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The effect of inoculum density on reproduction of the reniform nematode, *Rotylenchulus reniformis*, and on root development of sweet potato cultivars; W-152, Centennial, Porto Rico and Goldrush was studied under greenhouse conditions. The inoculum density had no significant effect on the root weight of the cultivars tested. The number of mature females on root systems was higher at the highest inoculum level and the number of eggs per female was significantly higher at lower densities. The number of eggs produced per root system at different inoculum densities was not significantly different on the cultivar Goldrush but was higher on the other cultivars as inoculum density was increased. Maximum eggs per root system was lowest on Goldrush and highest on Centennial.
Literature Review

Many nematodes require living organisms for food and for completion of their life cycle and are known as obligate parasites. Some cause diseases on the hosts they parasitize; however, some nematodes are free-living organisms inhabiting soil and water.

Plant parasitic nematodes are generally found in or on the roots of their hosts, or they are found in the stems, leaves and in the seeds of the plants. Because of their feeding habits, some cause severe damage to agricultural crops. The infected plants show many different symptoms associated with injuries caused by nematodes on roots as well as on above-ground parts of plants. For instance, the plant parasitic nematodes are responsible for excessive root branching, they induce the formation of root galls, root lesions, root cracking and predispose the roots to root rots. Sometimes, the host plants show a stunted growth and may have necrotic lesions or distortions of leaves and stems.

Although plant parasitic nematodes can cause diseases on plants by themselves, some of them play a major role in disease complexes involving certain other pathogens such as fungi and bacteria. Moreover, some plant parasitic nematodes are known to be the vectors of virus diseases.
Because of a great concern about economic losses of crops due to plant parasitic nematodes, several methods of control have been developed including cultural practices, biological control, resistant varieties and use of chemical agents.

The reniform nematode, Rotylenchulus reniformis, is a plant parasitic nematode found on a large number of cultivated plants and fruit trees in many tropical and subtropical countries (1, 15, 17, 29). It was first described from Hawaii (18) where it was found on the roots of cowpea plants growing in pineapple fields. The work done by Linford and Yap in 1940 (18) indicated that the reniform nematode infected the roots of 68 host plants in Hawaii. In addition, the reniform nematode has been found on a large number of cultivated plants and fruit trees in many tropical and subtropical areas including several places in the southern part of the United States of America (1, 15, 17). For instance, the reniform nematode constitutes a serious pest of cotton in Louisiana (2, 7), Alabama (21) and Texas (17), and has been reported on sweet potatoes in Louisiana (3, 20).

The reniform nematode (19) is an obligate plant parasite with only the females infecting the roots. The young females, which assume a C-shape when at rest and have a strong stylet, a sclerotized head and a narrow tail, enter the roots of host plants to about half their body length and the posterior part remains outside the roots.
During their feeding on the host, the females enlarge until the posterior part of their body swells and becomes kidney-shaped. After fertilization, the females secrete a jelly-like substance around their body where they deposit their eggs. After the eggs hatch, the larvae molt twice to develop into males and females.

The reniform nematode causes heavy damage to sweet potatoes by causing root rotting, chlorosis, cracking of the fleshy roots and field losses (13, 20). Furthermore, Clark and Wright (13) reported that this parasite affected the quality by reducing the size of individual sweet potatoes and by causing the fleshy roots to crack in infested field plots.

Resistance to *Rotylenchulus reniformis* has been found within certain cultivars of soybeans, cotton and Irish potatoes. Rebois et al (22) showed that two soybean cultivars Pickett and Dyer were resistant to the reniform nematode. This resistance was characterized by the inhibition of female development on the incompatible host and by the inability of this nematode to induce the formation of giant cells in pericycle and phloem tissue of the resistant cultivars (24). The resistance in soybean to the reniform nematode was not necessarily the same resistance as for root knot nematode, but the cultivars resistant to the soybean cyst nematode (*Heterodera glycines*) were also resistant to the reniform nematode. Therefore, the authors (22) concluded that the same or linked genes for resistance
in cultivars Pickett and Dyer appeared to have been derived from Peking, a common soybean cyst nematode resistant parent and these genes were responsible for resistance to both nematodes. However, Birchfield (5) suggested that the resistance to the cyst nematode and to the reniform nematode was due to separate but probably linked genes since not all soybean cyst nematode resistant cultivars they tested were resistant to the reniform nematode. The studies of resistance in potato (Solanum tuberosum) to the reniform nematode (25) revealed high levels of resistance and tolerance. The genes for resistance to the reniform nematode seemed to be independent of the genes for resistance to races of potato cyst nematodes (Globodera rostochiensis). A high level of resistance to reniform nematode also has been found within certain selections of cotton (9). The histological responses of resistant and susceptible cultivars of cotton to the reniform nematode were studied by Carter (9). The nematodes developed equally in resistant and susceptible cultivars during 6 days after penetration. However, further development of nematodes in the resistant cultivars was inhibited because of the degeneration of the cells surrounding the feeding sites and because of the lignification of cell walls followed by cell necrosis and death of the nematodes. The reaction of different sweet potato cultivars to the reniform nematode was first described by Martin et al. (4). Working under greenhouse conditions, they reported significant
differences among sweet potato selections; although, none of these selections showed a high resistance to the reniform nematode. They found that of 24 sweet potato cultivars, Goldrush was the most resistant because it supported the least reproduction of this nematode and it was the least suitable for increase of the reniform nematode population of the cultivars tested. As Goldrush was very susceptible to root knot nematode, Melodogyne incognita, they concluded that the factors controlling resistance in sweet potatoes to Rotylenchulus reniformis may differ from those responsible for resistance to root knot nematode. Further studies on the reaction of some sweet potato selections to the reniform nematode (12) indicated that three sweet potato selections supported less reproduction of reniform nematode in the greenhouse than Goldrush (least suitable standard), while 26 selections supported greater reproduction than Centennial (highly suitable standard) and 13 selections were intermediate. Nevertheless, Goldrush was reported to be the most severely damaged under field conditions even though it had lower reniform nematode populations (13).

In summary, the reniform nematode is a serious pest of sweet potatoes and various measures of control have been used. Several sweet potato cultivars and selections have been tested for resistance to the reniform nematode in the fields and under greenhouse conditions, but neither immunity nor a high degree of resistance has been noticed up to
now. Chemical control is the most effective measure of control against the reniform nematode on sweet potatoes (16). Significant nematode population reduction and yield increase were recorded in areas treated with soil fumigants (12). In addition, the occurrence of cracks on the fleshy roots was significantly lower in fumigated plots (12). According to Birchfield and Martin (6) nematocide treatments on sweet potatoes against the reniform nematode resulted in significantly higher yields and better grades than the non treated plots.
INTRODUCTION

A number of publications (11, 16, 26, 27) dealing with certain nematode populations have reported that if a certain host plant is grown at different initial population densities, these nematodes tend to increase to similar final population levels. This phenomenon is called the ceiling level, and has been demonstrated with several species of plant parasitic nematodes, especially the cyst nematode (Heterodera S). The ceiling level has been observed by Chitwood and Feldmesser (11) and by Jones (16) in fields as well as in pot tests. Further investigation about this phenomenon has been done recently by Seinhorst (26, 27). The study of the ceiling level is of major interest because it may be used as a measure of the host status of a plant. (29) Efficient hosts are the plants on which nematodes can build up to high ceiling level while a poor host possesses a low ceiling level. Nonhosts are qualified as those plants on which the nematodes fail to reproduce at all. Preliminary studies indicated the possibility that sweet potato cultivars may have varying ceiling levels for reniform nematode reproduction (14).

The objectives of this study were to: 1) define the ceiling levels for four sweet potato cultivars, 2) determine the relationship of root growth to ceiling level,
and 3) determine the reproductive capacity of individual nematodes at varying population densities.

Materials and methods

Four sweet potato cultivars: Centennial, Porto Rico, Goldrush and W-152 were selected based on unpublished and preliminary data (14). One vine cutting was planted in each pot filled with steam sterilized 1:1 sand-soil mixture. The plants were inoculated seven days after planting with different concentrations of reniform nematode eggs: 0 used as a control, 50, 500 or 5000 per 11 cm - diameter clay pot. For the first experiment, twenty replicate pots were used for each cultivar and concentration. Due to greenhouse space limitations, the different treatments were conducted sequentially. The plants were grown for 6-8 weeks at temperatures ranging from 80°F - 100°F. After 6-8 weeks, the plants were removed from the pots and were washed gently with running tap water to free roots of soil. Later, the roots were weighed and the total root system yield of each plant was recorded. The roots were cut into small pieces and placed in a petri dish containing water. The mature females on the roots were then counted with the aid of a stereoscopic microscope. The number of eggs per egg mass for each inoculum density on each cultivar tested was obtained by placing an egg mass into a drop of 0.525% sodium hypochlorite for 4 mintues. The eggs released were then counted with the aid of a stereoscopic microscope. Five egg masses were taken at random on each root system.
The method of Hussey and Barker (14, 30) was used for the extraction of eggs from the roots with 0.525% sodium hypochlorite.

The second experiment was set up in the same way as the procedures described above, except that only five plants for each inoculum density were used but all treatments were conducted simultaneously.

The data were analyzed by one way analysis of variance and Duncan's new multiple range test.

Results

The root weight of noninoculated Goldrush plants did not significantly differ from that of plants inoculated with different densities of the reniform nematode (Table 1 and 2). However, significant differences were recorded among the numbers of mature females per root system with a higher number occurring at the 500 inoculum level in test 1 and at higher inoculum level in test 2. The differences between eggs per female at different inoculum levels were not statistically significant in test 1, but in test 2 the number of eggs per female was significantly higher at low inoculum densities. The number of eggs per plant produced on Goldrush at different inoculum densities was not significantly different.

Porto Rico supported a significantly greater number of females and eggs per root system at the highest inoculum density, but its root weight was not significantly reduced.
(tables 3 and 4). The number of eggs per female was significantly higher at lower inoculum densities.

The effect of inoculum density was highly significant ($p < 0.01$) on root weight of Centennial cultivar which was reduced at higher densities in test 1 but not test 2. The number of eggs per root system was not significantly different among inoculum densities in test 1 (table 5); however, in test 2 (table 6) a significant increase in eggs per root system occurred with the 5000 inoculum density, but the number of the eggs per female was not statistically different.

Very few mature females were found on the root system of W-152 at low densities. The root weight was not affected; the number of eggs per female was statistically similar, but the number of eggs per plant was significantly higher at the 5000 inoculum density (tables 7-8).

**Discussion**

Different initial densities of the reniform nematode did not significantly affect root weight of the cultivars tested including Goldrush which is sensitive to reniform nematode damage in the field (13). The higher initial population levels in naturally infested fields (13). might have severely affected the root growth of Goldrush (13). Besides, stresses such as drought are more important in the field than in the greenhouse and they often make damage from root diseases more severe.
In spite of the extensive root systems and apparent availability of feeding sites for the nematodes, the number of mature females infecting the roots seemed to be dependent on the host. Some cultivars had few nematodes and a small number of eggs on the root system (Goldrush and W-152), whereas others supported a great number of mature females and eggs (Porto Rico and Centennial). These differences in infection and in reproduction of the reniform nematode on the cultivars tested may indicate the existence of differences in host status (16) among the cultivars.

