THE TEXAS PRESS AND THE FILIBUSTERS OF THE 1850s: LOPEZ, CARVAJAL, AND WALKER

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Jeffrey A. Zemler, B.A.
Denton, Texas

May, 1983

Zemler, Jeffrey A., The Texas Press and the Filibusters of the 1850s: Lopez, Carvajal, and Walker. Master of Arts, May, 1983, 179 pp., bibliography, 67 titles.

The decade of the 1850s saw the Texas press separate into two opposing groups on the issue of filibustering. The basis for this division was the personal beliefs of the editors regarding the role filibustering should have in society. Although a lust for wealth drove most filibusters, the press justified territorial expansion along altruistic lines. By 1858, however, a few newspapers discarded this argument and condemned filibusters as lawless bands of ruffians plundering peaceful neighbors. Throughout the decade, the papers gradually drifted from a consensus in 1850 to discord by the date of William Walker's third attempt on Nicaragua in 1858.

PREFACE

Many scholars have described the South as a united body in favor of filibustering expeditions. Others have argued that a majority of the newspapers approved, while a small minority disapproved. The purpose of this research is to determine which pattern, if either, describes the actual situation in Texas. From this examination, a clear picture emerges which shows Texas not to be a united body, but a state containing a small,"silent" minority.

Two of the expeditions examined, the Narciso Lopez and William Walker expeditions, are major filibustering excursions. Lopez's attempts to free Cuba lasted from 1849 to 1851, while Walker's invasions of Nicaragua covered a five year period, 1855 to 1860. Since the national newspapers covered these two enterprises, they were nationalistic in their scope. Although support for the filibusters centered in the South, northerners were aware of the actions of these men. Jose Maria J. Carvajal led the third expedition from the Texas side of the Rio Grande. Small in comparison to Lopez's and Walker's, this expedition attracted considerable attention in the Texas press, warranting its inclusion in the paper.

During the 1850s many newspapers were founded and abandoned in Texas. Most newspapers had a life span of between one and two years. The weeklies used in this paper are exceptions to this pattern. All were founded prior to or in 1850, and all lasted into the 1860s or longer. By examining these newspapers, one can monitor opinion growth and detect any trend. Despite the limited number of newspapers from which to choose, it has been possible to obtain a broad geographic representation of the state of Texas in selecting the newspapers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

FILIBUSTERING IN THE UNITED STATES TO 1830

The history of filibustering movements emanating from the United States is one of intrique, heroism, and death. The actors included Americans and foreigners who acted as both patriots and spies.[1] Over the years the United States served as the base of operations for expeditions launched against Texas, Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, and Nicaragua. The filibustering movements began nationally on a small scale in the first decade of the 1800s and emerged into a sectional movement by the decade of the 1850s. Over a span of fifty years, the attitude and philosophy of American expansion evolved from a concept of mission to an all encompassing destiny which justified armed intervention in a foreign country. Over the course of these years Spain became the primary villain whom Americans regarded as a suppressor of rights and a prohibiter of freedom. Freedom of the oppressed became the watchword of the filibustering movement.

When the United States acquired Louisiana in 1803, American expansion became synonymous with American security. The acquisition of this territory from France was through diplomatic means; thus, the philosophy that was to invade

the American expansionists had its roots in this peaceful transaction. This belief in America's natural right to security created within the American expansionist doctrine a willingness to postpone or omit the philosophy that all people were entitled to liberty and equality. Americans began to rationalize interference with the liberty and equality of foreign peoples if such interference was seen as a protection of American security.[2]

The filibuster, who in essence was an expansionist, was imbued with the American idea of mission. The expansionist saw himself as the propagator of democracy. This mission, bestowed on the American people by the Creator, formed the basis of the expansionist doctrine. As the years progressed, the American saw himself as being among the elect who was to confer, if deemed propitious, the natural rights upon the people of the world. The final element in the American philosophy of mission was to regenerate the backward people of the world. This idea, however, was late in arriving and did not become a part of the doctrine until the 1850s. The filibuster proclaimed himself America's ambassador of freedom; the person to strike the first blow for democracy.[3]

