pointed out that such deplorable actions harmed the sacred cause of Cuban freedom.⁹⁸

The New Orleans riots are very significant as an agency for determining to what extent the anti-Spanish hatred in the city could be aroused. The causes, nature, and scope of the uprising are worthy of note. It is apparent that the press was in a large measure responsible for the outbreaks because of its demand for an immediate vengeance on Spain. This indictment must stand, although it is true that the press contemplated

⁹¹Courier, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Crescent, August 30, 1851; Bulletin, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851.

⁹²Bulletin, August 23, 1851; Crescent, August 30, 1851.

⁹³Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Weekly Delta, August 25, 1851; Bulletin, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; True Delta, August 23, 1851. The Crescent, August 30, 1851, stated that the New Orleans police force numbered 1,250 men, fifty of whom could have suppressed the riots at any time.

⁹⁴Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Courier, August 23, 1851.

⁹⁵Picayune, August 22, 1851; Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36.

⁹⁶Crossman to Council, loc. cit., 36.

⁹⁷Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 26, 1851; Bee, August 22, 23, 29, 1851; Bulletin, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 23, 24, 1851; Courier, August 22, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Crescent, August 30, 1851.

⁹⁸Picayune, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 23, 1851.

attacks on Spanish Cuba, and not anti-Spanish disturbances in the city itself. The depreciation of the riots by the press was too spontaneous and universal to be seriously questioned. Undoubtedly the civic authorities were unprepared for such an emergency. Separate police action in the three municipalities was not calculated to increase their effectiveness, but it made for disorganization and confusion. At the outset the authorities appeared unwilling to take vigorous action for they did not attempt to employ the available militia. This hesitancy may probably be accounted for on the ground that these local officials shared the mob's hatred of Spain and were not unwilling to see La Union and the Spanish consulate feel the outraged wrath of Americans for the Crittendon executions, or because they were loath to arrest certain prominent citizens who may have been active in the early disorders when revenge against Spain was the sole motive. All accounts agree that the riots could have been quelled at first by effective measures, but during the whole course of the affair there was absolutely no concerted police action until late in the evening. The authorities merely urged the crowd to disperse and cease destruction. No arrests were made at isolated moments when the police interfered. Later the riots got completely out of hand because of the increasing number of participants, and the spontaneity of the disturbances in different parts of the city while the public looked on indifferently, or helplessly, or approvingly. Thus the great, shifting mob was left intact for eight hours to wander from one Spanish establishment to another committing vandalism where conditions were most opportune. The destruction of La Union and the consulate were dictated solely by purposes of revenge, and all citizens were declared to have felt such

sentiments. Consequently it is not at all unlikely that persons of some prominence in the city participated in at least one of the two attacks. That may explain the fact that Recorder Genois and the police made no arrests at the office of the consulate although surprising a few men there in acts of vandalism. Further disorder was invited at the consulate by the failure to post a police guard after the rioters had been persuaded to withdraw. Quite naturally the crowd returned shortly and completed the interrupted destruction. The press universally exonerated the filibusters and the permanent population, and attributed the disorders to the lower and more ignorant classes. The only arrests made were of persons recognized as old offenders, but these arrests were effected late in the evening after the revenge motive had been supplanted by that of plunder. It was acknowledged by all that as soon as concerted police action was resorted to, and numerous arrests occurred, order was quickly restored. That fact makes the impotent police measures seem all the more culpable.

CHAPTER VII

AFTERMATH OF THE RIOTS

"American blood has been shed. It cries aloud for vengeance--vengeance on the tyrant!...blood for blood! Our brethren must be avenged! Cuba must be seized!"
Courier, August 21, 1851.

Immediately after the riots the vengeance of New Orleans was directed against Spanish Cuba, and the city was occupied for a two-week period in an attempt to finance and equip an expedition of revenge against the island. There was no dearth of available men, and there was great public enthusiasm in support of the Cuban venture. Although this movement absorbed for a time the entire attention of the people, the financial collection drive proved to be a failure largely because of the dull business season, and the enforced sustenance of the two thousand filibusters in the city. When news was received of the complete rout of Lopez's forces and the execution of their leader, an immediate reaction was manifested against further expeditions to Cuba. The Cuban movement of r  vanche was then abandoned by New Orleans under a cloud of gloom and bitterness.

The day following the riots New Orleans was still convulsed with grief and rage over the Crittenden executions,¹ but its anger was no longer directed against innocent Spanish residents in the city² but very visibly turned against the Spanish in Cuba.³ Regardless of the press attitude in New Orleans before the riots the news of the massacre of the filibusters had

¹Bee, August 23, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; True Delta, August 23, 1851.

²Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

³Courier, August 23, 1851; Daily Delta, August 23, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, 1851; Bee, August 23, 1851; Jesse W. Boyd, "Lopez's Expedition to Cuba," Gulf States Historical Magazine, (Birmingham, Alabama, 1902-1904), II (1904), 341.

united all the press and the public in denouncing the perpetrators of the crime,⁴ and after that time there was no one in the city who opposed Cuban liberation.⁵ A warlike atmosphere pervaded⁶ as hundreds of additional filibusters poured into the city,⁷ and the press led loud demands for an expedition of revenge against Spain.⁸ It was confidently declared that this expedition would be of such determination and proportion, and so supported by the outraged voice of the people that it would "laugh to scorn proclamations of amity and treaty stipulations."⁹ In the preparations for the expedition Federal laws were disregarded,¹⁰ and there was no official interference to arrest these preparations.¹¹ Money especially was needed and the press addressed stirring calls to the people to contribute.¹² Although this popular advocacy of a revenge expedition was contrary to the

⁴Crescent, August 25, 1851.

⁵Bee, August 23, 1851; Orleanian, September 7, 1851. The idea of Cuban annexation was discussed again at this time but the prevailing sentiment seemed to be with the Bee, August 23, 1851, and the Courier, August 30, 1851, when those organs declared that Cuban independence must be attained before the question of Cuban annexation could be considered.

⁶Bee, August 25, 1851.