The number of eggs per root system generally increased with increasing inoculum densities. However, this study showed a lack of significant differences among final nematode populations produced on Goldrush (tables 1, 2) and Centennial (table 5) inoculated with different inoculum densities. This fact suggests the possibility that these sweet potato cultivars may have different ceiling levels (16, 29) for reniform nematode reproduction under certain conditions. The number of mature females was high at the highest inoculum level and the number of eggs per female was significantly higher at the lower densities (tables 2, 3, 4, 5) but decreased with increasing inoculum density. This higher reproduction of individual females on the cultivars at low densities may explain the fact that the final populations were not significantly different at all inoculum levels.
In his report on the relationship between population increase and population density in plant parasitic nematodes, Seinhorst (29) pointed out the importance of the influence of external conditions on population increase. This remark may help us to explain why the same cultivars resulted in different numbers of eggs per female in the two different tests. The sweet potato cultivars were grown at different periods: test 1 was conducted during Fall-Winter season; while test 2 was during Spring-Summer period. Such differences in reniform nematode reproduction on the cultivars might be due to the changes in environmental conditions. Thus, further investigations on the effect of environment on the reproduction rate of the reniform nematode on sweet potato cultivars are needed.
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Table 1: Effects of inoculum density on Goldrush cultivar (test 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.17b</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.56a</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>7 b</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>9.36b</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>55 a</td>
<td>39.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>9.995b</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>11 b</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 20 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 2. Effects of inoculum density on Goldrush cultivar (test 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.86 a (21.10)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 c (0)</td>
<td>0 a (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.10 a (10.73)</td>
<td>6 b (12.52)</td>
<td>166 a (81.22)</td>
<td>1376 a (3076.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>28.56 a (7.46)</td>
<td>5 b (4.76)</td>
<td>54 bc (15.70)</td>
<td>2880 a (4656.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>21.90 a (8.95)</td>
<td>22 a (11.19)</td>
<td>67 b (4.61)</td>
<td>4208 a (3272.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 3. Effects of inoculum density on Porto Rico cultivar (test 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.63 b</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0 c</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.17 b</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4 c</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>10.98 c</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>21 b</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>22.44 a</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>58 a</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 4. Effects of inoculum density on Porto Rico cultivar (test 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Eggs/Female Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.22 a</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.44 ab</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>8 b</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>318 a</td>
<td>32.64</td>
<td>1568 b</td>
<td>1028.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>26.32 b</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>20 b</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>69 b</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>3728 b</td>
<td>2329.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>47.92 ab</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>99 a</td>
<td>71.29</td>
<td>79 b</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>23232 a</td>
<td>24809.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 5. Effects of inoculum density on Centennial cultivar (test 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.20 a (4.96)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 d (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.05 a (4.57)</td>
<td>2 b (4.47)</td>
<td>358 a (0.89)</td>
<td>37284 a (72059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>8.43 ab (5.06)</td>
<td>125 ab (83.72)</td>
<td>65 c (31.37)</td>
<td>28284 a (21556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>6.05 b (2.93)</td>
<td>177 a (181.30)</td>
<td>125 b (30.43)</td>
<td>29764 a (24290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 6. Effects of inoculum density on Centennial cultivar (test 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.56 a (14.19)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.96 a (10.98)</td>
<td>11 ab (21.18)</td>
<td>93 a (22.06)</td>
<td>3696 b (7777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>31.88 a (11.64)</td>
<td>10 ab (9.02)</td>
<td>99 a (47.61)</td>
<td>4752 b (4685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>24.60 a (11.28)</td>
<td>39 a (37.91)</td>
<td>90 a (16.17)</td>
<td>40304 a (45358)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 7. Effects of inoculum density on W-152 cultivar (test 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.31 b (7.14)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.59 b (9.62)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
<td>0 b (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>15.95 b (4.17)</td>
<td>3 b (2)</td>
<td>44 a (0.57)</td>
<td>1288 b (1235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>26.96 a (11.17)</td>
<td>17 a (3)</td>
<td>59 a (20.55)</td>
<td>5520 a (3232)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 20 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
Table 8. Effects of inoculum density on W-152 cultivar (test 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inoculum Density</th>
<th>Average of root weight in grams</th>
<th>Number of Females Per Root System</th>
<th>Eggs/Female</th>
<th>Eggs/Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.54 a</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.58 a</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>28.74 a</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4 b</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>28.54 a</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>67 a</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Each mean is an average of 5 replications with one pot chosen as one replicate.
2. The means followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan’s new multiple range test at 0.05 level.
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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a history and analysis of two Negro newspapers, L'Union and the New Orleans Tribune, which from 1862 to 1870, were vitally involved in Louisiana Reconstruction. The main sources of material were the newspapers themselves and the memoir of the editor of the Tribune. Other newspapers, contemporaneous accounts, reminiscences, and a variety of secondary works were also used.

L'Union began in December 1862, after the capture of New Orleans, as part of the wealthy free Negroes' effort to secure civil rights. With few exceptions it appeared only in French, and under the editorship of Paul Trevigne, presented the class's demands and protests. Because of the limitation of language and various internal weaknesses, it was not an effective organ. By mid-1864 it had aroused such a violent reaction among some whites that it was forced to discontinue.

Several days later, one of L'Union's owners, Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez, started the New Orleans Tribune to continue the movement's work. It soon became very influential when Jean-Charles Houzeau, a Belgian, was hired as editor. It became the first Negro daily in the United States and in the next four years stimulated issues and reforms, guided the Negroes, and was the rallying point for Louisiana radicalism. Houzeau gained the attention of Congress and the Northern press and
aided the movement greatly. With the onset of Radical Reconstruction in 1867 and Louisiana's 1868 Constitution the paper's goals were realized. However, a split in the state Republican Party caused by the Tribune's objection to the organization's candidates for state offices resulted in a year-long lapse in publication. When it reappeared in late 1868 and until its dissolution in 1870 its importance was negligible.
CHAPTER I

THE FREE NEGRO IN ANTE-BELLUM NEW ORLEANS

Free colored people, living in New Orleans as early as 1725, presented a sharp contrast to the ignorance of their enslaved brothers. Edward L. Tinker, a historian of that city, considers them to have been "... more highly educated than any of their race in the United States." They attained unusual wealth and refinement and filled a wide range of occupations. In the more than one hundred and fifty years of their development they rose steadily in all the attributes so admired in Western society. Nevertheless, because of the South's growing self-defensiveness in the second quarter of the nineteenth century they were gradually oppressed.

When New Orleans fell in April 1862 during the Civil War, the free Negro class was able to put forth an articulate enclave of men who attempted to lead their people in a movement for equal rights. Although their success was erratic and temporary, their small political force was felt by the ultimate sources of national power and affected the rebuilding of the South. Two of their newspapers, L'Union and the New Orleans Tribune, played a leading role in this effort. The story of how they came to be powerful and sophisticated enough to exert an influence in national and state politics after living for almost 1

---

two centuries on the sufferance of white society is essential to understand their motives and actions during Reconstruction.

In 1711 there were only twenty Negroes in the vast territory called Louisiana. The year after New Orleans was founded, in 1719, the Compagnie d'Occident brought the first large shipment of Africans to sell to the colonists. In subsequent years three to five hundred slaves were introduced per year and later, when their value was fully realized, they were imported by the thousands.²

Almost from the beginning of the first permanent settlement in Louisiana free Negroes were present, and as the years passed their ranks grew rapidly. Some may have come as indentured servants or as free men, but the greatest number derived from the union of white men and Negro women. In 1724 Bienville's Black Code prohibited the marriage of whites with Negroes of any racial mixture and banned both whites and free men from cohabiting with slaves. The lack of white women, however, made the law unenforceable, and miscegenation was frequent. When the Spanish regime began in 1769, there was already a considerable number of free griffes, mulattoes, quadroons, and octofoons (3/4, 1/2, 1/4, and 1/8 Negro).³

Appreciative or guilt-conscious Caucasian fathers settled abundant property and money on their colored mistresses and illegitimate progeny. As early as 1786 Governor Don Estevan Miro felt compelled to issue a proclamation forbidding free colored women from

² Ibid., 256-57. ³ Ibid., 259.
publicly displaying their fortunes. The growth of the wealth itself was never inhibited, and it accrued rapidly. In 1860 the New Orleans free population was worth an estimated fifteen million dollars, mostly in real estate. One example was Aristide Mary (a Reconstruction figure) who inherited an entire city block on Canal and Old Levee streets from his French father.4

Further instances are too numerous to mention, but one observation can be made: the wealth that some free men so easily acquired was generally preserved and multiplied. The class had few dilettantes, and even some of those who inherited little or nothing built large fortunes. Most remarkable was the case of Thomy Lafon, whose speculations enabled him to leave an estate worth almost one-half million dollars.5

The gens or hommes de couleur libre, as the French called the free men, derived prestige from their affluence. Material possessions alone set them apart, but it also allowed many of them to acquire refined educations in Europe in lieu of its availability to them in their native city. Thereby an extraordinary array of literary artists and professional men were produced.

The common men, who constituted the majority of the class, were also well educated for the time, particularly considering their circumstances. For example, in 1850 close to eighty percent of the city's


9,961 free Negroes were literate, and 1,008 of their children attended school. Compare these figures to those of Baltimore: in 1850 only forty percent of its 25,442 free Negroes were literate and only 1,453 of their children attended school; that is, even though the class was over two and one-half times as large as the one in New Orleans. Under increasingly adverse conditions the literacy of the Crescent City group rose to ninety percent in 1860. Allowing for different criteria, these figures are higher than the average for Louisiana in 1966.

The New Orleans free men were deeply concerned with education. Although schools for their children were not outlawed until the mid-1850's, the white public was extremely uneasy about Negro education. The colored men paid substantial taxes for public instruction which they could not take advantage of. Consequently, they resorted to private institutions and to classes held in their homes. The efficacy of this system is manifest in the statistics given above.

The mass of the free men were just as successful economically. Most were unskilled laborers and a considerable portion was respectable tradesmen. They dominated such trades as carpentry, masonry, bricklaying, and cigar and shoemaking. Many were also mechanics, coopers, carmen, house painters, barbers, and clerks, and several

became well-to-do home builders and tailors. In fact, the ratio
of skilled to unskilled jobs among free men was higher than among
Irish and German immigrants who had the obvious advantage of being
white. The class did have its drags—prostitutes, beggars, criminals,
and the like—but its overall responsibility and prosperity was re­
markable. To realize the actual magnitude of its achievement, it is
necessary to understand the legal and social conditions under which
the free Negroes lived.9

Although the New Orleans free people were far better off
than slaves, in comparison to whites they were oppressed. As the
Civil War approached, their legal status was made progressively more
tenuous and restricted. Earlier, under French and Spanish rule they
had come fairly close to equality with whites. In fact, when Louisi­
ana was sold to the United States in 1803, in the treaty France attempt­
ed to guarantee the colored population's rights and privileges. That
this promise would soon be overlooked was indicated when free men were
barred from entering the territory in 1807. Their right to vote was
only preserved for nine years. In 1812, when Louisiana became a state,
free Negroes were disenfranchised. Hypocritically, three years later,
a corps of free men was employed under white command to assist the
defense of the city in the War of 1812. According to General Andrew
Jackson they accomplished their part of the task admirably. Neverthe­

9 Robert C. Reinders, "The Free Negro in the New Orleans Economy,
1850-1860," Louisiana History, VI. (Summer, 1965), 274-76.
less, the ground was being cut from under them.\textsuperscript{10}

When slavery began to come under heated criticism in the 1830's, one reaction of Louisiana's ruling class was to drastically repress the free men. The logic of the slave order made their presence and especially their success a contradiction to the Southern ideology. The South also feared that they were potential agitators and leaders of slave revolts. Consequently, the 1830's saw the state outlaw the writing, printing, or speaking of what was considered seditious opinions. Also, further manumission was allowed only if the emancipated slave was removed from the state. The plan of this legislation was to both subjugate the class and stop their growth. By 1840 the mission was completed, but the paranoid legislators continued to enact repressive laws. Their reaction was intensified and became something of a mania.\textsuperscript{11}

The New Orleans press played its part in this crusade by whipping up public opinion against the free men. The newspapers noted that they were "uppity and impudent," and when one Negro insulted a policeman the \textit{Daily Crescent} observed that "... the high blooded negro is now in prison and will soon be called to explain why he fancied himself so much better than white men."\textsuperscript{12} As a result of this propaganda, opinion was sufficiently focused in an

\textsuperscript{10} Woodson, \textit{Free Negro Families}, xxx. \textsuperscript{11} Ibid.

anti-Negro mold to make the legislation of the 1850's look like the prelude to a pogrom.

In 1855 the state legislature outlawed any new religious, charitable, scientific, or literary societies of free Negroes and bluntly closed the door to manumission. Non-resident free men were again barred from the state, and if they happened to be on ships docking in New Orleans they had to be registered. Later this law was reinforced when it became a popular theory that such visitors were abolitionist agents. Thus, in 1859 free colored sailors were required to be kept in jail until twenty-four hours before departure time. In the same year the legislators, straining to do something severe, became petty. They made it unlawful for free Negroes to operate coffee houses, billiard halls, or retail stores where liquor was sold. The assemblage also made the ridiculous recommendation that free men should choose masters and voluntarily remain slaves for life, originally they had tried to make this mandatory.13

New Orleans heaped its own restrictions upon the free people. New ordinances prevented them from using firecrackers, playing cards, or dominoes, or holding dances with slaves. Further, the city prohibited the gathering of any Negroes, slave or free.14

Laws are only as strong as the degree of their enforcement.

In the case of those applying to New Orleans colored people, there

---


14 Ibid., 90.
is evidence that the police were fairly lenient until just before the Civil War. Besides law enforcement, however, the laws were also quixotic because the free men possessed many of the legal guarantees and privileges of whites. They could acquire and dispose of property, be party to binding contracts, and could marry within their class. They were tried in the same courts, under the same formalities as whites, and Louisiana was unique in the South in that free men were accorded the right of habeas corpus. Further, their testimony was valid in cases against whites, and like the latter, the testimony of slaves was inadmissible against them (except in cases of insurrection). The Louisiana Supreme Court declared as late as 1850 that free Negroes were, "... such persons as courts and juries would not hesitate to believe under oath and moreover are entitled to the protection of our laws." The Negro historian, Carter G. Woodson, said that the rights of free men in Louisiana were generally maintained with great energy. For example, he said that nowhere were suits to recover freedom so frequent or so successful. Nonetheless, the psychological impact of the repressive laws was serious.

The free colored class was always an accidental and unwanted product of Southern society. The colored people accepted their situation, as one writer noted: "... albeit with certain mental and a


few physical reservations, and constructed an institutional and class framework within the circle of caste limitations."

It is uncertain when distinct castes developed among the gens de couleur libre, but they were probably formed before 1750. Their society was built around the differences in the group already mentioned: skin color, education, occupation, and wealth, and was molded by ever-present slavery and prejudice. These factors gave the group variety and wide disparity in social status.

The wealthy, cultured free men, called cordon bleus, were separated by an impassable barrier from the slaves and even the lower class free men. Wealth and education, not skin color, determined who was in the highest caste. Within the castes, however, further differentiation was determined by racial mixture. Almost all free men were hybrids, and the different degrees such as griffe, mulatto, quadroon, and octoroon were closely guarded distinctions. The cordon bleus had no monopoly on light skin. Colored prostitutes and beggars were frequently quadroons and octoroons.