The earliest filibustering expeditions were directed against Spanish possessions in the New World. In 1806 a Venezuelan exile launched an expedition from the United States to free his homeland from Spanish tyranny. Francisco

de Miranda arrived in New York on 9 November 1805 from England with the idea of liberating Venezuela. While in England, Miranda had tried to interest the British in a similar venture, but they hesitated. The news of difficulties between the United States and Spain over the Louisiana boundary and commercial rights at the port of New Orleans seemed to Miranda to create the ideal situation for acquiring supporters for his movement. Miranda, therefore, was determined to invade South America with North American support.[4]

In New York Miranda enlisted the aid of a former traveling companion, Colonel William Stephens Smith, surveyor of the port of New York and son-in-law of John Adams, who introduced Miranda to Commodore Thomas Lewis and merchant Samuel Ogden. Ogden supplied the money for the provisioning of the ship called the Leander, which Ogden had sold to Miranda. This business transaction hinged on the requirement that Miranda acquire the approval of the United States government.[5]

Miranda received this tacit approval on 11 December 1805 when he called on Secretary of State James Madison. Madison refused to approve of the venture officially, but he did agree "to look the other way while Miranda's merchant friends put up the money and recruited an expeditionary force in the port of New York." By 29 December Miranda had

informed his fellow adventurers of the approval, and the recruitment and outfitting of the expedition began.[6]

Smith's duty was recruitment. Through his efforts, about 200 men enlisted. Since the need of secrecy was important, the men did not know the actual purpose of the expedition. Some men joined because of their financial needs, while other men enlisted in the hope of acquiring gold or silver. The supplies placed on board the Leander included 582 muskets, 19 nine pounders, 8 six pounders, and an assorted quantity of cartridges and musket flints.[7]

The Leander, with its crew of filibusters, left New York on 2 February 1806. The Spanish minister to the United States, the Marquis of Casa Yrujo, informed his government and the United States government of the intent of Miranda. Spanish authorities in Venezuela prepared for the anticipated invasion, while American authorities arrested Smith and Ogden for being accomplices of Miranda. Both men argued that since New York officials had not moved to suppress the expedition and the administration had given its approval, they were innocent of any crime. Smith and Ogden were acquitted in a subsequent trial.[8]

On the twelfth day at sea, a British frigate, the Cleopatra, commanded by John Wright, hailed the Leander. After a brief discussion, Miranda obtained the release of several impressed American seamen and also permission to

find protection in any British station in the West Indies. Miranda proceeded to Santo Domingo where Captain Jacob Lewis, the brother of Commodore Thomas Lewis, was to provide two ships. Unfortunately for the expedition, Lewis refused to cooperate. After a month's delay, the filibusters left the island aboard three vessels, the Leander, the Bacchus, and the Bee.[9]

On the night of 27 April, Miranda attempted to land near Puerto Cabello. The Spanish officials, having been alerted, repelled the invasion. Miranda ordered the three vessels to retreat, but two Spanish schooners overtook the smaller vessels, the Bacchus and the Bee. The sixty filibusters on board were arrested and placed in the dungeons of Puerto Cabello. The Spanish instituted a trial and on 12 July 1806 passed judgment. Ten men received the death sentence, and the remaining prisoners consigned to various Spanish prisons.[10]

The Leander, meanwhile, headed for Trinidad but enroute was stopped by the British sloop of war, the Lily. Miranda obtained protection for his expedition from the captain and sailed under the watchful eye of the British to the island of Granada and then to Barbados. Miranda quickly won the support of Admiral Alexander Cochrane, who agreed to supply naval escort for the expedition in return for trade agreements in the newly independent country. The expedition

then sailed to Trinidad, where 200 new recruits were added to the force.[11]

