msa_sc2901_scm2353-0174 ©Maryland State Archives

THE KENT NEWS.

Frustra, laborat, qui omnibus; placere, studet.—"He labours vainly, who endeavors to please every one.

BY E. MANSFIELD. CHESTER TOWN, Md. $1 50 PER ANNUM, in advance.

VOL. 14. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1853. NO. 23.

THE KENT NEWS.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,

Devoted to Agriculture, Politics & Gen'l News.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

EDWARD MANSFIELD,

PROPRIETOR.

TERMS:

$1,50, payable in advance—$2 at the expiration of the first six months, or $2,50 at the end of the year—5 copies for $6—10 copies for $10. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

Terms of Advertising.

Advertisements not exceeding twelve lines will be inserted three times for $1, and 25 cents for each insertion thereafter. Larger ones in proportion. A liberal deduction will be made to yearly advertisers. Advertisements must have the number of times marked, or they will be published till forbid, and charged according ly.

All communications must be post-paid.

THE AFFAIRS OF CUBA.

Letter from Edward Everett to Lord John Russell.

The following letter from Edward Everett in reply to the despatch of Lord John Russell, which appeared in the papers some weeks ago, is published in the Boston Advertiser. It is a paper which will be read with deep interest and satisfaction; and we gladly avail ourselves of the privilege of laying it before our readers. In publishing the letter, the Boston Advertiser introduces it with the following remarks:

It will be regarded, we doubt not, as pertinent to the occasion, although the writer of it is no longer in an official station. So far as the subject under discussion is strictly a diplomatic question the reasoning of Lord John Russell will doubtless be replied to from an official source. But so far as it relates to the proper method of treating the subject under consideration, it becomes in a great measure a personal question, and it naturally devolves on the author of the original letter to defend the views presented in it against the comments that have been made upon them. Such a course we conceive cannot be regarded by the Secretary of State as an encroachment upon his official duties, nor will any one regard the public discussion of the particular topics of this letter, as any interference with the regular disposition of the pending public questions, by the official parties with whom they are entrusted. The public, we doubt not, will take a particular interest in the future developement of Mr. Everett's views on the subject of his official letter, and in his reply to some of the criticisms which have been made upon it

To the Right Honorable Lord John Russell:

BOSTON, 17th Sept., 1853.

MY LORD.—Your despatch of the 16th of February last to Mr. Crampton has lately appeared in our public papers. As it is in reality, if not in form, a reply to my letter of the first of December 1852, on the subject of Cuba, I regret that it was not prepared and sent before my retirement from the department of State. But though I must now do it as a private individual, I feel as if it was my duty to answer it. I shall endeavor to do so, in a manner consistent with my sincere respect for your public character, and a lively recollection of your personal kindness during my residence in England.

Before remarking on the contents of your letter, I will observe that, though it contains some courteous expressions, its tone is, upon the whole, not quite as conciliatory as might have been expected, considering that my letter of the 1st of December was altogether respectful and friendly towards the two Powers, both in form and in substance. I have heard that in presenting this correspondence to Parliament you indulged "in some sarcastic remarks," but I have not seen any report of them. Your despatch is not free from a shadow of sarcasm in one or two sentences. This I shall endeavor to avoid in reply, not that it would be difficult to follow you into that field, but because I cannot think that an encounter of wits between us would be an edifying spectacle, or one which would promote any desirable national object.

You say, that in my letter of the 1st of December, I entered into "arguments not required by the simple nature of the question before me;" and the length of my letter has been complained of in other quarters. The question propounded to us was certainly in one sense "simple," as every question is that can be answered "Yes" or "No." But how various, complicated, and important the the interests and relations involved in it! Besides the organ of every Government must be the only judge of the proper length and relevancy of his replies to the communications of foreign powers. The proposal to which I was returning an answer, jointly made by two of the leading powers of Europe, related to the most important subject in the circle of our foreign relations. I thought that a few paragraphs were well employed, in unfolding the views of the President on the subject; and the reasons why he declined entering into a compact purporting to bind the three Governments for all coming time to a certain line of policy, in a case of so much importance.

You will recollect that the members of our executive government do not sit in Congress. Those expositions which are made in your Parliament by Ministers—in speeches not unfrequently of two and three—sometimes four and five hours in length—must be made in this country in a Presidential Message, (rarely referred to by your press without a sneer at its length,) or an Executive Report or despatch. My letter of the 1st of December would make a speech of about an hour, which does not seem to me immoderate for such a subject.—However, a little greater fullness of statement and argument, in papers expected to come before the public, is, it must be confessed, in harmony with the character of our government, and is generally indulged in.