⁷Crescent, August 29, 1851. The Daily Delta, August 22, 1851, stated that five thousand men could be transported from New Orleans in twenty-four hours if steamers were available.

⁸Daily Delta, August 22, 24, 1851; Orleanian, August 23, September 6, 7, 1851; Bee, August 23, 1851.

⁹Bee, August 23, 1851. See the Daily Delta, August 22, 1851; Orleanian, September 4, 6, 1851.

¹⁰True Delta, September 3, 1851.

¹¹The Orleanian, September 7, 1851, advocated that Congress should immediately repeal all laws so construed as to prohibit the intervention of the people of the United States in Cuba. The Courier, August 25, 1851, advocated popular mass meetings everywhere to disapprove of the president's policy of suppression of the expeditions to force him to submit to the popular will.

¹²Crescent, August 29, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 24, 1851; Courier, August 25, September 3, 4, 1851.

position of the administration, the latter was not without its champions among the press at New Orleans. Fillmore's past opposition policy to the expedition was defended as necessary and just,¹³ and several journals sternly cautioned that another expedition should not be sent to Cuba unless it were made on a scale of such magnitude as would insure it against earlier disasters.¹⁴

The public in the city was extremely quick to respond to the call of the press for revenge against Spain in Cuba. The night of the riots there was an immense Cuban mass meeting at Lafayette square, and "the excitement was irresistible, overwhelming."¹⁵ H. M. Reynolds, District Attorney, Colonel Field, Colonel Wheat, and Judge Walker addressed the crowd, begging for a suppression of the riots, and urged the direction of the hostility of the populace toward Spanish authority in Cuba.¹⁶ The speakers were often interrupted by great bursts of applause which showed the determination of the people to support such a movement,¹⁷ and resolutions were drawn up which provided for a revenge expedition to Cuba, and a liberation of the island.¹⁸ In a very few days a Cuban committee of thirty-three men had been appointed,¹⁹ which in turn placed the whole direction of Cuban affairs into the hands of General Felix Houston.²⁰ An office of the Cuban committee for

¹³Orleanian, August 26, 1851; Crescent, August 28, September 15, 1851; Bulletin, August 28, September 6, 1851; True Delta, August 30, 1851.

¹⁴Picayune, August 24, 1851; Crescent, September 2, 1851; Orleanian, August 28, 1851.

¹⁵Courier, August 22, 1851. See also the Daily Delta, August 22, 1851. The Picayune, August 22, 1851, said that the huge throng had assembled there nearly two hours before the scheduled time.

¹⁶Picayune, August 22, 1851; Bee, August 22, 1851; Daily Delta, August 22, 1851.

¹⁷Daily Delta, August 22, 1851.

¹⁸Ibid., August 22, 1851.

¹⁹See ibid., August 24, 1851, for a list of the men serving on the Cuban committee.

²⁰Picayune, August 24, 1851; Daily Delta, August 24, 1851.

subscriptions was then opened to receive donations.²¹ When that measure failed to achieve the desired results, a great mass meeting was held at Banks' Arcade, August 26, for the purpose of electing a committee which would go en masse to all business establishments to collect money for the Cuban enterprise.²² The crowd was of such great size that only a small portion of those assembled could find standing room inside the building.²³ The Adjutant General of Louisiana, Horatio Davis, presided, Colonel Wheat, and Major Fraser made speeches in favor of obtaining vengeance in Cuba and were loudly applauded.²⁴ Cuban fervor seized the populace as the Washington company of artillery in a solemn ceremony at "The Oaks" honored the memory of the Crittenden men.²⁵ Cuban songs were composed,²⁶ Cuban benefit performances were given,²⁷ coffee-houses,²⁸ and bar-rooms contributed a day's receipts to the Cuban venture,²⁹ and other business

²¹Daily Delta, August 24, 1851. Houston immediately issued an appeal for financial aid, affirming that there was no lack of available men for the expedition. Daily Delta, August 23, 1851.

²²Picayune, August 27, 1851; Daily Delta, August 27, 1851. See the Daily Delta for the names of the committeemen appointed.

²³Daily Delta, August 27, 1851. The Picayune, August 27, 1851, said that hundreds of persons who could not force a passage into the mass within the building filled the banquettes. See also the Crescent, August 27, 1851; Courier, August 27, 1851.

²⁴Daily Delta, August 27, 1851; Crescent, August 27, 1851.

²⁵Judge Alexander Walker also participated in the ceremony. Daily Delta, September 2, 1851; Picayune, September 1, 1851. The Third Company of the Battalion of Artillery also expressed deep sorrow for the Crittenden men and especially for a member of their company, J. P. Salmon, who had enlisted in the expedition. Daily Delta, August 26, 1851.

²⁶Crescent, September 2, 1851.

²⁷Daily Delta, August 30, 31, September 3, 4, 1851; Picayune, September 2, 1851. The Courier, August 25, 1851, was one of the first to advocate this policy.

²⁸Courier, September 4, 1851.

²⁹Daily Delta, August 27, 1851.

establishments and private citizens donated to the cause.³⁰ It was soon observed that despite the popular enthusiasm there was an extreme difficulty in obtaining money for equipping and launching the expedition, but this was attributed to the extremely dull business season.³¹ Many of the contributions came from merchants who were willing to subscribe for the venture only on assurance that steamers had been purchased or chartered, and that the filibusters would leave in a certain length of time, their subscriptions to be returned in case of the failure of the parties to leave.³² Although the Cuban committee continued their contribution drive in New Orleans and southern Louisiana until September 7, their total collection amounted to somewhat less than eight thousand dollars with a little less than five thousand being contributed by the city itself.³³ Since all but about two hundred dollars of this amount had been expended to sustain the filibusters in the city, the collection drive had been a failure.³⁴

In the interim, so absorbing had the Cuban question become and so vitriolic were the attacks of some Democratic organs on the Fillmore administration,³⁵ that the Whig journals in the city complained that the

³⁰A list of six ladies of New Orleans who had contributed to the Cuban fund was given by the Daily Delta, August 26, 1851.