The more successful colored men went to great extents to emulate higher class white society. They had fine homes, carriages, imported clothing, and usually either employed servants or owned domestic slaves. They sent their children to European schools and

19 General Benjamin Butler said that the "darkest of them were about the complexion of the late Mr. Webster." James Parton, General Butler in New Orleans (New York, 1864), 517.
had exclusive literary and social societies. An observer noted that a few free men had boxes at the opera, a place, he said, where common white trash was not allowed. Another traveler, J. T. Trowbridge, after his visit to New Orleans, wrote that he saw free colored people "dressed in silks, accompanied by their servants, and speaking good French." Prejudice, ostracism, and increasing repression in the thirty years before the Civil War naturally had a deleterious effect on the New Orleans free colored population. The insulation their caste system afforded them was only a partial relief. As a result, emigration out of Louisiana began slowly in the late 1830's, but was not heavy enough to halt the group's rapid growth during that decade. A population of 11,906 in the city in 1830 rose to a peak of 19,226 in 1840. Due to the growing hostility directed toward the class in the following twenty years, however, its population dropped abruptly to 9,961 in 1850 and remained static at approximately that figure until 1860. Natural increase alone would have resulted in a larger number on the eve of the war. A colored accountant, J. B. Jordan, said that emigration in 1840 was not considered seriously except by a few, but in 1845 it became a topic of discussion and in 1850 became an active plan.

20 Richard C. Wade, Slavery in the Cities; the South, 1820-1860 (New York, 1964), 269.


22 Reinders, "Decline," 95.
Although only scattered records exist to indicate how many left, those leaving had as their principal destinations France, Haiti, and the Northern United States, with a handful going to Liberia, Mexico, and California. 23

The most damaging effect of the anti-free Negro movement and the consequent exodus was the loss of potential leaders. Many of those who left were the very individuals who might have offered a focus of protest. Sensitive artists and intellectuals such as Victor Sejour, Edmund Dede, Eugene Warberg, Richard Lambert, Nelson Debroses, Joseph Rousseau, Pierre Dalcour, and Camille Thierry found life in Europe more to their liking.

Nevertheless, a few leaders remained, and when the city was captured in April 1862 they responded vigorously. Among the most important was Dr. Louis Charles Roudanex, the subject of the next chapter. Roudanex, together with a number of other like-minded men, helped launch the Negro rights movement in Louisiana.

23 Ibid., 95-96.
CHAPTER II

DR. LOUIS CHARLES ROUDANEZ

Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez, "educated in Paris, wealthy and refined," was the man who made L'Union-Tribune movement possible. He helped found the first of these papers and then, when it failed, started the more powerful Tribune. Though his role in the daily writing of the two journals is uncertain, it is clear that he was largely responsible for their over-all goals. Essentially he wanted the Negroes, his own race, to have civil and economic equality with the whites. Historians, however, when they have not simply ignored him, call him a radical alien whose intention was to "Africanize" Louisiana. Compared with his colleagues, Roudanez's memory has been far more distorted and maligned.

Even Roudanez's origin has been blurred and fictionalized. He was by no means an alien, although those writers who have treated him almost unanimously label him "Santo Domingan." Even a partial list of those who have done this is impressive: Governor Henry Clay Warmoth, Roger W. Shugg, Hodding Carter, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Edward L. Tinker.

2 Henry Clay Warmoth, War, Politics and Reconstruction: Stormy Days
but what he may have intended only as a political "smeee," others have taken as truth.

What has happened to Roudanez at the hands of historians brings to mind a question posed by Bernard Weisberger: "one basic historiographical problem revolves around the question of whether the 'Negro' revealed by the documents is the true image of himself or the man whom whites want him to be." In Roudanez's case, a further query must be considered. Have later writers, rather than misinterpreting him, simply found the "image" as established by Warmoth so convenient to their theses that they did not bother to check the documents? This possibility not only applies to Roudanez's origin but also to his entire life. For these reasons, the following is based as much as possible on primary materials.

Louis Charles Roudanez was born on June 12, 1823, in Saint James Parish, Louisiana, to Louis Roudanez, a French merchant, and Aimée Potens, a femme de couleur libre. Although almost nothing is known of his childhood, there is an indication that an attempt was made to "pass" him as white. An octoroon, his baptismal record was registered in the "white" ledger of the parish church, and two prominent white aristocrats participated in the christening ceremony. M. Potier, in Louisiana (New York, 1930), 51, 57, 89; Roger W. Shugg, Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers During Slavery and After, 1840-1875 ( Baton Rouge, 1939), 215; Hodding Carter, The Angry Scar: the Story of Reconstruction ( Garden City, New York, 1959), 395; Du Bois, Black Reconstruction. 466; Tinker, Creole City. 106-107, 156-57.

the president of the College of New Orleans, baptized the infant, and Marius St. Colombe Bringler, a member of one of Louisiana's wealthiest and most famous families, was his godfather. For some reason, however, the effort to make him white was unsuccessful, and he spent his life as a colored man.

While still a youth, however, Roudanez was sent by his parents to New Orleans, the city where he would later play such an important role. There he received the beginning of an education and, afterward, some practical business experience in a notion store. The latter facet of his education was so successful, in fact, that he was able to pursue another type of career. He accomplished this by saving a few hundred dollars while he worked at a small salary at Hill and Cooley's store. During the depression of the 1840's Roudanez shrewdly invested his nest egg in deflated municipal bonds. Soon, when the economy returned to normal, he sold the securities for far more than he paid for them, acquiring a small fortune. Financially independent, he decided to travel to France to study medicine.

Arriving in Paris in 1844, at twenty-one, Roudanez soon began the long travail of a physician. He studied under the famous expatriate American doctor, Phillipe Ricord, at the University of Paris's Faculty of Medicine. After seven years of instruction he was graduated.

4 "White Baptismal Record, 1809-1895," St. Michael's Parish Church, Convent, Louisiana.
with honors in 1853.6

Graduation, however, posed a difficult problem for Roudanez. After spending such a long time in France under liberal racial attitudes, it would be a shock to return to the New Orleans of the late 1850's. He was determined to leave Europe, nevertheless, and though he wanted to go to Louisiana, he took the advice of his French friends and decided upon the Northern United States. This choice is easily understood, but what he did next is not.

Oddly, Roudanez went to Dartmouth College in New Hampshire and began to study for another medical degree. That institution's records corroborate the diploma he received in Paris and also show that after four years of study, he acquired the second, apparently superfluous, degree in 1857.7 There seems to be no explanation for the above unless, perhaps, he felt dual credentials would compensate for being colored if he returned to New Orleans.

Whatever the reason, he arrived in New Orleans in 1857 and the fact that he was an octoroon did not appear to hinder his success. He quickly developed a large, lucrative practice comprising some of the "best" families in the city. In fact, he prospered as if he were white and was soon firmly established.8

One year after he returned, he felt secure enough to become a

6 Ibid.
7 Joan G. Stewart to Author, March 11, 1966. In the possession of the latter.
family man. In 1858 he married Miss Celle Saulay and in the hectic years of Civil War and Reconstruction ahead they had eight children.9

But operating a large practice and rearing a numerous family were only a part of his responsibilities in the 1860's and 1870's. In the spring of 1862 New Orleans was captured and the oppression of the colored population was greatly alleviated. Roudanexz, who had tasted racial liberty in Paris, was among the leaders of the free colored elite who responded to the opportunity presented for promoting Negro rights.

The first thing the colored leaders did was to attempt to mold the energies of their race into a political force. What was seriously needed in 1862 was a common voice. Soon after the city's fall Dr. Roudanexz and a few other colored men made the first effort at satisfying this necessity by establishing the newspaper, L'Union.

From the beginning, L'Union advocated the abolition of slavery and civil and economic equality, including suffrage, for the colored people. Although Roudanexz was a principal owner of the organ, the extent of his participation in its actual production is uncertain (Paul Trevigne was the editor). It can be assumed, however, that the paper's goals were also the doctor's.

9 Daily Picayune (New Orleans), March 12, 1890; In 1890 three of Roudanexz's daughters were in Paris. One was the directress of an exclusive girl's school there. In the same year and city, one of his sons was attending the College de Louis Le Grand. Canonge, "Roudanexz;" Three of Roudanexz's sons received medical degrees from Dartmouth College. Louis Charles, Jr., born September 17, 1864, graduated in 1890 and died January 7, 1927; George A. Roudanexz, born September 17, 1866, graduated in 1890 and died August 23, 1919; Albert F. Roudanexz, birth date unknown, graduated in 1892 and was still living in 1940. Stewart to author.
L'Union struggled under handicaps which severely limited its effectiveness. The greatest obstacles were the violent hatred directed at its staff by local Confederate sympathizers and the disinterest of federal officers who were still engaged in the war. An additional weakness was the restricted audience that a French-language newspaper had, even in Louisiana. All these debilities led to L'Union's dissolution in the summer of 1864.

Dr. Roudanez purchased the defunct journal's printing equipment and in several days launched the New Orleans Tribune. He operated this new organ for almost six years at a heavy financial loss. The expense, however, was compensated for by the paper's unusual success. Several conditions which affected the Tribune enabled it to transcend its predecessor's weakness and incapacitation. The doctor at once avoided the crippling error of printing the newspaper exclusively in French. He also hired Jean-Charles Houzeau as its editor, a man who had impressed him as being a skilled propagandist. In the following years Houzeau more than realized the doctor's hopes. Under his direction, the paper played a key role in Louisiana Reconstruction and at times, even had some influence in national affairs.

Ironically, however, with the full realization of Negro goals in the 1869 Louisiana Constitution, the Tribune and Roudanez soon ceased to be politically important. The cause of this development

stemmed from the doctor's disapproval of the candidates chosen by that year's Republican Convention. He refused to support them, and although Houzeau convinced him that this was a fatal tactical error, he balked. He allowed his editor to endorse the nominees through the newspaper, but declined to add his own prestige to their cause. Consequently, Houzeau resigned and the Tribune ceased to appear for almost a year. It was then revived for one year, but it had declined to only a semblance of L'Union.11

A question arises: why was Roudanez unable or unwilling to adapt to political reality? Unlike what often happens to idealists who support a movement's early development, Roudanez was not rejected by the practical men and the corrupt opportunists who take over a mature crusade. In his case it was more a matter of his spurning them, the result being his political suicide, not theirs.12

The explanation for Roudanez's action lies, perhaps, in the fact that he was too refined for the class he tried to lead. His social analogue was more the white aristocrats than either the Negro or white Republican leaders. In reality, this relationship may have been quite direct. As has been seen, his ties with the "Bourbons," such as Marius Bringier, may have been very intimate. The paradox was that he was a colored man with upper-class white ideals who was

forced by race to identify with the Negro cause. Unlike such Negro leaders as P. B. S. Pinchback and Oscar J. Dunn, however, Roudanez had a Jeffersonian philosophy of government leadership. He wanted both races to share in the state's administration, but the chiefs had to be taken from among the educated elite. When he saw the Negro being used by carpetbaggers and unqualified colored men, he refused to support the latter two and, except for one brief reappearance, vanished from public affairs.

Roudanez's last involvement in politics was in the Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873, a reaction to "Afro-Carpetbag" rule. The maneuver incorporated men of both races with ideals similar to Roudanez's, and others who simply wanted to regain political influence for themselves or for their economic interests. The plan's strategy was to displace radical government by effecting a merger of whites and Negroes. The goal was, of course, also the doctor's, and as a result he became a leader of the colored adherents.

Speaking anonymously in an interview with the New Orleans Times; Dr. Roudanez said;

You may not be aware of it, but among the more intelligent and influential classes of our people, it is thoroughly understood that there is no future for Louisiana, and consequently none for the inhabitants thereof, whether white or black, unless the next election is carried by an anti-corruption party. . . . Let your people come out fairly and squarely . . . and a party can be formed that will sweep the state like wildfire. . . . We know that, by an alliance with you, we can have

13 Williams, "Unification Movement," passim.
more privileges than we now enjoy. We will not then cling to carpet-baggers for protection, but can ourselves take whatever share of office and representation falls to us fairly. Still we have some rights now, and we don't intend to give them up. Rather than do that we will cling to the carpet-bagger forever. . . .

He was, of course, speaking for the colored faction rather than just himself. He certainly had not been attached to the carpet-bag government. What he intended was to expel these officials who he had disclaimed in 1868. But the situation of 1873 was much the same as in the earlier year. The Negro masses did not share his opinions. The Unification Movement miscarried because it failed to secure wide popular support among either race.

From the collapse of the 1873 venture until his death seventeen years later, Roudanez apparently devoted himself to his family and practice. He recouped his wealth which had been poured out to support the two newspapers and made several visits to his children in Paris. Little else is known, and on March 11, 1890, he died.