You observed that "the absorption or annexation of Louisiana in 1803, of Florida in 1819, of Texas in 1845, and of California in 1848 had not escaped the two Powers; still less did they require to be reminded of the events of the seven years' war or of the American war." But facts may be mentioned for illustration or argument, as well as information. Most certainly the important and notorious events named by you—leading incidents in the history of the United States and of the world—cannot be supposed to have escaped the governments of England and France, who were parties in some of the most important of the transactions in question. I had no thought of "reminding" your governments of the events of the seven years' war and of the American revolution, as matters of historical fact, of which they were ignorant; though I really doubt and beg to say it without offence, whether there are many individuals in the government of either country possessed of an accurate and precise knowledge of the facts hastily sketched by me.—That sketch however of the territorial changes, which have taken place on this continent during the last century, was intended as an illustration of the proposition, that our entire history shows it to be chimerical, to attempt in reference to the specific measures, to bind up, for all future time, the discretion of a government, established in a part of the world, of which so much is still lying in a state of nature.

I had another motive. The public opinion of Christendom, created in a good degree by the Press, has become an element of great and increasing influence in the conduct of international affairs. Now, it is very much the habit of a considerable portion of the European press, to speak of the steady and rapid extension of the territory of the United States, as the indication of a grasping spirit on the part of their government and people. The subject is rarely alluded to, by one school of translantic public writers, for any other purpose. Thus the public mind of the civilized world is poisoned against us. There is not only manifested, on the part of these writers, an entire insensibility to the beauty and grandeur of the work that is going on—more beneficial if possible to Europe than to us, in the relief it is affording her—but we are actually held up at times as a nation of land-pirates. It was partly my object to counteract this disposition; to show that our growth had been a natural growth; that our most important accession of territory had taken place by great national transactions; to which England, France and Spain had been parties; and in other cases by the operation of causes which necessarily influence the occupation and settlement of a new country, in strict conformity with the laws of nations and not in violation of them.

You say that "it occurs to Her Majesty's Government to ask for what purpose are these arguments introduced with so much preparation and urged with so much ability," and you answer the question in the following manner: "it would appear that the purpose, *not fully avowed, but hardly concealed* is to procure the admission of a doctrine, that the United States have an interest in Cuba, to which Great Britain and France cannot pretend."

Here a little unintentional injustice is done my letter, in which it is distinctly stated more than once, for reasons set forth at length and very partially controvered by you, that the government of the United States considered the condition of Cuba, "as mainly an American question," in which they had a very deep interest and you a very limited one. Not only was no attempt whatever made to conceal this doctrine, but it was fully avowed and reasoned out in my letter of the first of December, 1852

To meet one of the chief grounds on which the United States rests this claim, that of geographical proximity, after some local allusions of which I do not see the exact bearing, you observe in effect, that Cuba is somewhat nearer to Jamaica than it is to the nearest part of the United States, and you consider this as showing that we cannot have a greater interest in the island than you have.—Now, if Jamaica bore the same relation to Great Britain, which our States on and near the Gulf of Mexico bear to the rest of the American Union, your reply to my arguments would be good. But the direct reverse is the case. Jamaica is a disrant colony, whose entire population (of which not more than one-tenth is of European origin) does not exceed that of an English city of the second class. It is, as I perceive from your speech of the 4th of August, a burden on the imperial treasury. It must in its present state stand high on the list of the colonies, which (as appears from Lord Grey's recent work on the colonial policy of your administration) are regarded by more than one active and influential party in England, as incumbrances of which she ought to get rid, if she could do so with credit.—How different, in all respects, the case with the States lying on the Gulf of Mexico! In the extent of sea-coast, in the amount of valuable products furnished to the world's commerce, in the command of rivers which penetrates the heart of the continent, they are a most important, as they are an integral portion of the Union. They are numerically all but a sixth part of it. The very illustration made use of by you strikingly confirms instead of refuting the doctrine that "the condition of Cuba is mainly an American question."

This preposition could be enforced by other strong arguments besides those adduced in my letter of December the first; but as those arguments, with the exception just commented upon, have not been met by you, I deem it unnecessary to enlarge upon the topic.