³¹Orleanian, August 28, 1851; Courier, September 4, 1851. The Courier, September 4, thought that a solution for this problem would be a dollar collection campaign, asserting that every man in the city would give that amount.

³²Daily Delta, September 3, 7, 1851. One man gave a hundred dollar subscription to the Cuban cause payable when fifty other persons matched it. Daily Delta, September 3, 1851.

³³The actual figures were \$4,885.74 contributed by New Orleans, \$2,272.60 collected from country regions, and only \$700 from the sale of Cuban bonds. Bee, September 9, 1851. See also the Daily Delta, September 14, 1851. This report was signed by Isaac W. Marks, George Christy, and S. W. Oakley.

³⁴Picayune, September 7, 1851; Bee, September 9, 1851.

³⁵Courier, July 26, August 8, 13, 19, 1851; Daily Delta, July 15, August 28, September 11, 12, 1851. The latest attack on the administration began with bitter indictments of the American consul at Havana, A. F. Owen, who was reported to have made absolutely no intercession in behalf of Crittenden's men. See the Orleanian, August 24, September 7, 1851; Daily Delta, August 27, 1851; Picayune, August 22, 1851; Crescent, August 22, 1851. Naturally when Owen's lamentable action and the administration's weak foreign policy were linked up by Democratic journals, the Whig organs were quick to defend Fillmore.

Courier and the Delta were trying to make the Cuban question serve party purposes by railing against the Whig administration's Cuban policy.³⁶

The Democratic journals defended themselves against this charge saying that Fillmore's adamant opposition was not a representative one of the Whigs.³⁷ So paramount did the Cuban question become that some journals observed that no interest in the local November elections had yet been shown.³⁸

With all the agitation in the city for an expedition to Cuba it was natural that the fortunes of Lopez there should have been an object of general interest.³⁹ After the initial horror caused by information of the Crittenden executions, the city began to defend or attack Lopez's voluntary separation from Crittenden's command,⁴⁰ and to speculate over the fate of Lopez and his men.⁴¹ As days passed and only contradictory reports were received at the city,⁴² the anxiety over Lopez's command steadily increased,⁴³ but some journals conceded that the latest reports

³⁶Orleanian, August 26, 27, September 9, 1851; Bulletin, September 6, 1851; See, August 27, 1851; Crescent, August 25, 1851.

³⁷Courier, August 8, 27, 1851. The Weekly Delta, September 1, 1851, declared that some of the leading spirits of the Cuban movement in New Orleans were Whigs. The fact that the Whigs were not completely united in opposing the Cuban movement is indicated by the fact that in the Whig convention for the nomination of the district Whig candidate for Congress, Mr. St. Paul's resolution to annex Cuba failed by a vote of seventeen to eleven. Daily Delta, September 24, 1851.

³⁸True Delta, September 2, 1851; See, August 26, September 2, 1851.

³⁹It was hoped that the revenge expedition launched from New Orleans could effect a junction with Lopez's forces, but news of Lopez's death caused an immediate abandonment of this scheme. See footnotes 47-50 of this chapter.

⁴⁰The Daily Delta, August 27, 1851, defended the division on grounds of stern necessity. However the True Delta, August 24, 27, 1851, roundly criticized Lopez's judgment and action in this regard.

⁴¹Bulletin, August 22, 1851; See, August 25, 1851. The Orleanian, August 23, 1851, declared that it was not greatly concerned over Lopez since Crittenden's men were the flower of the expedition and best known in New Orleans.

⁴²Picayune, August 27, September 2, 3, 1851; Orleanian, September 2, 3, 1851.

⁴³Picayune, August 30, 1851; True Delta, August 31, 1851. On September

showed an ill omen for Lopez.⁴⁴ It was not until September 4 that the ship Cherokee brought the dismal news of the complete defeat, dispersion, and capture of Lopez's command, and the execution of the Cuban general.⁴⁵ With the reception of this information the entire city was covered with gloom and thrown into deep consternation.⁴⁶ Almost immediately there was a definite reaction in the city against further expeditions to Cuba. Such ventures were no longer advocated or held as a possibility by the press,⁴⁷ and it was recognized that they could only result in further reprisals and needless sacrifice of lives.⁴⁸ Simultaneously the press asserted that the filibusters, of whom there were approximately two thousand in the city at that time,⁴⁹ should break camp and leave for their homes.⁵⁰ The dissolution of this body of men began about September 6.⁵¹ After some slight

ber 4, the Picayune in its evening edition gave virtually the entire front page over to Cuban news of Lopez and the revolution. This was very unusual for the front page of New Orleans papers at that time was usually devoted to advertisements, governmental and foreign news.

⁴⁴Bulletin, September 3, 1851; Orleanian, September 3, 1851; Bee, September 3, 1851.

⁴⁵Lopez's forces were completely overwhelmed near the city of San Cristobal, Cuba, on August 25, 26. Those filibusters not killed on the battlefield were taken captives and Lopez was among these. The Cuban general died by the garrote at Havana about September 1. All other prisoners were eventually pardoned by Queen Isabella of Spain. Caldwell, Lopez Expeditions, 111-113.

⁴⁶Picayune, September 4, 1851; Courier, September 5, 1851; Orleanian, September 5, 6, 1851; Daily Delta, September 5, 1851; Weekly Delta, September 8, 1851. The Crescent, September 5, 1851, thought the news "melancholy and startling"; the Bee, September 5, 1851, called the information "disastrous." The True Delta, September 5, 1851, was the least affected of all for it casually stated that it was not surprised at the end of the mad adventure.

⁴⁷Orleanian, September 9, 1851; Crescent, September 6, 1851; Bee, September 6, 1851; Picayune, September 6, 1851.

⁴⁸Bee, September 6, 1851; Picayune, September 6, 1851.