Evidently, Roudanez's position in the city at his death was as secure as if he had never participated in Radical Reconstruction. The notices of his demise in the white newspapers were unusually long and complimentary. In L'Abéille (The Bee), the opinion of the Créoles was reflected in an obituary by Louis Placide Canonge, a well-known (white) journalist and literary figure. Besides rendering a detailed biographical sketch, the author paid Roudanez sincere homage:

14 Times (New Orleans), May 28, 1873.
15 Canonge, "Roudanez."
... those who were not of Dr. Roudanez's party can not refrain from giving their respect to his high probity and to the sincerity of his intentions... we hold him in great esteem. Until the end he remained a man of study, a practitioner of tireless activity, walking along with his epoch, and forwarding progress. This death is a sorrow not only for his family, but for all those who had relations with him... The composition of his funeral procession has witnessed this better than our pen... 16

Canonge's sentiments, and similar ones expressed in other conservative New Orleans newspapers, present a picture of Roudanez which is in contradiction to the "villain" created by some historians. The biographical facts substantiate the obituary writers. Roudanez was neither an alien nor a revolutionary; nor did he intend to "Africanize" Louisiana. He was an accomplished man who, if he desired, could have left the South's turmoil. Instead, he was compelled to fight for the Negro cause, although the condition of his birth equipped him with an elite, even aristocratic, viewpoint. Roudanez's tragedy was the dichotomy of his goals and principles. The former required guerrilla tactics and the latter prohibited them—the result was his alienation from the movement. The "true image" that emerges is that of a man who was a leader of the Negro cause in Louisiana, but who, in fact, resisted and eventually even fought the trend of corrupt radicalism and "Afro-Carpetbag" Reconstruction.

16 Ibid.
CHAPTER III

JEAN-CHARLES HOUZEAU

Roudanex was an important figure in Louisiana Reconstruction, but an even more influential man was Jean-Charles Houzeau. He determined the policy and wrote most of the editorials for the New Orleans Tribune and was almost wholly responsible for making it successful. Despite his significance, he has been ignored by historians.

Houzeau was born at Mons, Belgium, on October 7, 1820. He attended the College of Mons and later the University of Brussels, where he displayed brilliance in science and in the humanities. There, also, he manifested the originality and independence which later characterized him and which at this time led to his withdrawal from school. He preferred unrestricted travel and scientific research.1

From 1840 to 1845 he toured Europe and studied in the great libraries of Switzerland, Germany, and France. In Paris, however, his attention was diverted from science. The agitation which led to the 1848 Revolution was under way and the ideologies of such men as Louis Blanc and Pierre Proudhon, and the overwhelming sentiment for republican government, were a permanent influence on him.2 With these radical


principles fresh in mind he returned to Brussels and was appointed assistant to the director of the Royal Observatory. But his foremost concern at this time was political reform, not astronomy.

The Paris Revolt of 1848, the prelude to which he had witnessed, prompted Houzeau to act. He tried to foment a similar uprising in Belgium against the monarchy and the church. Possibly in association with Karl Marx, in exile in Brussels, he vented his radical opinions on individual liberty and social equality in the city newspapers. The government, however, had no trouble squelching either the nascent revolution or Houzeau. In 1849 he was removed from his position at the observatory on the basis that his political views were incompatible with state employment. Nevertheless, it soon became expedient for the government to overlook his sedition.

After a brief period in which his activities are uncertain, he was appointed director of a project to make a new national map based on astronomical triangulation. Recognition of his scientific prowess came from other quarters, too. He was nominated for membership by both the Belgian Royal Academy and the French Institute. But prestige in his homeland failed to compensate for his hatred of the government. After completing the map in 1857, he left Belgium with the intention of settling permanently in the more democratic United States.

The twenty-seven year old expatriate's destination was New Orleans. Arriving sometime in 1857, he occupied himself with studying English and observing the Louisiana legislature. He soon left the

3 Ibid. 4 Reulens, "Houzeau," 368.
5 Ibid., 370; Tinker, Creole City, 107.
city, however, when he became involved in a scheme to establish a settlement in Texas for alienated Belgians like himself. Although this plan quickly collapsed, he was already located near San Antonio and decided to remain. He did so for five years.6

Houzeau in the American Southwest was a peculiar combination of scientist and crusader. He studied the mental faculties of men and animals, constructed a small observatory, and made several short exploring forays.7 He also fraternized with the anti-slavery partisans and sent many letters to European newspapers describing the Texas political situation and bitterly, but rationally, attacking slavery. He did not confine himself to words, however, and became involved in the underground which helped Negroes and white abolitionists escape to Mexico. He soon had to take that route himself.

Houzeau's objection to slavery was so strong and so open that he soon became more estranged from his new environment than he had been in Belgium. Nevertheless, as the attempts to silence him became severe he responded with even more virulent criticism. Finally, in real danger, he was forced to flee. In Mexican disguise, and carrying a message from the Texas Unionist to President Lincoln, he arrived safely in Matamoras. Again, due to his convictions, he was a political outcast.8


7 Ibid., 1.; Reulens, "Houzeau," 369.

8 Tinker, Creole City, 107.
Houzeau never sought peace. After a brief sojourn in Mexico he secured passage to New Orleans, a more turbulent city than San Antonio even though it was under federal occupation. Aboard ship he met some people who talked of Dr. Roudanez’s struggle for Negro justice. Unknown to Houzeau, Roudanez had also heard of his sympathy for the cause, in this case, through reading his European letters which had been reprinted in Northern newspapers. Thus, even while en route his future was intertwined with the crusade in Louisiana.9

He arrived in New Orleans in February 1863 and met Roudanez almost immediately. The doctor warned Houzeau that his abolitionist letters had stirred up hatred toward him among the city’s pro-slavery faction and cautioned him to be discreet. Consequently, the thirty-three year old scientist-radical adopted the pseudonym "Cham," which became, at the same time, famous and infamous.

Besides warning Houzeau, Roudanez also persuaded him to collaborate on L’Union. He tried at first to get the Belgian to assume the editorship of the faltering paper, but temporarily the doctor had to accept less. Houzeau definitely sympathized with the Negro movement, but he was also a scientist. He was writing a large study of the mental faculties of men and animals and planned to finish his research in the Eastern libraries. Nevertheless, he combined his interests and agreed to send a weekly article to L’Union. The bargain completed, he left for Philadelphia.10

9 Ibid., 109. 10 Ibid., 108.
During the following year, from September 1863, to July 1864, numerous, (though not weekly) columns by "Cham" were printed in L'Union. He treated various subjects that would interest the journal's readers: diplomacy, politics, military events, Lincoln, Grant, Copperheads, the declining Southern war effort, colored soldiers, Maximilian, and, of course, slavery and abolition. In addition to writing these articles and doing research for Mental Faculties, Houzeau found time to write a book. This work, Question de l'Esclavage, is a two hundred and twenty page masterpiece of abolitionist propaganda and a preview of his Tribune editorials. It was, however, written for European readers and was never translated into English.

Houzeau ended his stay in Philadelphia. L'Union had failed, and Roudanez had purchased it to start the Tribune. The doctor intended to avoid duplicating the weaknesses of the earlier paper, but in the first two months of publication the new organ differed only slightly from its predecessor. Finally, however, Roudanez was able to convince Houzeau to accept the editorship and in November 1864 he returned to New Orleans and began the job. The start of his direction unquestionably marked the rescue of the Tribune and was in many ways a turning point in the Negro movement.

11 L'Union, September 22, 1863 and January 5, 12, 16, 21, April 19, May 3, 19, 24, June 14, 23, July 9, 1864.
12 Jean-Charles Houzeau, Question de l'Esclavage (Brussels, 1863).
"Dalloz," as Houzeau began to call himself, immediately identified with the New Orleans Negro Party. He threw himself into their cause with calculated, clear-sighted determination, but without illusions. Scientifically, he proceeded to revamp and arm the newspaper as an aggressive propaganda organ backed by a strong organization. The required changes were clear to him.

Houzeau realized that L'Union had been an impotent caste journal and that it had by no means been the organ that the movement needed. One of its faults, he said, was that it appeared only in French: "It isolated these colored men from the general life of the country . . . they could address themselves neither to the national government, to the Northern press, to public opinion, nor even to the slaves." Though, due to his urging, the Tribune had always been bilingual, until his arrival the English section had been only a "scissors job" as he called it. He quickly reversed this situation: "It (the English part) had to be our great arm of attack and defense and it was the one which deserved most attention and care."

Although he accomplished this first improvement easily the most formidable and injurious weakness was still to be repaired. It was the alienation between the colored leaders and the slaves. Mainly the problem involved persuading the oppressed group to trust their natural leaders, the free elite. But the problem was not merely one
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of ignorance, nor was it one-sided. Both factions had cogent reasons for their recalcitrance to ally with the other. Apparently, Houzeau was the only man who understood the dilemma and tried to rectify it.

A number of the gens de couleur libre had owned slaves and although their motives were usually philanthropic, cases of cruelty and exploitation were frequent. The Negroes remembered this, but the biggest source of estrangement was that, like the lowest caste whites, the Negroes doubted that those above them had their interests in mind. As far as some free colored men were concerned, the Negroes were correct. Many of those in the higher caste believed that they could secure their rights sooner if they abandoned the black mass.

Houzeau later commented on the problem which faced him in 1863:

They were, they said, closer to the whites; they were more advanced from many viewpoints. It seemed to them that it would be accorded to the free man what the Negro would never possess—civil equality. Strange error in a society where prejudice struck alike everyone with African blood in his veins, no matter how small the proportion.

The result, if the division persisted, would be the abortion of the entire cause. Houzeau reasoned that if mulattoes, octoroons, and quadroons were alone given civil rights, they would find themselves "lost in the mass; an imperceptible minority in the legal state, a minority without possible influence, condemned to nothing but a semblance of rights." [But if the free men took their logical position as leaders of the Negroes they would have a political force.] Finally,

16 Ibid., 11-12. 17 Ibid., 12
he added, it was always advantageous in a social upheaval to base oneself on principles; it would be "... easier to claim the emancipation of all, in virtue of natural rights, rather than asking the elevation of a handful of men of varied colors as a simple expedient."\footnote{Ibid.}

At best, Houzeau was able to accomplish partial unity for a few years. The divisions were too deep and founded upon too many generations of experience to be mended by anyone but a messiah who appealed equally to the intelligent and the ignorant Negroes. Houzeau, however, was not a man who could mesmerize mass audiences with oratory. He was a cold, withdrawn person who worked almost wholly underground. Nevertheless, he was able to surmount these handicaps with surprising success.

The reasons for the paper's effectiveness were first the result of the changes Houzeau made from French, to French and English, and his efforts to organize the Negroes. It was also due to an improvement that he made in the journal's content. L'Union had obscured the positive things it presented in a fog of hyper-patriotism and idealism. The Tribune, in contrast, proffered real, pragmatic leadership. Though it militantly criticized the prevailing order, it was soundly based on logic and fact. At the same time, it made constructive suggestions for reform. Houzeau wrote up to twenty editorials a week in this vein and created a paper that could not be easily ignored regardless of one's political allegiance.
Houzeau was an extremely efficient and able propagandist. He had no intention of simply producing a potent newspaper and then hoping that the right people would read it. His methods included purposely reaching the most important audience available. Thus, he sent copies of the Tribune to the Northern press and to Congressmen, two ultimate sources of national power.

Already, in January 1865, just weeks after he assumed the editorship, Houzeau's methods were proved. United States Representative William D. Kelley read the first of several of "Dalloz's" editorials to the House. In his speech, the Radical Congressman from Pennsylvania said:

I find in the New Orleans Tribune . . . which . . . I may remark, is the organ of the proscribed race in Louisiana . . . an admirable article in response to the question, 'Is there any justice for the black?'

He then proceeded to read the editorial and as Houzeau later observed, this " . . . was for the Tribune a sort of baptism. From that day on we were placed in front of the country." National recognition, of course, enormously strengthened the paper's influence, but as yet the political situation in the South was not ripe for full scale reform. Houzeau was not discouraged. He continued the flow of editorial protest and advice and fed the radicals.

19 William D. Kelley, Wendell Phillips, and Frederick Douglass, Equality of all Men before the Law Claimed and Defended (Boston, 1865), 24.

with potent ammunition for almost three years before the movement's goals began to be realized. Also, he departed somewhat from his usual introversion and became involved in the maze of political clubs and committees which so confuse that period of New Orleans' history.

Among such functions he was a member and convention delegate of The Friends of Universal Suffrage, and when that organization was transformed into the Louisiana Republican Party, he remained active. Later, he was also vice-president of the Louisiana Homestead Society and an official of the Freedman's Aid Society.21 Everything he did was single-mindedly aimed at strengthening the movement, weakening its opposition, and taking advantage of each opportunity. In 1864 and 1865 these chances were rare but a complex chain of events was under way whereby the enemy was preparing its own defeat.

The first manifestation of the disintegration of pure-white rule in Louisiana occurred in the 1864 Constitutional Convention. That body made several concessions to the Negroes, and there was even a weak move to extend them suffrage. When the Republican Party began to lose its grip on the state, however, self-preservation made it expedient to give the Negro the vote. The only way this could be done was to take advantage of the provision which the 1864 Convention had made, allowing itself to be reassembled. Finally, in the summer of 1866, in opposition to great Democratic resistance and through complicated legal machinations,

the Convention was reconvened. The conservatives and reactionaries knew that this delegation would produce a new constitution which would probably disfranchise many whites and, in turn, give the vote to the Negroes, creating an immediate black majority. Consequently, passions were so aroused that when the Convention met on July 30, 1866, it was smuffed out in a bloody riot in which scores of Negroes and a few whites were killed.