But though the United States certainly consider that they have "an interest in the condition of Cuba, to which Great Britain and France cannot pretend," it is not, either in my letter nor any other American State paper within my recollection, assumed that Great Britain and France have "*no* interest in the maintenance of the present *statu quo*, and that the United States *alone* have a right to a voice in the matter." Our doctrine is, not that we have an absolute exclusive interest in the subject, but that we have a far deeper and more immediate interest than France or England can possibly lay claim to. A glance at the map one would think would satisfy every impartial mind of this truth.

In order to establish for France and England an equal interest with the United States in the condition of Cuba, you say—"Great Britain is in possession by treaty of the island of Trinidad, which in the last century was a colony of Spain. France was in possession at the commencement of this century of Louisiana by voluntary cession of Spain." It is true that Spain was compelled by France to cede Trinidad to Great Britain by the treaty of Amiens. If while this cession was in agitation—as it was for some time—the United States and any other neutral power (if there was any other) had exerted themselves to defeat it, and had invited you and France to bind yourselves by a perpetual compact never to acquire it, the interference, I apprehend, would have been regarded as worse than gratuitous. I cannot see why we have not as good a right to obtain, if we can, from Spain the voluntary cession of Cuba, as you had to accept the compulsory cession of Trinidad, which is, by position and strength, the Cuba of the Southeastern Antilles.

France was, as you say, at the beginning of this century, in possession of Louisiana by the voluntary cession of Spain. This possession, however, (nominal at best) did not take place till seven months after France had sold Louisiania to the United States for 80 millions of francs, and it lasted only from the 30th of November to the 20th of December, 1803. The object of France in acquiring Louisiana, was to re-establish herself in the interior of this country; an object as menacing to your North American possessions as to the United States. Is it possible you can think such a possession of Louisiana for such a purpose a sufficient ground on the part of France for interfering with our relations with Cuba? May she, a European power, without consulting us, obtain from Spain in 1800, a cession of half the habitable portion of North America,—a cession which threw her for fifteen hundred miles on our western frontier, and not only shut us out from the Pacific, but enabled her to close the Mississippi, and is it so very unreasonable in us to decline her invitation to bind ourselves for all time not to accept the cession of an island which lies within thirty-five leagues of our coast? Does she even derive her right thus to control our relations with Cuba in 1853 from her twenty days' possession of Louisiana in 1803? What can be clearer than that whatever right accrued to her from that three weeks' possession, (which was a mere ceremonial affair to give form to the transfer of the province to the United States;) must have passed to us by the transfer, followed by our actual possession and occupation for half a century.

You observe that "Lord Malmesbury and M. Turgot put forward as a reason for entering into the proposed compact, the attacks which had been made on the island of Cuba by lawless bands of adventurers from the United States, and with the avowed design of taking possession of that island," and to this reason you add,—"Mr. Everett replies in these terms:" "The President is convinced that the conclusion of such a treaty, instead of putting a stop to these lawless proceedings, would give a new and powerful impulse to them," and this argument you call "not only unfounded but disquieting."

After acknowledging, rather coldly I think, the conduct of the late President in discovering the lawless enterprise referred to, you reproachfully pronounce my remark just cited "a melancholly avowal for the chief of free State:" and you seem to intimate, without expressly saying so, that it implies on the part, of the people of the United States, an insensibility "to the value of the eternal laws of right and wrong, of peace and friendship, and of duty to our neighbor, which ought to guide every Christian Nation." You also take occasion, in reference to the same remark, to impress upon the people of the United States "the utility of those rules for the observance of international relations, which for centuries have been known in Europe by the name of the law of nations. Among the commentators on that law (you continue) some of the most distinguished American citizens have earned an enviable reputation, and it is difficult to suppose the United States would set the example of abrogating its most sacred provisions."

I suppose no one in Europe or America will think the intended force of this rebuke mitigated, by the diplomatic reservation contained in the last two lines. Let us enquire for a moment if it is well deserved.

The expeditions to which you allude as calculated to excite the reprobation of every civilized state," were discountenanced by the President in every Constitutional and legal way. The utmost vigilance was at all times employed, but unhappily for the adventurers themselves without effect. In this there is matter neither for wonder nor reproach. The territory of the United States is but little less than the whole of Europe; while their population is not quite equal to that of the United Kingdom, and their standing military force small, and scattered over an immensely extensive frontier. Our government, like that of England, is one of law; and there is a great similiarity between the laws of the two countries which prohibit military expeditions against the possessions of friendly powers. In fact your Foreign enlistment act of 1819 was admitted by Mr. Canning to have been founded in part, on our neutrality law of the preceding year. Of the two, I believe our laws are the more stringent; but it is somewhat difficult to enforce them in both countries.