⁴⁹The Picayune, September 7, 1851, estimated the number of filibusters at two thousand. The Bulletin, September 8, 1851, believed only fifteen hundred were in the city, but the Daily Delta, August 26, 1851, claimed that three thousand were there. The number undoubtedly would have been greater if the city press had not cautioned filibusters against coming to New Orleans unless they would pay their own expenses. See the Daily Delta, August 27, 1851; Orleanian, August 28, 1851; Picayune, September 7, 1851.

⁵⁰Bee, September 6, 1851; Crescent, September 6, 1851.

⁵¹Daily Delta, September 7, 1851; Picayune, September 7, 1851.

disturbances in the city following the demands of the filibusters for payment of their passage home, and the inability of the Cuban committee to furnish the requisite money,⁵² the filibusters were dispersed by the police and the decampment was carried through without further disorder.⁵³ With the exodus of these men from New Orleans to their respective homes the active idea nurtured by the city of an expedition of r  vanche against Spanish Cuba was brought to an unsuccessful termination.

The Crittenden executions and the subsequent disasters in Cuba inevitably gave rise to a discussion of the motives of the filibusters and their leaders, and the cause for the failure of the venture. The True Delta definitely charged that certain New Orleans citizens and journals⁵⁴ had gotten the expedition together and were wholly responsible for it.⁵⁵ Many queries were voiced as to whether the people had been deceived as to the scope of the Cuban revolution, and whether the Cuban revolution had been fomented in America.⁵⁶ By far the greater portion of the press confessed that before the Pampero had sailed, it believed the favorable reports of the Cuban revolution to have been reliable,⁵⁷ and credited the filibusters and their leaders with the most generous motives.⁵⁸ With the single exception of the True Delta the New Orleans press attributed the abject demise

⁵²Picayune, September 7, 1851; Bee, September 9, 1851; Crescent, September 8, 1851; Orleanian, September 7, 1851.

⁵³Picayune, September 7, 1851; Bee, September 9, 1851; True Delta, September 7, 1851.

⁵⁴The True Delta, September 9, 1851, specifically accused the Picayune, and other less influential although desperate organs, of falsifying Cuban news to make it appear that the revolution was universal there.

⁵⁵True Delta, September 5, 1851.

⁵⁶Picayune, August 24, 1851.

⁵⁷Picayune, August 24, 1851. The Bee, August 25, 1851, observed that the Delta, Crescent, Bulletin, and the Courier, as well as itself, admitted that they had believed the reliability of the reports.

⁵⁸Picayune, August 24, 1851; Orleanian, August 28, 1851; Crescent, September 5, 1851; Courier, September 8, 1851; Weekly Delta, September 8, 1851. The Courier, September 10, 1851, said that nothing in history exceeded the heroism of Lopez and his gallant band.

of the Cuban venture to failure of the Cuban Creoles to cooperate with Lopez. The Courier excused this on the ground that although the Creoles wanted to aid Lopez, the rigid Spanish surveillance had prevented them from obtaining arms and flocking to his banner.⁵⁹ The fact remained that Cuban apathy or hostility toward Lopez's men was severely condemned by many journals,⁶⁰ and it was conceded that the universal distrust of the Creoles by Americans rendered unlikely American aid in their future struggle against Spanish oppression,⁶¹ if indeed the Cubans desired independence at all.⁶²

One significant event was to arise in New Orleans after the Crittenden executions which was not connected with that unfortunate affair, but which was a result of the surreptitious launching of the Pampero from New Orleans on August 3. This occurrence was the dismissal of William Freret, Collector of the port of New Orleans and ex-Mayor of the city, by the Fillmore administration after a governmental investigation into his alleged negligence of duty in allowing the Pampero to leave the city.⁶³ Freret's removal precipitated much comment in the press. Some administration Whig organs contented themselves with the simple statement that Freret's explanations to the authorities at Washington⁶⁴ were insufficient,⁶⁵ and reposed

⁵⁹Courier, September 6, 1851.

⁶⁰Bee, September 5, 1851; Bulletin, September 5, 1851; Daily Delta, September 9, 1851; Picayune, September 10, 1851.

⁶¹Bulletin, August 25, 1851.

⁶²Bee, September 6, 1851; Picayune, September 5, 10, 1851. Recently there has appeared an excellent article which amassed conclusive evidence to show that the planter and business class of Cuba, most of whom were Creoles, were opposed to Lopez's revolutionary activities because of a fear of actual property damage during the disturbances, and a dread of a possible negro slave insurrection in the event Lopez conquered the island. See D. C. Corbitt, "The Junta de Fomento of Havana and the Lopez Expeditions," The Hispanic American Review (Baltimore, Maryland, 1918-22; Durham, North Carolina, 1928-), XVII (1937), 339-46.

⁶³Rumors of Freret's removal appear to have been first circulated in New Orleans about September 3. See the Daily Delta, September 4, 1851.

⁶⁴Freret's correspondence with the Secretary of the Treasury at Washington in regard to the launching of the Pampero could not be obtained. The only copy located is contained in a pamphlet found in the New York Public Library, and that institution accounted it too rare to loan.

⁶⁵Bee, September 9, 1851.

confidence in the president's judgment in the affair.⁶⁶ However the removal of the Collector angered many Whig chieftains in the city,⁶⁷ and other private citizens,⁶⁸ in addition to arousing the ire of virtually the entire press which thought the move extremely ill-advised and unjust.⁶⁹ In their ardent defense of Freret the press revealed that most of the important governmental officials had been absent most of the summer when preparations for the expedition were going on,⁷⁰ and that even at the time the Pampere had left New Orleans, there was a totally inadequate staff of governmental officials present in the city.⁷¹ The very journals exposing the absence of these officers were the first to defend it, declaring that theirs was a position of helplessness against a public and a popular cause. The launching of Lopez's expedition could not possibly have been stopped since not one citizen would have aided in preventing the venture.⁷² Indeed if "...Messrs. Fillmore and Corwin [Acting Secretary of State] had been here, they could not have prevented it."⁷³ Further no circumstances specifically directed the attention of Freret to the Pampere, and in any event

⁶⁶True Delta, September 14, 1851.