The filibustering expedition proceeded to Venezuela and on 1 August arrived at La Vela de Coro. Inclement weather postponed the landing until the third. Spanish resistance was weak, and the filibusters easily captured the sparsely inhabited town of Coro. Few of Miranda's countrymen responded to his call for independence but instead enlisted in the Spanish army to repel the invaders. On 13 August Miranda ordered his men on board the Leander and proceeded to sail to the island of Aruba. The British informed Miranda that naval protection could no longer be supplied, so the expedition sailed to Granada. Upon landing on the island, many of Miranda's followers withdrew from the expedition.[12]

The Miranda expedition was an ill-fated attempt to break the chain of Spanish rule in the New World. For subsequent filibustering expeditions in the Western Hemisphere, Miranda expedition was to serve as a "painful prototype." Defeat, imprisonment, and execution would become a part of the filibustering story. In addition, the American population would withhold its support and praise, unless the filibuster met with success. The Texas independence movement was the only example of a successful outcome in the history

of filibustering movements. The actors in this episode would become enshrined in glory.[13]

The first American penetration into Texas occurred in 1800. Philip Nolan, a naturalized citizen of the United States, led a band of men into Texas reportedly to capture wild horses. The Spanish believed he was the advanced scouting expedition for an American invasion. The Spanish overpowered and killed Nolan and most of his band of about twenty-five men. Scholars question whether this was an actual filibustering expedition or a trading excursion, and, as one historian has remarked, "it would be presumptuous to conclude that he was a filibuster in the true sense of the word."[14]

Following the death of Nolan, interest in Texas did not wane. Napoleon's invasion of the Iberian peninsula in 1807 and independence movements in the Spanish colonies created a diversion for filibustering activities. A blacksmith from the Mexican town of Revilla came to the United States to obtain aid for the Mexican Revolution. Don Jose Bernardo Maximiliano Gutierrez de Lara (Gutierrez) arrived in the United States in the autumn of 1811. After a discussion with President James Madison and Secretary of State James Monroe, Gutierrez returned to Louisiana to organize an expedition. Evidence supports the conclusion that Madison endorsed an expedition into Texas organized by Gutierrez.

Unfortunately for the Mexican patriot, the president awarded command to a Cuban exile, Don Jose Alvarez de Toledo y Dubois.[15]

Gutierrez, unaware of this presidential arrangement, gave command of the expedition to Augustus W. Magee, a former lieutenant in the United States Army. The filibusters had no trouble recruiting men, and the force was ready to leave by August. On 8 August 1812 the Gutierrez-Magee expedition crossed the Sabine River into Texas. The force consisted of about 130 men under the command of Colonel Magee and General Gutierrez. The filibusters met little Spanish resistance, and on 12 August they marched into Nacogdoches. The Spanish attempted to stop the American advance at La Bahia, but the town was captured on 7 November 1812. San Antonio fell to the invaders on 29 March 1813. During the siege of La Bahia Magee died, and Samuel Kemper succeeded to the command. With the capture of the provincial capital in March, Texas was under the control of the filibusters.[16]

The filibusters organized a provincial government and drafted a constitution on 6 April 1813. The Spanish forces near the Rio Grande began advancing toward San Antonio. The filibustering force engaged the Spanish, and on 20 June the royalist forces suffered their third major defeat. Meanwhile, Toledo had arrived on the Texas frontier

and attempted to gain control of the expedition. After a series of negotiations with Gutierrez, Toledo on 4 August 1813 assumed command of the expedition encamped at San Antonio.[17]

Toledo faced a grim situation. The Spanish forces had regrouped and were preparing an offensive against San Antonio. The filibusters advanced to meet the royalist forces, and at the battle of Medina River, the Spanish overwhelmed the invaders. The Americans dispersed and made their way to Louisiana the best way they could. The Spanish victory of 18 August 1813 secured for Texas a reprieve from filibustering intrigues.[18]

When John Quincy Adams negotiated the Adams-Onis Treaty in 1819, the reaction on the frontier was one of protest. The citizens of Natchez organized a filibustering expedition to invade Texas. The command of the expedition fell to James Long, a surgeon in the War of 1812. The invading force was comprised of between fifty and seventy men who were promised not only adventure but also land. The filibusters launched their attack on 21 June 1819 and easily captured the town of Nacogdoches. On the same day the filibusters also established a government with a twenty-one member council. Two days later "Texas was declared to be an independent republic."[19]

Long realized that additional men and ammunition were needed, so he opened up correspondence with the Lafitte brothers, Jean and Pierre, who had established a settlement on Galveston Island. The Lafittes agreed to join the filibusters' republic. The newly formed republic appointed Jean Lafitte governor of Galveston and established Galveston as a port of entry. Long left Nacogdoches on 22 October for a personal conference with the Lafittes, unaware of impending difficulties with the Spanish.