These expeditions got up in the United States by a Spanish general and supposed to indicate a lawless disposition off the part of the American people, comprised a very small number of persons, some of whom were foreigners, enjoying the same freedom of action in the United States, that refugees from every part of the continent enjoy in England. The same reproach which is cast upon us, for these expeditions is, at this moment, cast upon England by the continental powers. Events which have occurred in London, since your dispatch was written, strikingly illustrate the difficulty and the risk under constitutional governments, of preventing abuses of that hospitality, which it is the privilege and boast of such governments to extend to all who seek it.

There is no doubt widely prevalent in this country a feelling that the people of Cuba are justly disaffected to the government of Spain. A recent impartial French traveler, M. Ampere confirms this impression. All the ordinary political rights enjoyed in free countries, are denied to the people of that island. The government is, in principle, the worst form of despotism, viz: absolute authority delegated to a military viceroy, and supported by an army from abroad. I speak of the nature of the government, and not of the individuals by whom it is administered, for I have formed a very favorable opinion of the personal character of the present captain general, as of one or two of his predecessors. Of the bad faith and utter disregard of treaties with which this bad government is administered, your committees on the slave trade have spoken plainly enough at the late session of parliament. Such being the state of things in Cuba it does not seem to me very extraordinary or reproachful, that throughout the United States, a handful of misguided young men should be found, ready to join a party of foreigners, headed by a Spanish General, who was able to persuade them, not as you view it, "by armed invasion to excite the obedient to revolt and the tranquil to disturbance," but as they were led to believe, to aid an oppressed people in their struggles for freedom. There is no reason to doubt that there are at this moment, as many persons, foreigners as well as natives, in England, who entertain these feelings and opinions as in the United States; and if Great Britain lay at a distance of one hundred and ten miles from Cuba, instead of thirty-five hundred, you might not with all your repressive force, find it easy to prevent a small steamer, disguised as a trading vessel, from slipping off both an outport in the night on an unlawful enterprise. The expedition of General Torrijos in 1831, as far as illegality is concerned, is the parallel of that of General Lopez.—It was fitted out in the Thames, without interruption till the last moment, and though it then fell under the grasp of the police, its members succeed in escaping to Spain, where for some time they found shelter at Gibraltar. It is declared in the last number of the Quarterly Review to be "notorious, that associations have been formed at London for the subversion of dynasties with which England is at peace; that arms have been purchased and loans proposed; that 'Central Committees' issue orders from England, and that Messrs. Mazzim and Kossuth have established and preside over boards of regency for the Roman States and Hungary, and for the promotion of revolution in every part of the world." I have before me a list, purporting to be taken from a Prussian police Gazette of fifteen associations of continental refugees organized in London and now in action for the above mentioned purposes.

When these things are considered, the fact that, in the course of four or five years two inconsiderable and abortive efforts have been made from the United States though deeply to be lamented and sternly to be condemned as a violation of municipal and international law, does not appear to me so "shocking" as it seems to be thought by you. It does not, in my judgement, furnish any ground for the reproaches which it has drawn upon the government and people of the United States. Nor does the remark in my letter of the first of December that a disposition to engage in such enterprises would be increased rather than diminished by our accession to the proposed Convention, strike me as "a melancholy avowal," as you pronounce it, on the part of the President. You forget the class from which such adventures are in all countries enlisted;—the young, the reckless, the mis-informed. What other affect could be expected to be produced on this part of the population, by being told that their own government, in disregard of the most obvious public interests, as well as of the most cherished historical traditions; had entered into a compact with two foreign powers, to guarantee the perpetuity of the system under which Cuba now suffers? Does not Lord Howden, the English Minister at Madrid, make a very similar avowal in his letter of the 30th of May last, addressed to the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs; when he says;—"I cannot conclude without expressing my deep regret; that the course of Spain is such, as to produce a general alienation in the opinion of the English public; out of which will most infallibly result a state of feeling *which no government can control or oppose?*"

The idea that a convention like that proposed was a measure naturally called for, in consequence of these lawless expeditions, seems to rest upon an entire misconception of the present state of the law in the United States, and of our treaty relations with Spain. Our treaties with that government and the laws of the United States forbid all such enterprises. The tripartite convention would have added nothing to their unlawfulness. If we had been desirous of multiplying objections, we might well have complained; that the acts of a very small number of rash young men, citizens and foreigners, should be put forward by two of the leading powers of Europe, as the main reason why we should be expected to enter into a strang compact with those powers, binding ourselves never to make lawful and honorable acquisition of Cuba. There is no logical connection between the ideas, and there is something bordering upon the offensive in their association.