The irony of the riot was that though it blocked the Negro vote, at the same time it convinced the North that the South was still in rebellion. In part this led to Radical Reconstruction which did far more than just give the Negro suffrage.

Houzeau, who was an onlooker during the riot, made certain that full propaganda value was gained from the anti-Negro massacre. As soon as he escaped from the fighting, he went to the Tribune office, printed a special issue, describing the riot in detail, and rushed it to Congressmen and Northern newspapers. The riot's final result, in part due to Houzeau's publicity, was a strong public reaction which favored the Radical Republicans in the fall election. When Congress convened in December the Radicals felt that the people had endorsed their plans for the South.

As if the riot was not enough, during the winter the South— including Louisiana—almost unanimously rejected the Fourteenth Amendment. In April 1867, Congress retaliated with the First Reconstruction Act, which, among other provisions, disfranchised many whites and enfranchised the Negroes. Thus, in several months the impasse of 1864
and 1865 was broken and the South was revolutionized.

The most important and immediate result of Radical Reconstruction in regard to the Louisiana Negro party was the Constitution of 1868. It embodied everything the Negroes had demanded and more. Houzeau viewed it as the apogee of the movement, and it was, for the decline quickly followed. In the Republican Nominating Convention of that year the rift between the free colored elite and the Negro masses—never really healed—reopened. The candidates which the majority chose were completely objectionable to Houzeau's colleagues. Though he agreed that they were offensive, he did not react in the same way as Roudanez. The doctor immediately went to Houzeau and proposed that they present a different list, but the Belgian rejected the idea. He felt that they could not ignore the verdict of the convention after having accepted its authority and, also, that a another ticket would split the Republican Party and might cause its defeat in the election. He concluded that the paper must support the nominees and then, afterwards, try to keep the elected officials from perverting the cause.22

Dr. Roudanez decided to allow Houzeau to direct the paper in favor of the Republican candidates, but with a reservation. Neither he nor the other Tribune men would assist in the endorsement. Houzeau was checkmated: "My colored friends and I could march together as long as we marched in agreement. It was not up to me to impose on them, in spite of themselves, a plan for the defense of their cause."23 He

22 Houzeau. "Le Journal Noir," (June, 1872), 120.
23 Ibid., 121.
resigned on January 18, 1868, and the paper ceased to appear for almost a year. It was, as mentioned, revived for a time, but for various reasons it was only a specter of the old Tribune.

Despite the failure of the paper and the movement's partial corruption in 1868 and in following years, Houzeau regarded the overall crusade as a great success. In "Le Journal Noir," which he wrote in 1872, before the return of white rule, he remarked:

> It was a great spectacle, that of the coming to power of this great new class, numerous and industrious, only some years before so harshly and profoundly weighted down. One felt his heart at ease at the late reparation. . . . It will always be for me a cause of great satisfaction to have had my place in this rehabilitation of five million people. From a philanthropic viewpoint, as from one of social progress, it was the greatest event of our time.24

Houzeau's personal satisfaction was well deserved. He struggled shrewdly and tirelessly for almost five years for other men's rights. He was an indispensable practical leader and propagandist, and it is doubtful whether the Louisiana Negroes would have been as successful without him. The Tribune certainly would have duplicated many of L'Union's weaknesses. [In fact, it is safe to assume that if Houzeau had not changed the direction of the newspaper its historical significance would be as a document of the impotent protests of an idealistic, caste-conscious minority.  

Houzeau compensated for his colleagues' inability to lead a political movement, and when they ceased to follow his direction they and their journal failed.

24 Ibid., 117.
The reason that he left the Tribune was because his friends were unable to bend their ideals to political reality. Houzeau himself was more pragmatic. He agreed that their cause was the "greatest spectacle of our time," but he reasoned that a momentary set back did not mean the entire movement was a failure. His motive for joining it, in the first place, was not just to assist the Negroes, but to assist the centuries-long natural rights revolution. Explaining this, he said:

The cause that we defended was after all but a chapter in the great universal cause of the oppressed of all colors and all nations—in the end the same denial of justice. I understood the situation of the New Orleans colored men, I identified myself with them, because if the people were different the situation had for me nothing strange. I found again on one side a dominating class, and on the other, a dominated class that was crushed under foot and which had no caste in society.25

Houzeau left the United States in 1868 for Jamaica. He lived there with a Negro family and finished much of the work which had been interrupted in 1863. In 1872 he completed Studies on the Mental Faculties of Man and Animals, and also wrote a memoir (quoted earlier), "Le Journal Noir." In addition, he wrote numerous scientific essays and books which were published in Belgium and which led to his return there. In 1875 the director of the Royal Observatory died and Houzeau was urged to fill the vacancy. After much coaxing he returned in 1876 and commenced another frenzied decade of activity.26

26 Reulens, "Houzeau," 370.
Houzeau soon dominated the scientific community of Belgium. In addition to being head of the observatory, which he completely reorganized, he was elected president of the Belgian Royal Academy of Science. He also helped found the Royal Geographical Society and was several times its president. Later, in 1882, he made an expedition to Texas as part of a world-wide Venus tracking project (made possible by his invention, *l'héliomètre a foyer inégal*). But this, again, was only one side of a man who was also concerned with public affairs and political philosophy.

Houzeau found time among his scientific work and the staggering amount of writing he did, to be involved in politics. He was a member of both the Belgian Labor Party and the "Freethinker's Society," and although the extent of his participation is uncertain, both groups considered him important enough to have a representative speak at his funeral.

In 1883 a disease he had contracted during his last visit to America began to disable him. He resigned his post at the observatory and retired to Schaerbeek. Despite his bad health, he devoted his last five years to compiling a bibliography of all the astronomical books, articles, and manuscripts known in the world. When he was half done with this project he died on July 12, 1883.
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Obituaries of Houzeau appeared in the major newspapers of Europe and England, and biographical sketches were printed in many scientific journals. At his funeral five long eulogies were delivered to a large crowd of mourners. Besides the two already mentioned, speeches were made by a general of the Belgian Army and by representatives of the Royal Observatory and the Royal Geographical Society. Perhaps the most concise characterization of Houzeau given at this ceremony was that, in his time, he had one of the deepest interests in the cosmos—in the stars, in the earth and in men.31

CHAPTER IV

L'UNION

On April 26, 1862, just over one year after the Civil War began, New Orleans fell to federal troops. Besides the importance of this event to the war, it had considerable meaning for the city's ten thousand free colored inhabitants. Although they remained the lowest element in free society under Union occupation, their nature as such changed. In one day their status as the third element in a culture made for two was upset. They were not, of course, given political rights but were tacitly allowed freedom of press and protest. In this new, slightly altered condition the free Negroes took the first steps toward political power.

Not all free men responded. Like other groups, there were those who were absorbed in subsistence and those who were simply apathetic. The exceptions, men who were both inclined and able to make use of this new opportunity for promoting their lot, came mostly from the educated and wealthy coterie of colored aristocrats, the cordon bleu. Travel and education had heightened their objection to the Southern caste system and when New Orleans was captured they were the first of their race to demand civil and economic rights. In the summer of 1862 a small enclave of these men created the newspaper L'Union as a vehicle of their protests and opinions. In doing this, a thing many
whites considered revolutionary and impertinent, they launched the Negro movement which had a profound effect upon the history of Louisiana.

The first issue of L'Union appeared on September 27, 1862. Its motto, "Memorial, Politique, Litteraire, et Progressiste," accurately represented its contents and belied its surprising quiescence. The bulk of the newspaper consisted of war news, European bulletins, saccharin fiction, and commercial advertisements. Except for sporadic editorials which indicated that L'Union had a mission, the paper was thoroughly middle-class and unmilitant.

But besides content, L'Union's most glaring deficiency as a crusade organ was its muteness. With few exceptions, the paper was printed in French, which was not the common language of either the city's whites or Negroes. Circulation, therefore, was greatly restricted and whatever effect might have been made on Northern opinion or on the federal officers who were the direct source of control in New Orleans was inhibited.

The responsibility for L'Union's inadequacy as a political action journal falls upon its supporters, including Dr. Roudanez, and its editor, Paul Trevigne. These men lacked the skill necessary to make the paper effective. It took two years of experience and failure before it was superseded by the unusually successful New Orleans Tribune. In the meantime, L'Union remained an intra-caste journal and its impact was small except for the violent reaction it provoked among some of the city's French-speaking whites. Consequently, the paper's historical significance was limited, but as a document of the thinking of its creators
and of their class, it is invaluable. Edward L. Tinker called L'Union
(and the Tribune) ("the best record of the Negro side of the envenomed
battle for white supremacy in Louisiana."

The opinions and principles of the free colored elite were,
in fact, monotonously repeated in the paper's editorials month after
month. Variety occurred only in reaction to new issues, and even then
the arguments were patent. For, like the early Marxist dogma, the Negro
credo provided a ready interpretation for everything: "We are a respect-
able segment of this city's population. We own fifteen million dollars
worth of property and are well educated and refined. For generations
we have been patriotic and loyal and have helped you fight your wars.
We ask an end to hypocritical democracy and to privilege based on race.
We want to rank as human beings with full civil and economic equality."
With these ideas in mind the editorials were written.

In L'Union's maiden issue an editorial enthusiastically announced
the start of the drive for Negro rights. The author considered it the
signal of a new era: "The hour has sounded for the fight of great humani-
tarian principles against a vile and sordid interest which breeds pride,
ambition, and hypocrisy." He was adamant: "You were born for liberty
and happiness! Don't deceive yourselves, and don't deceive your brothers."²

L'Union initiated more, however, than just the movement. The
style of its editorials was set upon the model of French Revolutionary

1 Tinker, Creole City, 156.

2 L'Union, September 27, 1862. (All L'Union editorials were translated
by Roger Des Forges for James McPherson of Princeton University who loaned
them to the author for use here.)
literature. The prose was exclamatory and florid, and its intensity must have caused the whites some apprehension. Soon, though, it became clear that the only extreme characteristic of the L'Union men was their rhetoric. As will be seen, the editors went to great trouble to prove the integrity of their middle-class ideals. The free men had no illusions of becoming dominant, but merely sought the recognition and privileges of the class with whom they identified. To dispel any doubt concerning their intentions they balanced the radical fervor in the original issue with a patriotic treatise on republicanism.

In the form of advice to foreigners this editorial extolled the American system and even went so far as to hope that it would spread throughout the world. The writer argued that immigrants should surely appreciate democracy and adhere to its cause, currently in danger. By admonishing the newcomers to Louisiana the editorial exposed the colored men's disapproval of them. They were irritated that a man could come from Europe and instantly have more rights than the native Negroes. Later, this complaint would be made bitterly clear, but in the meantime L'Union turned from criticism to make an examination of the colored man's situation in 1862.

In a long editorial, which is almost a précis of L'Union, the demands, the protests, and the rationale of the free elite were presented. The article said that contrary to general opinion the colored man understood what his role should be in the war between the states.
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It was necessarily as an ally of the Union. He had no illusion, however, that because of this loyalty the federal government would immediately bestow full rights upon his class. Prejudice, he said, was well rooted in the white population of the United States and would be an insurmountable barrier for years. Nevertheless, an immense step had been taken toward equality as a result of what the writer termed the "great civilizing war." He added that all colored men should aid the North in suppressing the Southern rebellion. Not only was the cause theirs, but such action would quell the criticism that the Negro was a complete stranger to the events which could better his lot. 4

After he analyzed the present and established the allegiance of his class to the Union, the writer explained why free men deserved full rights. To begin he detailed their military services. Their "love and defense of country" extended from the colonial days, through the American Revolution, and the War of 1812, to the current war. He said that officials had vainly promised the colored veterans civil rights as a reward for their action, but that nothing was ever done. He wondered if the government feared that they would misuse such rights. 5

To allay doubt the editorialist presented evidence of his class' responsibility. From oppression they had raised themselves to distinction. Their present development was as notable as any group in the state. They were paragons of middle-class ideals, he concluded, and once this was commonly known the only reason for withholding their rights would

4 Ibid., October 1, 1862. 5 Ibid.
be the ignorance and prejudice of the whites.\textsuperscript{6}

In the following month, after establishing the degree of their culture and what they considered the justice of their demands, L'Union finally made a statement on the sensitive question of the free men's relationship to slaves and former slaves. Again, its position was not radical. The author, in fact, sounded much like a white Southerner. He made it implicit that it would be difficult to ally with such crude people, but that it was their duty to lead them. He stated the obvious fact that they were ignorant and as such were unfit for citizenship. The free men had to teach the newly free "that the word 'liberty' is not the sign of anarchy and laziness," and that liberty would only be useful to them if they were industrious and orderly. He further said: "Compatriots, let us not forget to inculcate in our freed brothers this principle that true liberty is achieved only by practice of all the religious and social virtues." There was no mention of suffrage and, moreover, the impression conveyed is that the old free men wanted to keep the social strata among the Negroes essentially the same as it was under slavery.\textsuperscript{7}

The above editorial reflects one of the main qualities of L'Union, that is, as a caste paper. As Houzeau said in "Le Journal Noir," it was the newspaper of \textit{elite pariahs}, of the highest low class in society.\textsuperscript{8} This paradoxical state was partly engendered by a fear that freeing and enfranchising the slaves would obliterate their own class in a homogeneous

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{7} \textit{Ibid.}, November 15, 1862.
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black mass. Certainly, however, L'Union did advocate abolition. In December 1862, when it was known that Lincoln was soon going to deliver the Emancipation Proclamation, L'Union spared no enthusiasm in heralding it. 9

During the same month L'Union became self-defensive when the Creole newspaper, La Renaissance, attacked General Butler and the free Negroes. It claimed that the colored men who had previously been "... eminently Louisianian" had been made the general's tools through his pandering to their sick vanity. L'Union was incensed. 10

In response to the La Renaissance it argued that it was the whites who were vain, that this was evident in their egotistic refusal to grant the colored man his natural rights. Moreover, the free men had been prepared to aid in the defense of the city against the Union troops:

... and what did they do to us, with us so 'eminently Louisianian'? We saw ourselves refused the favor of taking part in a brigade by the lively opposition which several foreigners manifested ... what had they done for us, so we might remain faithful to the detriment of our cause? When a colored man, wronged by some individual of the lowest rubbish that European society tosses up on our shore, asks some justice, what happens? with a cold proceeding which we little expected, the Black Code is cited for us. 11

Thus L'Union defended the free men's identification with the

9 L'Union, December 30, 1862.
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North. And there was need for defense. In the winter of 1862-63, the date of the above editorial, the Confederacy was still strong. The war's turning point in the following summer was, of course, unforeseen. If the South was able to win the war, or, at least, manage to confirm secession and drive the Federals out, the consequences for the free men would be severe. In the face of this threat and under constant harassment by local vigilantes it required courage to continue the newspaper.