The Spanish had no intention of allowing the Long expedition to remain in Texas. The Spanish government began collecting soldiers at San Antonio, and on 27 September a force of 550 men headed for the invaders' camp. Long learned of the approach of the Spanish and quickly returned to Nacogdoches, only to find the Spanish two days away. After concealing the arms, Long left Texas on 26 October 1819. The Spanish had captured twenty-six men when they arrived at the Sabine River. On the opposite bank stood an American force which had orders to capture Long. The American commander asked for the release of the Spanish prisoners, and the Spanish complied by releasing eighteen. Throughout the month of November the Spanish pacified the area, and the filibustering expedition ended.[21]

The importance of this expedition in the confines of American expansion relates to the desire for land. The Long

government established a land policy which provided payment for the recruits and also established a pattern for the dispersal of land. The government awarded each settler a section for himself and a quarter section for each child under the age of eighteen. The leaders of the expedition planned to open Texas to American settlers and further American expansion.[22]

After the collapse of his first expedition, Long organized a second filibustering excursion. By June of 1820 the filibusters had established themselves near Galveston Island at a place known as Bolivar Point. They spent the ensuing months building a fort called "Las Casas". Dissatisfaction mounted among the men, and all but twenty or thirty men deserted. Finally on 19 September 1821, Long attacked La Bahia with about fifty-two newly recruited men. The Spanish responded to the invasion with renewed vigor. They surrounded La Bahia, and on 8 October Long surrendered his command to the Spanish commander. Long was sent to Mexico where he died on 8 April 1822.[23]

The invasions of Texas were just one area of attack against the Spanish possessions in the New World. Mexico, south of the Rio Grande, and Spanish Florida also attracted filibustering activities. The Spanish born Don Francisco Xavier Mina led one unsuccessful expedition into Mexico. During the Napoleonic invasion of Spain, Mina had been a

successful guerrilla leader. When Ferdinand VII returned to the throne in 1814, Mina opposed his restoration. A plot was devised to aid the political prisoners in Spain, but the plan failed, and Mina fled to England.[24]

While in London, Mina came into contact with General Winfield S. Scott. Mina's plans to invade Mexico interested Scott, and he assured the young Spaniard of a warm reception in the United States. One historian has argued that this assurance given to Mina by Scott is the reason why so many Americans joined the expedition and why the federal government failed to act against the filibusters. Mina sailed from Liverpool on 15 May 1816 with fifty men and arrived in the United States on 20 June.[25]

Upon arrival in the United States, Mina began to prepare for an expedition against Mexico. The Spanish minister to the United States, Luis de Onis, registered a complaint with the State Department and through a spy, Alvarez de Toledo, sought to undermine the operation. The United States government viewed Mina's preparations as only a commercial venture, and when about 200 men sailed for Port-au-Prince at the end of August and Mina himself on 26 September, the federal government did not try to stop them.[26]

When Mina arrived at Port-au-Prince, he faced a grave situation. Men were disillusioned with the expedition, and

many deserted the cause. About half of them sailed for the United States where Mina's backers withdrew their support because of ill feelings. Mina decided to sail for Galveston where he hoped to join forces with Louis Aury, who was organizing a similar expedition. On 27 October the expedition set sail for Galveston. While enroute yellow fever broke out and about thirty men died. When the force arrived at Galveston on 22 November, little more than 100 men remained.[27]