⁶⁷Many Whigs were reported to be in favor of Freret and the party chiefs talked the first presidential appointee into declining the post. Daily Delta, September 19, 1851.

⁶⁸An angry crowd stood around the Custom House and discussed Freret's removal. Orleanian, September 7, 1851. Conversely the True Delta, September 14, 1851, claimed that the public was not affected by the question.

⁶⁹Crescent, September 4, 5, 1851; Courier, September 9, 1851; Daily Delta, September 4, 1851; Bulletin, September 9, 1851.

⁷⁰Judge McCaleb, United States District Judge, was on a furlough in the interior, the Surveyor of the port and the United States Marshall had made trips to Washington, and Logan Hutton, District Attorney, had been in Kentucky. Courier, September 4, 1851.

⁷¹The True Delta, September 3, 1851, asserted that only Colonel C. A. Labuzan, United States Deputy Marshall, had been at his post when the Pampere sailed, and it thought other public officials had been negligent. The Crescent, September 4, 1851, declared that Judge McCaleb, Logan Hutton and the assistant district attorney had been out of town summer vacationing when the Pampere was launched.

⁷²Courier, September 4, 1851; Crescent, September 4, 1851.

⁷³Daily Delta, September 9, 1851.

the ship was not thought to be in a condition to leave New Orleans with its defective machinery, nor that it would leave overnight without clearance papers.⁷⁴ In spite of bitter objections to Freret's removal, the administration did not relent and reinstate him. When the first appointee to the empty post of the collectorship of the port declined the position, Fillmore appointed another man.⁷⁵

The Crittenden executions had completely united the sentiments of the people in New Orleans in an intense hatred of Spain, and the idea of a revenge expedition to Cuba was avidly supported by the press and public. For a time the movement assumed such importance that it crowded everything, even local politics, out of the public mind. But for the last two years New Orleans had been the money mart for the Cuban expeditions, and was even then financing the living expenses of some two thousand filibusters. These facts, coupled with the extremely dull business season, made the financial collection drive, so vital to the launching of another expedition, a complete failure. News of the abject end of Lopez's expedition threw the city into deep gloom and despair. Almost at once there was a definite reaction against dispatching further expeditions to Cuba and the movement was abruptly ended with the dispersion of the filibusters. The press attributed Lopez's ill-fortune to the cowardly Creoles of Cuba, and it was predicted by many that this sad experience would henceforth cause Americans to view Creole appeals for aid against Spain in an extremely unfavorable light. When Freret, Collector of the port, was dismissed by authorities at Washington, because of his alleged negligence of duty in allowing the filibusters

⁷⁴Picayune, September 7, 1851; Crescent, September 4, 1851. See footnote 51 of chapter five of this thesis.

⁷⁵Daily Delta, September 19, 1851.

to leave on the Pampero, the city press leaped to Freret's defense, declaring that all governmental officials in the city had been powerless against the popularly supported Lopez expedition. The absence of most governmental authorities at the time of the launching of the Pampero was deemed a recognition of their helplessness against a public cause. The press defense of Freret, although unsuccessful in its attempt to obtain a reinstatement of him, was significant in that it sharply revealed the intense public sympathy for the Cuban movement when Lopez and his men had sailed on the Pampero.

APPENDIX

New Orleans Filibusters with Lopez's Last Expedition to Cuba

Colonel W. L. Crittenden	Joseph B. Gunst
Colonel W. Scott Haynes	Charles Harrison
Captain Robert Ellis	J. H. Hearsey
Captain J. A. Kelley	C. Knowll
Captain Victor Kerr	P. Lacoste
Lieutenant James G. Owen	Thomas Lee
Lieutenant H. G. Summers	M. Lieger
Jaime Aquelli	John Martin
Conrad Arghahi	William Miller
Franklin Boyd	C. A. McMurray
Jean B. Braun	George Parr
Thomas D. Brown	J. Patan
J. G. Bush	Nicholas Port
J. Cassanovas	S. H. Prenel
John Cline	G. Richardson
P. Coleman	J. P. Salmon
Jose Chichiri	Charles Smith
Charles J. Daily	Henry Smith
Thomas Denton	R. C. Stanford
James G. Devew	Conrad Taylor
Victor Dupral	H. D. Tomasson
James Fiddes	Harvé Williams
George Foster	W. Wilson
Pat M. Grath	

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Bemis, Samuel F., and Garner, Grace G., Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States, 1775-1921 (Washington, 1935).

Clarke, Edith E., Guide to the Use of United States Government Publications (Boston, 1918).

Hassé, Adelaide R., Index to United States Documents Relating to Foreign Affairs, 1828-1861, 5 vols. (Washington, D. C., 1914).

Griffin, A. P. C., List of Books Relating to Cuba (Including References to Collected Works and Periodicals), in Senate Documents, XI, 3600. Numbers 138-206 (Washington, D. C., 1898).

Sabin, Joseph, Bibliotheca Americana. A Dictionary of Books Relating to America, from Its Discovery to the Present Time, 19 vols. (New York, 1868-1891).

PRIMARY SOURCES

NEWSPAPERS

New Orleans Bee (L'Abeille de la Nouvelle Orleans), 1849, 1850, 1851.

A Whig journal with a French and an English editor. In its Cuban policy it appeared to maintain an even balance between the ultra-radical Delta and Courier on one hand, and the extremely conservative True Delta and the Bulletin on the other. The paper favored the peaceful annexation of Cuba, yet did not condemn the expeditionaries who resorted to force in an attempt to annex Cuba.

New Orleans Commercial Bulletin, 1849, 1850, 1851.

A very conservative Whig organ, hostile to the idea of the acquisition of Cuba by force. It favored the suppression of the military expeditions, and would acquiesce in the annexation of Cuba only by means of legitimate diplomacy.

Louisiana Courier (Courier de la Louisiane), 1849, 1850, 1851.

This Democratic journal, printed in both French and English, was ultra-expansionist in regard to Cuba. It urged immediate acquisition, and supported filibustering attempts against the island.