Nevertheless, L'Union began to argue openly for suffrage and in November the colored leaders presented a petition to General Shepley, military governor of Louisiana, asking for the right to vote. They listed their services to the nation and to the state and their continual payment of substantial taxes to support this request. Shepley, however, referred the matter to General Banks. This delay frustrated the colored men because the election for state officials that Banks had ordered, was approaching. L'Union became desperate and numerous editorials were printed defending this droit de suffrage. Still nothing was accomplished. Banks finally rejected the petition, stating that he thought it "unfeasible to draw the line between free men of color and the recently emancipated Negroes." Thus in the election of February 1864, only whites were allowed to vote.

L'Union remained relentless. When Banks ordered a convention to meet in March 1864, to amend the Louisiana Constitution of 1852, the

colored leaders regarded the intervening months as their last opportunity. As a result, it was decided that a request would be made directly to President Lincoln for suffrage for qualified free men. For this purpose, they prepared a new petition with over one thousand signatures. The old pattern was followed of detailing the wealth, patriotism and military history of the class. They concluded it by saying:

... and we ask that all citizens of Louisiana of African descent, born free before the rebellion, may be, by proper orders, directed to be inscribed on the registers...

When the delegates arrived in Washington with the petition, some Radical Republicans attempted to persuade them to delete the caste qualification. It was not removed, however; instead, an amending paragraph was merely added.

In this condition the petition was presented to Lincoln on March 12, 1864. He received the delegates with courtesy but said: "I regret, gentlemen, that you are not able to secure all your rights." Colonel Forney quotes him as saying, "and that circumstances will not permit the government to confer them on you."

13 James M. McPherson, The Negroes' Civil War: How American Negroes Felt and Acted During the War For the Union (New York, 1965), 278. The emissaries to Lincoln were Jean-Baptiste Roudanez (the doctor's brother) and Arnold Bertonneau. The former was an engineer and the latter a wine merchant who was a captain in the first Negro regiment raised by General Butler. Benjamin Quarles, Lincoln and the Negro (New York, 1962), 227.

14 Liberator (Boston), April 1, 1864.

15 McPherson, The Negroes' Civil War, 279

16 Quarles, Lincoln and the Negro, 227.
The two colored men departed greatly disappointed, but they might not have been had they known the actual effect their petition had upon Lincoln. The next day the President wrote a letter to Governor Hahn:

I barely suggest, for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in, as, for instance, the very intelligent, and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. They would probably help in some trying time in the future...

James G. Blaine considered this letter "of deep and almost prophetic significance. It was perhaps the earliest proposition from an authentic source to endow the Negro with the right of suffrage." But Hahn had no intention of taking Lincoln's advice, and the Constitutional Convention met on April 6, 1864 with no Negro delegates.

During this political ferment, L'Union departed from its usual policy of silence on social reform. In an editorial called "Les Chars de la Ville," of May 24, 1864, a bitter criticism was made of segregated public transportation. It reflected that nothing demonstrated the absurdity of prejudice as well as separate street cars for the two races. It went on to say:

ask a dirty individual of whom the whiteness of his skin is hidden under a thick layer of filth, why colored persons cannot enter all the vehicles without distinction. This personnage of equivocal cleanliness will answer surely: 'We don't permit niggers to sit next

18 James G. Blaine, Twenty Years of Congress: From Lincoln to Garfield, II (Norwich, Conn., 1884), 40.
to whites. 19

One writer has commented that "here was what the whites feared; demands for political equality were leading to demands for social equality." 20 Although, this was certainly not true of all whites, feeling in New Orleans during the Constitutional Convention was turning strongly against the blacks. 21

The Constitution which the delegates produced included several concessions to the Negroes, but these were due completely to Banks' pressure. In fact, the convention had at first attempted to perpetually ban the extension of suffrage to colored men. The new document, however, abolished slavery and also recommended that in the future, the legislature grant the vote to Negroes who had such qualifications as past military service, taxable property, or, manifest intelligence. It also arranged for public education of Negroes and whites. Nevertheless, L'Union was soon disappointed. The newly elected legislature met and rejected Negro suffrage. 22

The action of the lawmakers did not dispel the opposition toward the Negro movement. Harassment of L'Union was intensified. This culminated when threats were made to burn the printing office and to kill Trevigne. Consequently, the newspaper's supporters were frightened and on July 9, 1864, L'Union was dissolved.

19 L'Union, May 24, 1864.

20 William E. Highsmith, "Louisiana During Reconstruction" (Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1963), 159.

21 Rousseve, The Negro in Louisiana, 100.

22 Ibid.
Regardless of intimidation and legislative decisions, *L'Union* had internal weaknesses which contributed to its failure. The almost exclusive use of French was a handicap, but even if the paper had been bilingual it would have remained somewhat impotent, for the editorials were inadequate and inappropriate for several reasons.

In the first place the editorial style was impractical. Revolutionary cliches, florid adjectives and an unrealistic intensity obscured ideas. This reflected the Creole culture of the free Negro aristocrats. They were steeped in romantic literature and in the ideologies of bourgeois European upheavals. When these notions were imposed on the nineteenth-century Negro civil rights movement the product was anachronistic and illusory, qualities which pervaded not only style but content.

In addition, one overriding fact colored *L'Union*'s editorial platform. The men who produced the newspaper, aristocrats of their race, had a certain degree of prestige within the Negro population. During the social disruption of the 1860's this elite group attempted to elevate all Negroes, but in doing so were determined to maintain their own distinctiveness. This vested interest greatly restricted the direction of the movement and undermined *L'Union*'s editorial integrity. There was, however, some basis for their position. To request suffrage and other rights for educated and wealthy colored men in the mid-1860's was considered extreme, but to also ask it for ex-slaves was absurd. It is doubtful, though, that political expediency was their prime motive. More likely, it was due to ingrained prejudice.
The condescending attitude toward newly freed slaves, the petition to Lincoln, and many editorials indicated the real nature of L'Union. It was a newspaper as thoroughly caste-conscious as the La Rennaissance. Though there are several parallels between the two, the Negro organ alone mixed social and traditional pretentions with the rationale of class struggle. Consequently, L'Union's position was paradoxical. With one hand its editors redundantly listed the military history, the devotion to Louisiana, and the economic and intellectual achievements of their caste. With the other they criticized the entire fabric of Southern society and allied themselves with the North. In part, the result was a failure to gain either significant white or Negro support.

However, tactful L'Union had been it is doubtful whether considerable white backing could have been attracted. Not only was their "insurmountable prejudice," against the Negroes, as L'Union had noted earlier, but also, a stratified society such as the South, resists social mobility. In such a class system, as one historian observed, a caste's attempt to elevate itself "unlooses feelings of tension and fear in the next higher group, which will exert itself, often violently, to keep the subordinate group down." L'Union's attempt to do so, within such a difficult context, was all but predetermined to fail.

Although the paper did collapse in July 1864, the movement had made some notable progress toward its goals. Most importantly, the

newspaper successfully imprinted the idea of colored rights upon the whites. W. E. B. Du Bois recognized this and said that if the Reconstruction experiment had been tried anywhere but in Louisiana the "question of Negro suffrage would not have been raised then or perhaps for many years after." L'Union, with all its ineptness, made colored rights a bitter, controversial issue which could not be ignored.

Roger W. Shugg comes to the same conclusion as Du Bois, but gives it even broader significance. In agitating for civil rights, Shugg says, the colored paper showed that Radical Reconstruction was not wholly a Northern product. L'Union made this achievement almost in spite of its journalistic and political weakness. The Tribune, in contrast, did it skillfully and far more thoroughly.

As will be seen in the following chapter, L'Union was an amateurish first step to the extraordinary success of the Tribune. The earlier paper was an unintentional experiment in learning through experience. Dr. Roudanez realized, with Houzeau's assistance, that L'Union's failure did not mean the general breakdown of the movement. Instead, he saw that the paper had collapsed merely because it was unfit. He created the Tribune and, with Houzeau as editor, avoided the preceding paper's mistakes.

24 (Du Bois, Black Reconstruction, 153.)
CHAPTER V

THE NEW ORLEANS TRIBUNE

The political situation in Louisiana in the summer of 1864 must have seemed hopeless to the free Negroes. The Constitutional Convention and the subsequent legislature of that year neglected L'Union's key demands for civil rights and instead established a modified status quo ante-bellum which appeared permanent. Nevertheless, the colored leaders persistently carried on their movement. Thus, when L'Union collapsed the creation of a new organ was imperative. Dr. Roudanez recognized this necessity and launched the New Orleans Tribune just twelve days after L'Union's last issue.

The New Orleans Tribune was inaugurated on July 21, 1864. Like L'Union it was a four-page tri-weekly, but in contrast it was bilingual. The slogan was changed from "Memorial, Politique, Littéraire, et Progressiste," to "Political, Progressive, and Commercial." The omission of "Littéraire" signified nothing. In the French section of the Tribune feuilleton, serialized essays and stories, continued as regular features. Nor did the addition of "Commercial" mark a change. Both L'Union and the Tribune included market quotations, ship arrivals and departures, and business advertisements. The new newspaper also employed essentially the same staff as the old, including the editor, Paul Trevigne. Nevertheless, in spite of the many similarities, it
was distinctly different.

During the first few months of publication, until Houzeau replaced Trevigne as editor in November, the Tribune duplicated several of L'Union's defects. The editorials were usually florid and shallow, and the only improvement besides the major advancement of using English, was a partial broadening of its political platform. The Negro masses were now given slightly more inclusion in the movement. Apparently the reason for this concession was the knowledge that L'Union's caste strategy had failed. It became necessary to advocate civil rights for all Negroes.

The Tribune's first editorial criticized Lincoln's veto of the Wade-Davis Bill and his adherence to his own moderate Reconstruction policy. The article said that his Ten Percent Plan would prevent the reform of the South which the war had made possible. Further, it argued for suffrage for qualified colored men so that the section could be rebuilt as Congress desired and in accord with "... the demands of the century." The editor was especially worried that Negroes would have no role in the coming election of Representatives to Congress. "Half measures," it warned, "killed the old Republic."1

An extremely flowery and emotional editorial on July 28 demanded suffrage because of Negro participation in the war. It said that although some progress had been made toward colored voting, it had all been in the North. From now on, it declared, the Louisiana Negroes "... are taking their place at the political banquet of the nation ... the noble destiny which our African race has taken in the gigantic

1 New Orleans Tribune, July 21, 1864.
conflict . . . has sufficiently revindicated our rights. . . ." The cry of Lamartine of "48", it said, should sound around the world: ". . . equality is the daughter of liberty!".

By August the language of the editorials was more moderate, but their logic, if anything, deteriorated. One editorial attacked Lincoln, claiming that he zealously protected the concept of the ownership of human beings. Further, when the colored delegation called on him at the White House in April 1864, the president told them that the Negroes' presence in America had led to the Civil War. A subsequent editorial noted a breakdown in the integrity of another Negro hero, William Lloyd Garrison, it claimed, agreed with Lincoln that suffrage was the exclusive province of the states, and moreover, that he unjustly confused the newly freed slaves with "... our intelligent population . . ." that had been free before the war. The Tribune writer was so infuriated that he jumped subjects and delivered a blast at immigrants and in the same breath threatened disaffection if Negroes were not rendered justice.3

A letter to the editor (probably written by the staff) discussed the subject of land reform. It criticized the theory that Negroes abandon themselves to "do-nothingness" and that they are incapable of ever enjoying the fruits of independent labor. Once they have the profit

2 Alphonse Louis De Lamartine (1790-1869) was a French poet, historian, and statesman. His most notable work was the Histoire des Girondins.