In February of 1817, Mina sailed to New Orleans to discuss a tentative expedition to Spanish Florida. Mina thought Florida would be an excellent base to launch an attack against Mexico. After discussing the venture with possible backers, Mina decided to continue with his original plan. On Galveston Island Aury was dissatisfied with the situation and tried unsuccessfully to gain control of Mina's men. Mina's arrival at Galveston on 5 April ended Aury's attempted seizure. On 7 April 1817, Mina sailed with his men for Mexico, leaving behind Aury and his small band of followers.[28]

Mina landed near the Santander River on 21 April with about 250 men. The filibusters, without opposition from the small band of Spanish soldiers, captured the Mexican village of Soto la Marina. Mina received a warm welcome from the inhabitants. The filibusters constructed a crude fort

where the military stores were placed along with a small contingent of troops. Mina, with about 200 men, marched away to obtain reinforcements, among the men was Henry Perry. Perry was a former United States army officer and a veteran of the ill-fated Gutierrez-Magee expedition. Perry was critical of Mina's military operation and with fifty men decided to return to the United States via Texas. This small band of filibusters attacked La Bahia demanding its surrender. Spanish troops from San Antonio forced the band to flee. The Spanish near Nacogdoches attacked the filibusters and killed most of the men, including Perry.[29]

The exploits of Mina were less than glamorous. The fort which had been constructed fell to the Spanish on 15 June 1817. All of Mina's supplies were now in the hands of the Spanish. Eight days later Mina ended his filibustering campaign by joining forces with the Mexican revolutionaries. Mina's career became one of a rebel fighting a type of conflict with which he had familiarity, a guerrilla war. The expedition must be classified as a failure because it never achieved its ultimate goal. Mina had hoped that by striking at Mexico, Ferdinand would be deprived of his source of wealth and forced to reinstate more liberal policies.[30]

The close proximity of Spanish Florida to the United States drew an assortment of filibusters intent on either

achieving a fortune or the annexation of land to the United States. On 13 March 1812 a force of seventy Georgians and nine Floridians attacked Florida. This expedition was under the command of George Mathews of Georgia, special agent of the United States to Florida. The purpose of the expedition was to acquire the territory and to transfer title to the United States. The Spanish at Saint Augustine refused to surrender, and the filibusters camped at Moosa Old Fort which was about two miles from the city. The expedition failed to achieve its purpose because of a change of complexion brought on by the war with England. The War of 1812 caused Florida to become an area of strategic importance. The expeditions launched into Florida during the war caused the filibustering expedition of Mathews to be lost among them. After hostilities had ended between the United States and Great Britain, interest in Florida again blossomed.[31]

In 1817 a Scotsman launched an expedition into Florida designed to "profit by the weakness of Spanish authority on its northern colonial frontier." Gregor MacGregor, a supposed Scottish nobleman, had fought with Simon Bolivar in Venezuela and was related to the revolutionary through marriage. In February MacGregor arrived in Baltimore, where he found financial backers for his scheme. He recruited men from the docks of Charleston and Savannah. On the morning of 29 June 1817 the expedition landed on Amelia Island with

about sixty men. The Spanish commander of the town and fort of Fernandina did not resist the advancing filibusters, and the area was easily secured by the invading force.[32]

MacGregor faced the problem of repelling Spanish attacks from troops stationed in Florida while his manpower remained constant and the needed aid from his contacts in the United States never materialized. Two of MacGregor's officers left on 4 September followed by MacGregor two days later. Only about fifty filibusters remained on the island when Louis Aury arrived to take command. On 21 September the island became the property of the "Republic of Mexico." Aury had refused to sail with Mina and had arrived in Florida on board a ship he had stolen from Mina.[33]

The arrival of Aury and his men changed the purpose of the expedition. MacGregor had intended to turn the area over to the United States after a profit had been made, but Aury proposed to make the island a base of operation for piratical enterprises. He sent privateers out to prey on Spanish shipping. Amelia Island became the collection point for all captured treasure. The slave trade flourished between Georgia and Florida even though the trade was illegal. Aury's men smuggled into Georgia an estimated 1,000 black slaves.[34]