Consider too the recent antecedents of the powers, that invite us to disable ourselves to the end of time from the acquisition in any way of this natural appendage to our Continent. France, within the present century, to say nothing of the acquisition of Louisiana, has wrested a moiety of Europe from its native Sovereigns, has possessed herself by force of arms, and at the time greatly to the discontent of England, of six hundred miles of the northern coast of Africa, with an indefinite extension into the interior; and has appropriated to herself one of the most important insular groups of the Pacific. England, not to mention her other numerous recent acquisitions in every part of the globe, has, even since your despatch of the 16th of February was written, annexed half of the Burman empire to her overgrown Indian possessions, on grounds—if the statements in Mr. Cobden's pamphlet are to be relied upon—compared with which the reasons assigned by Russia for invading Turkey are respectable.

The United States do not require to be advised of "the utility of those rules for the observance of international relations, which, for centuries, have been known to Europe by the name of the law of nations." They are known and obeyed by us under the same venerable name. Certain circumstances in our history have caused them to be studied more generally and more anxiously here than in Europe. From the breaking out of the wars of the French revolution, to the year 1812, the United States knew the law of nations only as the victims of its systematic violation by the great maritime powers of Europe. For these violations on the part of England prior to 1794, indemnification was made under the seventh article of Jay's treaty. For similar injuries on the part of France, we were compelled accept an illusory set-off under the Convention of 1800.—A few years only elapsed, before a new warfare upon our neutral rights was commenced by the two powers. One hundred millions at least of American property were swept from the seas, under the British orders in Council, and the French Berlin and Milan decrees. These orders and decrees were at the time officially declared to be in contravention of the law of nations by the two powers themselves, each speaking of the measures of the other party. In 1831, after the generation of the original sufferers had sunk under their ruined fortunes to the grave, France acknowledged her decrees to have been of that character, by a late and partial measure of indemnification, but the sacrifices and sufferings of war were added to those spoliations on our commerce and invasion of our neutral rights, which led to its declaration. Those orders were at the time regarded by the Lansdownes, the Barings, the Broughams and the other enlightend statesmen of the school to which you belong, as a violationn of right and justice as well of sound policy; and within a very few years the present distinguished Lord Chief Justice, placed by yourself at the head of the tribunals of England, has declared that "the orders in council were grieveously unjust to neutrals, and *it is now generally allowed, that they were contrary to the law of nations and our own municipal law.*"

That I call, my Lord, to borrow your expression, "a melancholly avowal" for the chief of the jurisprudence of a great Empire. Acts of its sovereign authority, countenanced by its Parliament, rigidly executed by its fleets on every sea, enforced in the courts of admiralty by a magistrate whose learning and eloquence are among the modern glories of England; persisted in till the lawful commerce of a neutral and kindred nation was annihilated; and pronounced by the highest legal authority of the present day contrary not merely to the law of nations but your own municipal law!

Under these circumstances, the Government and people of the United States, who have never committed or sanctioned a violation of the laws of nations against any other power; may well think it out of place, that they should be instructed by an English minister in "the utility of those rules, which for centuries have been known to Europe by the name of the Law of Nations."

There are several other points in your despatch, some of great public moment, which, if I were still in office, I should discuss on this occasion. I have, however, deemed it proper, at present, to confine myself to such remarks, as seemed necessary to vindicate my letter of the 1st of December from your strictures, leaving the new aspects of the case which your despatch presents, especially in its opening and closing paragraphs, to those whose official duty it is to consider them.

You will not, I hope, misapprehend the spirit in which this letter is written. As an American citizen, I do not covet the acquisition of Cuba, either peacably or by force of arms. When I cast my thoughts back upon our brief history as a nation, I certainly am not led to think that the United States have reached the final limits of their growth, or what comes to very much the same thing, that representative government, religious equality, the trial by jury, the freedom of the press, and the other great attributes of our Anglo Norman civilization, are never to gain a farther extension on this continent. I regard the enquiry, under what political organization this extension is to take place, as a vain attempt to penetrate the inscrutable mysteries of the future. It will, if we are wise, be under the guidance of our example; I hope it will be in virtue of the peaceful arts, by which well governed States extend themselves over unsettled or partially settled continents My voice was heard at the first opportunity, in the Senate of the United States, in favor of developing the almost boundless resources of the territory already in possession rather than seeking [illegible] the whole land through [illegible] had near [illegible] the whole [illegible]