3 Tribune, August 4, 1864.
motive, the article continued, their detractors would soon understand Negro productiveness. The division of the land, even on a rental basis, would result in harvests ten times as abundant as under slavery, and would benefit all Louisianians. Without saying how, the article noted that the land would inevitably be diffused among the population. 4

During the remainder of August and into November the Tribune attacked General Banks's "Free labor" system, claiming that it catered to the planters. Also, on August 13, a lead article berated the commander's apprentice policy. The editor said that Banks, in General Order Number 23 "... employed language that even the most tyrannical Spanish monarch never used ... using the word 'insolence' in a public order ... is clear proof that he is not a republican." The Tribune was particularly dissatisfied with the tax on colored men not employed in agricultural pursuits, the ridiculously small wage Banks directed the planters pay the freed men, and the one-year contracts the Negroes were forced to make. The paper demanded freedom to come and go, a right the labor system negated by requiring the black worker to secure a pass from his employer even if he wanted to visit a neighboring plantation. All these measures, it concluded, established de facto slavery.

In the fall of 1864 the paper repeatedly attacked the frequent arbitrary arrests of colored men in connection with the "free labor" system and for once it achieved a reform. Banks, the paper observed,

4 Ibid., August 11, 1864.
was forced to disavow his officers' actions and order an end to the arrests. This was the first successful trial of the Tribune's strength and it spurred the editors on to new issues. The journal was also made a daily at this time, becoming the first Negro daily in the United States. 5

Another editorial on October 23 discussed a more beneficial clause of General Order Number 23, which provided free education for colored children. This, together with a supplementary order, Number 38, established an office of education directed by three military men who were authorized to build schools, select teachers, and regulate instruction. The plan was soon put into effective operation, and the Tribune was pleased. In October, 125 teachers in less than half that many schools taught 7,900 pupils. Out of 16,340 colored children in occupied Louisiana over half were attending the institutions, and the paper predicted that in a few months a large portion of the remainder would be included.

These successes in education and freedom from arbitrary arrest failed to satisfy Roudanez. The Tribune was too much like L'Union. He tried to persuade Houzeau, then in Philadelphia, to return and assume the editorship, but the latter was not easily distracted from his research. After much cajoling, however, Houzeau was convinced that he was needed, and on November 14, 1864 arrived in New Orleans, and under the pseudonym "Dallox" took direction of the paper. The Tribune

5 Pride, "Register and History," 18.
became an efficient, even brilliant, propaganda organ and greatly aided the movement.

The improvements Houzeau made in the paper, already alluded to in Chapter III began with a deemphasis of the French section and an emphasis on the English half. He also unequivocally adopted the cause of all Negroes, thereby terminating the journal's caste bias. He then attempted to reconcile the various factions and the economic and educational levels of the Negroes in order to effect a broader and stronger political foundation. With the same end in mind he planned to increase circulation, and in particular, reach as many important readers as possible.

Another refinement developed simply because he wrote the editorials. Though before November 1864 there had been a few good articles in L'Union and the Tribune, after that date they were invariably excellent. There was an abrupt change from romantic illusion and ranting to incisive critical realism. Houzeau's compositions on such varied topics as the philosophy of law, politics, government, labor, the biological equality of races, and on other current issues were of a quality rarely found in a metropolitan newspaper. His immense knowledge and extensive reading enabled him to quote key authorities on almost any subject and write logical, irrefutable essays. Just weeks after he joined the Tribune he wrote an editorial which brought the paper to the attention of the national government and the Northern press, gaining valuable, lasting support for the Louisiana Negro movement. As he later said, it was a coup which "... astonished the pro-slavery
This editorial entitled, "Is there any Justice for the black?" appeared on December 15, 1864 in response to a New Orleans jury's acquittal of an Irishman, who, for amusement, had thrown a young Negro boy in the Mississippi River and then had prevented the boy's friends from rescuing him. In completely moderate language Houzeau recalled the concept of the jury in English law and detailed the guarantees it was supposed to offer. In New Orleans, he said, where the races were divided by prejudice and where whites believed themselves to have absolute right, special care was needed in selecting such a panel. In the Irishman's trial this was not done. Although Negro witnesses were allowed and the defendant did not deny his guilt, and though the prosecutor called for a verdict of guilty, the all-white jury found the murderer innocent. When William D. Kelley, Radical Republican from Pennsylvania, read this article to the House of Representatives on January 16, 1865, the Tribune's influence became national and the movement advanced a bit farther toward its goal.

It was no accident that Kelley read the editorial in Congress. Houzeau, upon assuming the direction of the paper, sent it to every Congressman, to principal Northern newspapers, and to indeterminate European recipients. The effect was not always as pronounced as on

6 Houzeau, "Le Journal Noir," (May, 1872), 14.; Not only did Houzeau take the precaution of using a pseudonym in New Orleans, he also never signed his editorials.

7 Kelley, Equality of all Men, 24.
January 16, 1864; but there is plentiful evidence that at least the Radicals read the paper and used it as a source of material for their speeches. From the end of 1864 to the last issue, almost every number of the Tribune had a small notice such as the following: "We wish to thank Senator Charles Sumner from Massachusetts for sending copies of his speeches, Senator Lyman Trumbull from Illinois for sending the Congressional Globe, and General Butler for favors rendered." The offices of Sumner and Kelley apparently sent materials to the Tribune almost daily and the list of others who frequently did so indicates the success of Houzeau's circulation methods: Senator Robert Yates, Illinois; Representative George W. Julian, Indiana; Representative George Boutwell, Massachusetts; Senator Jacob Howard, Michigan; the head of the Freedmen's Bureau, General O. O. Howard; the Negro leader Frederick Douglass; and others. The financier Jay Cooke even found cause to advertise in the paper.8

The response from Europe was just as impressive. There were letters from such men as the famous Frenchman, Victor Hugo, and the great Italian revolutionary, Giuseppe Garibaldi. The paper became so well known to French liberals that the Revue du Monde initiated a fund for the freed men in the United States. In a letter to Houzeau, the journal recognized the Tribune as the principal Negro organ in America and delegated to it the job of distributing the money. The men who signed this communiqué included (again) Victor Hugo, Louis Blanc, the political philosopher, Edgar Quinet, the radical author of The History

8 Tribune, passim.
of France, and a dozen others just as notable. In 1865 Houzeau continued his promotion of the Tribune and his editorial barrage. In spite of his efforts the situation of the Negro movement looked increasingly dark. The defeat of the Confederacy in April actually aggravated this condition. Throughout the year Houzeau called attention to what he termed the "rebel takeover of the state." The Democrats, bolstered by returning Southern soldiers, became firmly entrenched in the state government. In November they were able to put their candidate, J. Madison Wells, in as governor. The Belgian could only persist in his propaganda campaign.

He reiterated his demands for land reform, civil rights, and suffrage, and criticized the other New Orleans newspapers for various reasons. On June 13, an editorial, "Is Progress a fallacy?", argued, on the basis of references from Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Vico, and Chinese history, that it was not. Specifically, the Negro was capable of progress. The next day another lead article asked the question: "Is the South Rebel at heart?", and answered affirmatively with the rejoinder that it would not be if the Negroes were allowed to vote. On July 2 an interesting essay attempted to refute the theory of Southern hospitality and manners. It referred to works of Frederick Law Olmsted, Harriet Martineau, and Mrs. Basil Hall. During the summer an editorial disproved the myth that Negroes alone were suited to work in the tropics. Houzeau also wrote on the pertinent topic of war

9 Ibid., April 17, 1866.
crimes, basing his argument on Hugo Grotius's *De Jure et Pacis* and other important works on international law. He advised that Jefferson Davis be punished severely because ultimate guilt in war rests with the supreme commander. He concluded that subordinates should neither be incarcerated nor corporally punished. They had, however, lost some of their legal rights: "It is enough," he said, "for the republic to spare the lives of the rebels without restoring to them their plantations and palaces. Amnesty for the persons, no amnesty for the property."10

Houzeau expostulated on many subjects, but it was obvious that his main intention was to keep his readers from boredom until the political situation broke. He and the other members of the movement also spent some time organizing their faction and attempting to adjust the ex-slaves to freedom. In May the Freedman's Aid Association was created to afford Negroes, as the Tribune said, such assistance as land, loans, agricultural equipment, and legal counsel. Among the directors were Houzeau, Jean-Baptiste Roudanez, and Thomas J. Durant, a prominent lawyer and Unionist politician. In June, the Friends of Universal Suffrage, a party of radicals of both races, was formed, and designated the Tribune as their official organ. The newspaper also became a center for the ex-slaves, and through its offices many Negro families were reunited who had been indiscriminately sold before the war. Letters frequently appeared thanking the editors for their help.

10 Ibid., April 19, May 6, 1865.
In July a member of the Friends of Universal Suffrage proposed that a "voluntary" election be held in which Negroes and white Republicans would vote. The purpose was to show the national party the reaction they could expect if universal suffrage was legal and to elect a "territorial" Representative to Congress. The Tribune devoted itself almost completely to advertising this plan in order to insure a strong response. It announced the first week in September as the time of registration for a preliminary election for delegates to a convention to be held later in the month. In this first election, on September 16, T. J. Durant was chosen as the convention's president. Among the delegates were C. J. Dalloz (Houzeau), Aristide Mary, Henry Clay Warmoth, P. B. S. Pinchback, B. F. Flanders, and others, some of whom would be important in ensuing years.11

The Convention of the Friends of Universal Suffrage met on September 27 and by acclamation nominated Durant for Representative to Congress. He, however, declined the honor, and Warmoth was selected instead. The delegates then proceeded to draw up a manifesto which the Representative, after his election, was to present to Congress. In it the organization adopted the National Republicans' 1864 platform and advised slow, radical reconstruction. It objected to forced labor systems which were only substitutes for slavery and stated as the association's basis "... universal suffrage, and liberty and equality of all men before the law." The platform ignored the validity of the existing

11 Ibid., September 17, 1865.
state government, and designated November 6 as the date for the main election. Finally, the assembly shrewdly transformed the Friends of Universal Suffrage into the Republican Party of Louisianna and named the Tribune as the party organ.  

The paper published the minutes of the meeting and in October backed Warmoth's nomination. Each day articles advised the colored voters how to act correctly at the polls, especially in the case of physical opposition. On November 6 the election took place with unusual propriety and order, and Warmoth was elected. Later, he somehow persuaded the Secretary of State to affix the state seal to his credentials.

The entire plan was unexpectedly successful. Not only was the election the first time that Negroes acted in mass in a political endeavor, but the Republican Party of Louisianna gained the support of the national party. Moreover, when Warmoth arrived in Washington he was given a seat (with no voting rights) in the House while Louisiana's legal delegation watched from the gallery.

In the meantime the new state legislature went into session in November dominated by ex-Confederates and Bourbon aristocrats. President Johnson's general amnesty had put the government firmly in their hands and they were determined to suppress the Republicans and partis.

12 Warmoth, Politics, 43-45.
13 Ibid., 45.
14 Ibid.
ularly the Negroes. Consequently, Black Codes were enacted which almost duplicated the ante-bellum slavery laws. The assembly even passed a bill which would have returned the state government to the 1852 Constitution if Governor Wells had not vetoed it. Wells anxiously wanted to avoid having the antagonism between Johnson and Congress come to a climax over an issue in Louisiana. If this happened easy Reconstruction might cease. He was assisted in this struggle by the federal commander, who simply nullified some of the legislators' acts, and also by the Freedmen's Bureau. Regardless, the reactionary bills continued to be passed and whether or not they took effect, they could still arouse Congress. Wells sought another way to quell the lawmakers. The only course open to him was to have the 1864 Convention reconvened. Although this would certainly result in at least partial Negro suffrage it would stop the extreme Democrats. The governor, however, was indecisive and it was left for others to do later.

The Radical Republicans in Louisiana, including the Tribune staff, also tried to stop the legislators. Houzeau in his editorials bitterly criticized the body and continued to send the paper to Washington and to Northern newspapers in an attempt to inform Congress and the public of the situation in Louisiana. On January 6, 1866, the paper initiated a weekly issue, in addition to the six daily numbers, which contained all the important editorials and news. This was done in order

16 Warmoth, Politics, 47.
to distribute the journal more effectively. One large issue a week could be mailed to six times as many sources at the same expense of sending each daily. Again, this was Houzeau's idea, and as he later observed, it was successful in that the Northern press often borrowed from the Tribune.\textsuperscript{17}

The Republicans in Louisiana were not just depending on the possibility of federal intervention. Like Wells, they considered recalling the 1864 Convention as the best way to thwart the legislators. The immediate Tribune faction conservatively considered the plan to be of dubious legality, but nevertheless, began to describe the actions of the Republican leaders in this regard. The problem was that the power to reconvene the assembly was vested in its president, Judge Durell, who refused to do so. In May, he left on a three-month vacation, and a few delegates met and designated a provisional president, who promptly ordered the Convention to reassemble. At the same time Governor Wells called an election to fill the vacant seats. When the Tribune announced the success of the scheme, the Democrats were frantic. They realized that this revolutionary body would decree universal suffrage and thus put an end to aristocratic government in the state.\textsuperscript{18}

While the above was going on Congress enacted the \textit{Civil Rights Act of 1866 (April)} over Johnson's vote. The law was potentially useful in stopping the effect of the Black Code legislation in the South.

\textsuperscript{17} Houzeau, "Le Journal Noir," (June, 1872), 111.