New Orleans Crescent, 1849, 1850, 1851.

Politically the Crescent was a Whig organ and it remained definitely conservative in tone as concerned the Cuban movement. It advocated the annexation of Cuba, but deplored attempts of violence against the island for it felt that these would retard its desired inclusion in the Union.

New Orleans Daily Delta, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1858.

The fidelity of this Democratic journal is amazing for it never faltered in its devotion to the Cuban cause. The Delta desired Cuba immediately and was the most ardent champion of all military attempts against the island.

New Orleans Orleanian (L'Orléanais), 1849, 1850, 1851.

A most inconsistent Cuban policy was pursued by the Orleanian because of the fact that its English editor fully endorsed the Cuban cause, while its French editor was adamant against it, favoring the Whig administration's attempt to suppress the expeditions. The Orleanian was rarely moderate, but divided its time between the radical and conservative camps.

New Orleans Picayune, 1849, 1850, 1851.

Here was a Whig journal which favored the Cuban cause, and the inherent right of Americans to aid Cuba. Although not as much of a Cuban agitator as the Delta and the Courier, the Picayune was radical more often than moderate in the controversy.

New Orleans True Delta, 1849, 1850, 1851.

This Democratic organ offered the seeming paradox of out-Whigging all Whig journals in its bitter opposition to the Cuban movement, and in its support rendered to the efforts of a Whig administration to stifle filibustering attempts. It viewed the annexation of Cuba with suspicion, regarding such as pernicious to the slave interest of the South and the sugar investments of Louisiana.

New Orleans Price Current, Commercial Intelligencer and Merchants Transcript, 1849, 1850, 1851.

This weekly trade journal was of value only for its citations of Cuban-American trade statistics.

MAGAZINE OR PERIODICAL ARTICLES

De Bow, J. D. B., "The Late Cuba Expedition. Military Spirit of Our Country; Its Dangers; Our Neutral Duties and the Questions Which Arise under Our Treaties, etc., with Spain," De Bow's Review (New Orleans, 1846-1850), IX (1850), 164-177. De Bow's Review was published from 1846 to 1852 under such varying names as Commercial Review of the South and West, De Bow's Commercial Review of the South and West, and De Bow's Review of the Southern and Western States.

Although very favorable to the filibusters in the Cuba State Trials, the author displays a shrewd analysis of the failure of the Cardenas expedition.

Ditson, George L., "Cuba and Its Political Economy," Bunt's Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review (New York, 1839-1870), XVII (1847), 265-274.

This article concerns the poor management, heavy taxation, and oppression of Cuba by Spain, and observes that the South would do well to annex Cuba.

Ely, A. W., "Cuba As It Is in 1854," De Bow's Review, XVII (1854), 219-229.

The author concludes that the annexation of Cuba by the United States would be very beneficial to the island.

Ivy, V. H., "The Late Henry A. Bullard," De Bow's Review, XII (1852), 50-56.

A reliable account of Bullard's political career is given by the author.

Reynolds, Thomas C., "Cuba, Its Position, Dimensions and Population,-- Position with Reference to the United States, Territorial Limits and Extent of the Island, Progress and Statistics of Population, etc.," De Bow's Review, VIII (1850), 313-323.

A valuable source of information about Cuba for all except political phases.

Schlesinger, Louis M., "Personal Narrative of Adventures in Cuba and Penta," Democratic Review (Washington and New York, 1837-1859), XXXI (1852), 209 ff., 352 ff., 553 ff. From 1837 to 1851 this magazine appeared under the name of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review. In 1852 the title was changed to the Democratic Review.

Schlesinger's articles are of great value, for in addition to being an important source for Lopez's last expedition, they reveal public opinion in New Orleans as being favorable to the filibusters. It should be taken into account that Schlesinger's narrative is very biased, for he accompanied the expedition to Cuba as an officer.

"Cuba," Democratic Review, XXV (1849), 192-203.

An ultra-annexationist article which is vitriolic in its condemnation of the Spanish policy in Cuba.

"The Late Cuba State Trials," Democratic Review, XXX (1852), 307-319.

The highly abstract legal points of the trials are thrown in a fine relief by this clever analysis.

"The Neutrality Law: What Does It Mean, What Prohibit and What Permit?" Democratic Review, XXX (1852)

This is a very clever defense of the filibusters, and one which demonstrates the traces of a good legal mind.

"General Lopez. The Cuban Patriot," Democratic Review, XXVI (1850), 97-112.

John L. O'Sullivan probably wrote this highly eulogistic account of Lopez's early life.

"Commerce and Resources of Cuba," translated from the "Diario de la Marino," of Havana, January 2, 1849, quoted in Hunt's Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review, XXI (1849), 34-40.

The author deals only with Cuba's rise to a significant position in world commerce.

Commercial statistics in De Bow's Review, III (1847), 346-347; IV (1847), 391-402; VII (1849), 412-434; X (1851), 315-316, 447-449; XI (1851), 488-496; XII (1852), 81-85; XXIII (1857), 364-376.

BOOKS

Claiborne, John F., Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, 2 vols. (New York, 1860).

This work is important in that it reveals the keen Southern sympathy for the Lopez attempts on Cuba. Although biased in favor of Quitman and the Cuban movement, the author's narrative is accurate.

Hall, A. Oakley, The Manhattaner in New Orleans or Phases of 'Crescent City' Life (New York, 1851).

Valuable for its comments on the local government and newspapers.

Hardy, Lieutenant Richardson, The History and Adventures of the Cuban Expedition, from the First Movements down to the Dispersion of the Army at Key West, and the Arrest of Gen. Lopez. Also: An Account of the Ten Deserters at Isla de Mujeres (Cincinnati, 1850).

Essentially a source book of the actual expedition to Cuba, yet one which reveals a favorable Cuban sentiment in New Orleans.

Jones, Alexander, Cuba in 1851; Containing Authentic Statistics of the Population, Agriculture and Commerce of the Island for a Series of Years, with Official and Other Documents in Relation to the Revolutionary Movements of 1850 and 1851 (New York, 1851).