\textsuperscript{18} Warmoth, \textit{Politics}, 47.
and the Tribune hailed it as such, but doubted that it would be efficiently enforced. The paper was partly correct. Although a test case was promptly begun in a New Orleans court in May, events were coming to a climax in Louisiana which changed the entire situation. 19

Somehow Houzeau found time in the midst of this tension and furious activity to advocate a new reform. During the 1848 upheaval in Europe Houzeau had become a devotee of the concept of the eight-hour work day. The Tribune's banner indicated the addition of this issue to the newspaper's platform: "Universal Suffrage, Equality Before The Law, To All Citizens Their Rights, To All Workers Justice, Equitable Salary Paid Each Week, And Legal Work Day, 8 Hours." 20

His attention, however, was soon diverted from specific reforms. On July 30 the 1866 Constitutional Convention met in the Mechanics Institute in New Orleans. After convening at twelve p.m. the delegates took a recess to wait for a quorum to assemble. They never met again. The extreme reactionary Democratic faction decided that physical force was the only way to stop the meeting. Six years later, in a vivid description of the events of July 30, 1866, Houzeau wrote that to the ex-rebels

it was a matter to smother in the raw flesh this desire to accord to men of African race their political rights. By making the convention fall in a pool of blood, the planters imagined that it could never rise again and that the game would be won. 21

They did drench the delegates in blood, but they also put an end to

19 Tribune, April 8, 1866. 20 Ibid., April 22, 1866.
their own political activities for several years.

What happened that afternoon is called the "Riot of 1866" or the "Mechanics Institute Riot." Houzeau maintained more correctly that it was not a riot but a premeditated massacre. The unarmed assembly was attacked without warning in a position from which it could not retreat. Among the aggressors were city policemen and even one man in Confederate uniform. In the fury they did more than just kill; they mutilated their victims with knives, shot a minister carrying a surrender flag, and after murdering another man dragged his body outside and threw it on a refuse heap where they proceeded to dance around it roaring rebel yells and hoarses for Jeff Davis. The slaughter dragged on until after three o'clock, and between thirty to one hundred and thirty people were killed, all but one of whom was on the defensive side. Although the military authorities counted forty-eight dead, Houzeau, who was not given to hyperbole, said the number was one hundred and thirty—perhaps some bodies were removed before the soldiers arrived from the outskirts of the city.22

Houzeau had been in the middle of the riot and had tried to organize the delegates in a defensive formation but was finally forced to flee. Immediately realizing the effect the event would have on Congress, he rushed to the Tribune office and printed a special edition describing the afternoon in detail. He then sent it to Washington by

personal courier. The principal Northern newspapers published his account, and the emotional reaction in the country, as he said, was ". . . sudden and profound."23

Although the riot stopped the meeting, it made the coming of Negro suffrage certain. Even more ironic, the whites had no need to act. When the Convention recessed at one o'clock, the body did not have a quorum and was powerless.

When Congress reassembled, it sent an investigating committee of three to New Orleans. Houzeau met privately and at length with these men and when they returned to Washington the account they gave was essentially his. Congress immediately made proposals for Radical Reconstruction.24

For some reason no copies of the Tribune exist today for the period from June 30 to August 31, including the date of the riot. Edward L. Tinker suggests that they were "... destroyed by Southerners who were none too proud of the measures they were forced to take."25 During this time the Tribune was undoubtedly incensed. On August 31 it was still angry, partly because no arrests had been made in connection with the slaughter. In an editorial, "What was their crime?," the writer (not Houzeau) asked why the murderers were not being tried. He threatened that "the people will yet revenge these outrages upon

23 Houzeau, "Le Journal Noir," (June, 1872), 111.
24 Ibid., 111-12.
25 Tinker, Creole City, 112.
humanity, and mete out to rebel murderers their just due, even over the head of the dead dog in the White House." Other articles in following issues understandably called for a loyal state militia.

The break in the political impasse of 1865 and early 1866 had obviously occurred, and the Tribune armed itself for the coming year. On September 28 the paper began to receive the Associated Press wire service, and as a result doubled the daily price from five to ten cents and raised the yearly rate from twelve to sixteen dollars. The office was moved from 21 Conti to larger quarters at 122 and 124 Exchange Alley where the Wildlife and Fishery Building is today. The weekly Saturday issue was still being published.

The Radical Reconstruction landslide began after the violent summer of 1866. In the elections during September, October, and November 1866, the balance in Congress was tipped by a heavy Republican victory. In the Senate there were now forty-two Republicans to eleven Democrats, and in the House, the ratio was one hundred and forty-three to forty-nine. This unprecedented majority could pass any bill over the president's veto, and it was only a matter of time until Louisiana's aristocratic legislators would be negated.

But before being forced out of office the lawmakers continued to aggravate their already untenable position. Louisiana and the rest of the South (with the exception of Tennessee) rejected the Fourteenth Amendment in February 1867. This was their death rattle, for on March 2, Congress passed the Military Reconstruction Bill and, later, supplementary bills. Known as the Reconstruction Acts of 1867, they reduced
the South to a conquered territory. The section was divided into five
military districts. Louisiana and Texas formed district five and was
governed by a military commander, General Philip H. Sheridan. The
general, like his counterparts in the other districts, was directed
to prepare his province for readmission as states. He was to register
all adult male voters, white and black, who had not been denied the
right by Radical legislation. The Reconstruction Acts flatly disfracn-
chised some ex-rebels and those whites who were not proscribed had to
take a loyalty oath. Further, the registrars could reject anyone they
considered insincere. The New Orleans Times estimated that over half
the whites in the state were thus unable to vote.\textsuperscript{26} The registration
rolls were consequently heavily colored, and in the 1868 Convention the
delegates were almost all Radicals.\textsuperscript{27}

The Tribune was at its pinnacle of prestige and influence follow-
ing the 1866 riot. It was accorded praise from many quarters, but
the most satisfying and important was that proffered by the government.
\textsuperscript{28} In April 1867 the Tribune was designated an “Official Organ of the
United States Government.” By publishing federal laws, notices, and
military orders it was able to earn up to a thousand dollars a month.

The newspaper could no longer be ignored, and Houzeau took full
advantage of the fact. He filled the pages with perceptive, convincing

\textsuperscript{26} Times (New Orleans), April 21, 1867.
\textsuperscript{27} Shugg, Origins of Class Struggle, 220.
\textsuperscript{28} Tribune, April 21, 1867.
editorials on a wide range of topics. As General Sheridan put the state through the process leading to readmission, Houzeau offered suggestions on writing the new constitution, and proposed candidates for the election planned for early 1868. A large portion of his writing was devoted to telling the Negroes what not to do. He warned them to avoid being used by carpetbaggers and other political opportunists, but to remain loyal to the Radicals.

In October Houzeau printed an editorial explicitly defining the political situation in Louisiana. He said that in the Constitutional Convention to begin in exactly one month:

There will be . . . two parties, the 'Pure Radicals' and the 'Compromising Republicans.' Efforts will be made by parties outside of the Convention to secure the ascendancy of the Compromising section. But such efforts are doomed to fail.29

Warmoth, who by this time was considered a "Compromiser," later attested to the validity of Houzeau's distinction. In the former's autobiography, War, Politics and Reconstruction, he said that the "Pure Radicals," led by the Santo Domingans who published the Tribune, intended "... to make Louisiana an African State." His group, he added, had understood the danger of the Tribune's designs.30

On November 23 the Constitutional Convention convened and sat until March 9. The body was composed equally of Negroes and whites,

29 Ibid., October 23, 1867.
30 Warmoth, Politics, 54.
and both Republican factions agreed that the new constitution was to be thoroughly "Radical." The point of contention was the nominating convention which was to meet on January 14.

Trouble developed even before the second assembly met. The Tribune proposed one set of candidates, and the "Compromisers" proposed another. The editorial on October 23 had been wrong, the opposing faction did gain control of the meeting and its nominees were selected.

Houzeau described how this happened:

"I saw run to the Tribune with their hats covering their eyes and with a suplicating attitude, men who scoffed at us earlier, who had their hands covered with our blood and who affirmed today that they had always had the Negro in their hearts."

He said that the colored delegates had been deceived, that they had given in to the flattery of worthless men. The list of nominees that resulted was deplorable to both Houzeau and Roudanez.

Warmoth won the nomination for governor over a wealthy Negro, Major Francis Dumas, by a vote of forty-five to forty-three on the second ballot. The latter was then selected by a large vote for lieutenant governor, but according to Warmoth, declined the honor at the direction of the Tribune. Oscar J. Dunn, an educated ex-slave who even the Democrats later admitted was incorruptible, was then nominated. This was the ticket that the Tribune objected to and in so doing ruined itself.

---

31 Houzeau, "Le Journal Noir," (June, 1872), 113.
32 Ibid., 120.
33 Warmoth, Politics, 54-55.
Immediately after the nominations, Dr. Roudanez suggested to Houzeau that they propose a bolting ticket. The latter, however, reasoned that after acknowledging the Convention's authority they could not disclaim its choices later. He said that such a plan would divide the party and could lead to a Democratic victory. The doctor finally deferred to Houzeau and told him to direct the paper as he saw fit, but refused to endorse the candidates himself. Houzeau decided he could not continue under this condition and on January 18 resigned.  

Roudanez and a few other Radicals formed another ticket, but the effort was useless. On January 23 the Republican State Committee resolved that the Tribune no longer represented their party and repudiated it. At the same time they named the New Orleans Republican as the new party organ. On February 19 Congress crossed the Tribune off the list of government newspapers, and about two months later it ceased to appear.

The Tribune was revived late in 1868, but the earliest issue that is available today is the one for January 1, 1869. Although it was still a bilingual daily and a wire service subscriber the editorials had reverted to the quality of L'Union. The paper was exceedingly bitter, especially toward Warmoth. The February 28 issue, one of the few that survives from this period, was in the same condition as the last.

34 Houzeau, "Le Journal Noir." (June, 1872), 121.
35 Ibid.
mentioned number. But by March 6 it had become a weekly and apparently was printed only in French. It continued to appear until sometime in early 1870, however, its influence was negligible. The Republican superseded the Tribune both in party sanction and in being the colored newspaper.

L'Union-Tribune movement from September 1862 to January 1868 was a considerable success. Despite Roudané's final estrangement, the Tribune's goals were completely realized in the 1868 Constitution. Viewed as a part of the Reconstruction continuum, however, it was a failure. Though the goals had been fulfilled in law they were by no means fulfilled in application. The Tribune might have performed an immeasurable amount of good if Roudané had considered the results of the nominating convention as Houzeau did. If he and his paper had remained loyal to the party until at least after the election, or better, until there was an actual manifestation of corruption, the organ's protests would have been acceptable. Roudané then could have continued to serve the Negro cause, to which he was so devoted.

On the other hand, it is impossible to say exactly what effect the Tribune would have had in the next years had it maintained its prestige and influence. Perhaps alienation and rejection would have resulted soon after 1868 anyway. In order to preserve Radical rule in Louisiana, much less the Tribune's particular brand, federal occupation and protection would have been required. The Military Reconstruction Acts had specifically stated that intervention would only be temporary. The great Democratic majority in Louisiana would take over when the
the troops left, and when that happened the colored men would lose their role in government (the Tribune correctly predicted that this would occur). The Negro movement, including the Tribune, was an anachronism in the South. It was years ahead of its time and perhaps was predestined to have only momentary ascendancy and then to pass away leaving almost no trace. If the Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873 had succeeded, the Negroes might have sustained their political activities, but even if it had the Tribune would not have been there. It would have been dead for three years.

If the paper had not collapsed because of external circumstances it would nevertheless have died from within. The Tribune leaders, especially Roudanez and Houzeau, were, paradoxically, conservative revolutionaries. They had the same handicap as the Confederate leaders: in a manifestly revolutionary situation they were dominated by a concern for legality and moderation. Depending upon one's viewpoint, agitation for Negro suffrage might not have seemed inordinately extreme. The two things that the Negro movement attempted which can actually be considered revolutionary were its demands for the division of lands and the effort (of very dubious legality) to reconvene the 1864 Convention. The Tribune pursued the first of these goals only half-heartedly, and the second it secretly objected to. The organ advertised the steps that were being taken to recall the assembly, but its faction refrained from participating in it themselves (Houzeau was there only as a reporter). It is clear that the Tribune was timid. It did not want to stop the Convention because if that body succeeded
the result would be Negro suffrage and the end of Democratic control. However, the paper could have assured success. By emphatically con¬
donning the plan, a quorum would have been certain, and since violence was expected, military protection could have been enlisted.

In the terminology of the study of mass movements, Roudanez and Houzeau would be considered "men of words" or propagandists. This type person usually functions in paving the way for the fanatics who are capable of making seemingly impossible breakthroughs in the status quo, the same kind of condition which above was stated as "inevitably dooming" the Negro movement. The "men of words" in this case did not adequately prepare the Louisiana of the late 1860's for the introduction of fanatics. In order for these true revolutionaries to move in the prevailing order has to be first thoroughly discredited by propagandists. Existing society must be undermined and the masses must be familiarized with the idea of radical change. If the situation remains at all orderly the masses will be basically conservative. As Eric Hoffer, an ana¬
lyst of mass movements has said, "They can think of change but not of total innovation."36 The Tribune leaders did not prepare the Negroes for such a transformation; they were unwilling to go to such an extreme. Houzeau was a skilled propagandist but not a revolutionary one. To have avoided the eventuality of a Democratic revival something more than logic was required.

36 Hoffer, The True Believer, 120.
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