A very useful book concerning social and economic history of Cuba in 1850. In addition it includes much about the Cardenas expedition of 1850.

O.D.D.O., The History of the Late Expedition to Cuba, with an Appendix, Containing the Last Speech of the Celebrated Orator, S. S. Prentiss, in Defense of Gen. Lopez (New Orleans, 1850).

A strictly military account of the Cardenas venture.

Wilson, Thomas W., The Island of Cuba in 1850, Being a Description of the Island, Its Resources, Productions, Commerce etc. (New Orleans, 1850).

Exclusively confines itself to a discussion of the geographic and economic features of Cuba.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Senate Executive Documents, 31 Congress, 1 Session, No. 57.

Contains pertinent information on the Round Island expedition, and includes useful material on the Cardenas expedition.

Senate Executive Documents, 31 Congress, 2 Session, No. 41.

Government correspondence relating to the Contoy prisoners, and possible future expeditions to Cuba.

Senate Executive Documents, 32 Congress, 1 Session, No. 1.

Much information on Lopez's last expedition to Cuba, and official orders of Mayor A. D. Crossman occasioned by the New Orleans riots.

House Executive Documents, 31 Congress, 1 Session, No. 5.

President Taylor's report on the action of the administration concerning the Rey case in his Message to Congress, December 27, 1849.

House Executive Documents, 32 Congress, 1 Session, No. 121.

Traces the unsuccessful efforts of the Polk administration to buy Cuba from Spain in 1848-49.

Congressional Globe, 32 Congress, 1 Session [XXIV].

The W. Scott Haynes Memorial to Congress which reveals the exact number of expeditionaries on Lopez's last venture.

Congressional Globe, 32 Congress, 1 Session [XXV].

Of inestimable value; contains the full official correspondence growing out of the New Orleans riots.

Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, in the House Executive Documents, Vol. 115, 56 Congress, 1 Session, No. 735 (Washington, D. C., 1900).

Contains helpful information concerning the Round Island expedition.

Revised Statutes of the United States, second edition (Washington, D. C., 1878).

Important for the citation in extenso of the controversial Neutrality Act of 1818.

Richardson, James D., editor, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1902, 10 vols. (Washington, D. C., 1903).

A reliable authority when seeking presidential attitudes or proclamations.

STATE PUBLICATIONS

Official Journal of the Proceedings of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, First Session, Third Legislature, January 21, 1850.

Acts Passed by the Third Legislature of the State of Louisiana at Their Session Held and Begun in the Town of Baton Rouge on the 21st Day of January, 1850 (New Orleans, 1850).

Of little value since the Cuban question was not discussed by the legislature at that time.

MISCELLANEOUS

Cohen's New Orleans Directory (New Orleans, 1849-1852).

Very helpful for ascertaining the identities of persons connected with the Cuban movement, as well as that of newspaper owners and editors.

SECONDARY SOURCES

MAGAZINE OR PERIODICAL

Boyd, Jesse W., "Lopez's Expeditions to Cuba," The Gulf States Historical Magazine (Birmingham, Alabama, 1903-1904), II (1904), 326-342.

A well documented and reliable account.

Corbitt, D. C., "The Junta de Formento of Havana and the Lopez Expeditions," The Hispanic American Review (Baltimore, 1918-1922; Durham, North Carolina, 1926-), XVII (1937), 339-348.

An illuminating treatment of the hostility of the Cuban business classes to Lopez's revolutionary activities.

Curti, M. E., "Young America," American Historical Review (New York, 1895-), XXXII (1927), 34-55.

Shows the power of ideals on the American mind in the early 'fifties, and the supreme faith of Americans in themselves.

Greer, James K., "Louisiana Politics, 1845-1861," Louisiana Historical Quarterly (New Orleans, 1917-), XII (1929), 381-425; 555-610.

A very instructive account of ante-bellum state politics; gives an understanding of the background of this thesis.

Howe, William J., "Municipal History of New Orleans," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science (Baltimore, 1883-), VII (1889), 155-187.

Explains administrative methods of the New Orleans city government in 1850.

Kendall, John S., "Early New Orleans Newspapers in Louisiana," Louisiana Historical Quarterly, X (1927), 382-406.

Instructive on the early background of this thesis.

Meador, John R., "Little Wars of the Republic," Part V, "The American Filibusters," Americana (American Historical Magazine) (New York, 1906-), V (1910), 1130-1140.

Includes but scant notice of Lopez's activities.

Perez, L. M., editor, "Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1850-51, Betrayal of the Cleopatra, 1851," Publications of the Southern History Association (Washington, D. C., 1897-1907), X (1906), 345-362.

Concerns Spanish spy activity in New York City in 1850.

Pratt, Julius W., "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny,'" American Historical Review, XXXII (1927), 795-798.

Investigation well-worked out, though of little value in this study.

Schurz, Carl, "Manifest Destiny," Harper's New Monthly Magazine (New York, 1850-), LXXXVII (1893), 737-748.

An anti-imperialistic article which traces the "Manifest Destiny" movements of the 'nineties back to the desire of the ante-bellum South for Cuba.

Serogge, William O., "The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1848-1851," Mississippi Valley Historical Review (Lincoln, Nebraska, and Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1914-), III (1917), 403-404.

Notes that the Lopez expeditions were more of an American than a Cuban movement, and criticizes Caldwell for not making a thorough study of the factors in America which made the expeditions possible.

Serogge, William O., "Alabama and Territorial Expansion before 1860," The Gulf States Historical Magazine, II (1904), 172-185.

A short account of the Lopez expeditions. Based almost entirely on Alabama newspapers and secondary authorities, containing little of value.

Walker, Norman, "Commercial and Mercantile Interests," Standard History of New Orleans, Louisiana (Chicago, 1900), 538-577.

A general survey of the products of the New Orleans trade around 1850.

White, Melvin J., "The New Orleans Riot of 1851: Its Causes and Its International Significance," Tulane Graduate Magazine (New Orleans, 1912-), III (1914), 216-225.

This article is disappointing, for it gives only a hurried survey of the causes of the riots. Citations are based on secondary authorities and government documents.

Wilgus, A. Curtis, "Official Expression of Manifest Destiny Sentiment Concerning Hispanic America, 1848-1871," Louisiana Historical Quarterly, XV (1932), 486-506.

A splendid study which reveals both the concept and wide popularity of "Manifest Destiny," chiefly directed toward the attitude of members of Congress.

Winston, James E., "Economic History of New Orleans," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XI (1924), 200-226.

A well-documented survey of the trade of New Orleans from 1802 to 1840.

PUBLISHED MONOGRAPHS AND SECONDARY WORKS

Adams, Ephraim D., The Power of Ideals in American History (New Haven, 1918).
The influence of the "Manifest Destiny" doctrine is ably analyzed.

Adams, Randolph G., A History of the Foreign Policy of the United States (New York, 1925).

Alvarez, Alejandro, The Monroe Doctrine (Its Importance in the International Life of the States of the New World) (New York, 1924).

Asbury, Herbert, The French Quarter, an Informal History of the New Orleans Underworld (New York, 1936).

Bemis, Samuel F., A Diplomatic History of the United States (New York, 1936).

Contains a sympathetic, but good, defense of the "Manifest Destiny" doctrine, and a reliable survey of Lopez's expeditions.

-----, Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Louisiana, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1892).

Butler, Pierce, Judith P. Benjamin (Philadelphia, 1907).

Caldwell, Robert G., The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, 1848-1851 (Princeton, 1915).

Although primarily a military study of the expeditions, this monograph serves as a reliable guide for this thesis and furnishes excellent bibliographical aids. It is not entirely accurate on the formation and launching of the expeditions, due to the fact that so few New Orleans newspapers were consulted.

Callahan, James M., Cuba and International Relations (A Historical Study in American Diplomacy). (Baltimore, 1899).

Chadwick, French E., The Relations of the United States and Spain (New York, 1909).

Chambers, Henry E., A History of Louisiana, 3 vols. (New York, 1925).

Chapman, Charles E., A History of the Cuban Republic, a Study in Hispanic American Politics (New York, 1927).

Ettinger, Amos A., The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé, 1853-55 (New Haven, 1932).

Offers a valuable bibliography in this field.

Fortier, Alcée, editor, Louisiana, Comprising Sketches of Parishes, Towns, Events, Institutions, and Persons Arranged in Cyclopedic Form, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1914).

Gayarré, Charles E., History of Louisiana, 4 vols. (New Orleans, 1885).

Guggenheim, Harry F., The United States and Cuba (A Study in International Relations) (New York, 1934).

Halstead, Murat, The Story of Cuba, Her Struggles for Liberty ... The Cause, Crisis and Destiny of the Pearl of the Antilles (Akron, Ohio, 1896).

Kendall, John S., History of New Orleans, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1922).

Includes some pertinent information on the Cuban question in New Orleans in 1850-51.

Latané, John H., A History of American Foreign Policy (New York, 1927).

Latané, John H., The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America (Baltimore, 1900).

McMaster, John B., A History of the People of the United States (From the Revolution to the Civil War), 8 vols. (New York, 1883-1913), VIII (1913).

Martin, Francis X., The History of Louisiana from the Earliest Period to the Commencement of the Civil War, 1861. (New Orleans, 1882).

Quisenberry, Anderson C., Lopez's Expeditions to Cuba, 1850 and 1851 (Louisville, Kentucky, 1906).

Rhodes, James F., History of the United States (From the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration), 9 vols., new edition (New York, 1928), 1.

Sears, Louis M., John Slidell (Durham, North Carolina, 1925).

Sears, Louis M., A History of American Foreign Relations (New York, 1935).

Smith, Justin H., The War with Mexico, 2 vols. (New York, 1919).

A chapter on "Manifest Destiny" is useful.

Tinker, Edward L., Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana (Worcester, Massachusetts, 1933).

This work affords much information on the organization, management, and policy of French newspapers in New Orleans in 1850.

Vilá, Homínio Portell, Marcos Lopez y Su Epoca (La Habana, 1930), 1.

Offers the best account of Lopez's early life.

Weinberg, Albert E., Manifest Destiny, a Study of Nationalistic Expansion in American History (Baltimore, 1935).

Weinberg's treatment of "Manifest Destiny" has aroused the opposition of such scholars as Samuel Flagg Bemis, but it is unquestionably stimulating, and apparently sound for the greater part.

UNPUBLISHED MONOGRAPHS

Copeland, Fayette, "The New Orleans Press and the Reconstruction." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1937.

A splendid thesis and helpful on details as to the ownership and management of many New Orleans newspapers.

Ducrest, Jerome St. Julian, "New Orleans Commerce, 1830-1860." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1926.

Not a thorough or reliable account.

Freeman, Arthur, "The Early Career of Pierre Soulé." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1936.

Some valuable aids in bibliography are given by this thesis.

MISCELLANEOUS

Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, copyright in the United States, 1929, V.

BIOGRAPHY

C. Stanley Urban was born November 7, 1912, in Kansas City, Missouri, where he received his primary, secondary, and junior college education. In 1934 he entered the Central Missouri State Teachers College, Warrensburg, Missouri, and was graduated in 1936 with the degrees of A. B. and B. S. While there he served as history fellow, member of the debate squad, and school representative in oratory. He was a member of the Kappa Delta Pi, Pi Kappa Delta, and Phi Sigma Pi, national honorary fraternities. In 1936, as the recipient of a fellowship in history, he matriculated at Louisiana State University, and is now a candidate for a Master of Arts degree at that institution.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Urban, C. Stanley

Major Field: History

Title of Thesis: A Local Study in "Manifest Destiny": New Orleans and the Cuban Question during the Lopez Expeditions of 1849-51.

Approved:

Date:

Walter P. Richard
Major Professor and Chairman

Charles W. Kipling
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Walter P. Richard
Lyman M. Cox
John D. Baruch