The Monroe Administration became fearful of the reaction of the international community to the activities of

Aury. Aury's followers were becoming lax in their seizing of only Spanish vessels, and the United States government felt this might evolve into an international incident. By December of 1817 Monroe had the assurances of France, Great Britain, and the revolutionary governments of Spanish America that action against the filibusters of Amelia Island would be condoned. The president issued the order, and on 23 December 1817, 250 United States troops crossed into Florida. The filibusters made no resistance, and the American troops captured Fernandina in the name of the government of the United States. When General Andrew Jackson, in 1818, occupied the rest of the province, he solved the problem of what to do with Amelia Island.[35]

The MacGregor-Aury expedition into Florida is an example of one type of filibustering expedition while the Miranda and Mina expeditions are an example of a second classification. Material gain was the motive of the MacGregor-Aury endeavor. The Miranda and Mina expeditions had an altruistic motive, the freeing of an oppressed people. The filibustering expeditions of the future would be based on one of three types: 1) material gain; 2) altruistic motives; or 3) a combination of both. It would be the altruistic argument that would attract the most supporters, especially in the press. The MacGregor plan of annexing the land to the United States became an important element in the

filibuster philosophy, particularly in the southern states during the 1850s.

CHAPTER I ENDNOTES

[1]A "filibuster," for the purpose of this study, is a "soldier of fortune who engages in unauthorized warfare against a foreign country with which his own country is at peace," in Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language, 2 ed., s.v. "filibuster."

[2]Albert K. Weinberg, Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History (1935; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), p. 37.

[3]Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, pp. 39-41; Frederick Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 33.

[4]William D. and Amy L. Marsland, Venezuela Through Its History (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1954), p. 106; William Spence Robertson, The Life of Miranda, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1929), 1:293.

[5]Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:293-94; Joseph F. Thorning, Francisco De Miranda: World Citizen (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1952), pp. 173, 175.

[6]Thorning, Miranda, p. 174; Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:297.

[7]Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:299-300.

[8]Marsland and Marsland, Venezuela, p. 107; Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:301.

[9]Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:305; Thorning, Miranda, pp. 180-181.

[10]Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:305-6.

[11]Thorning, Miranda, pp. 182-84.

[12]Robertson, Life of Miranda, 1:313-20; Thorning, Miranda, p. 185; Marsland and Marsland, Venezuela, p. 109.

[13]James Jeffrey Roche, The Story of the Filibusters (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891), pp. 1, 7.

[14]Linda Ericson Devereaux, "Philip Nolan and His 'Wild Horses,' " Texana 12 (1974): 88; H. Glenn Jordan, "Philip Nolan: Trader or Filibuster?" Texana 12 (1974): 271-74; For historians who view Nolan as a filibuster see John Francis Bannon, The Spanish Borderlands Frontier: 1513-1821 (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970), p. 209, and Leroy R. Hafen and Carl Coke Rister, Western America: The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1941), pp. 263-65.

[15]Harris Gaylord Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943), pp. 1-10.

[16]Ibid., pp. 33-36, 42-51.

[17]Ibid., pp. 52, 60-65.

[18]Ibid., pp. 66-72.

[19]Frederick Merk, History of the Westward Movement (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), p. 266; Hafen and Rister, Western America, p. 267; Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport, pp. 234-36.

[20]Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport, pp. 239-42.

[21]Ibid., pp. 243-45.

[22]Ibid., p. 237.

[23]Ibid., pp. 250-54.

[24]Ibid., pp. 146-48.

[25]Harris Gaylord Warren, "The Origin of General Mina's Invasion of Mexico," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 42 (1938):5; Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport, pp. 150-51.

[26]Warren, "The Origin of General Mina's Invasion of Mexico," pp. 9-11.

[27]Ibid., p. 12.

[28]Warren, "The Origin of General Mina's Invasion of Mexico," p. 15; Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport, pp. 165-67.

[29]Warren, The Sword Was Their Passport, pp. 168-71.

[30]Ibid., pp. 171-72; Warren, "The Origin of General Mina's Invasion of Mexico," p. 5.

[31]Charlton W. Tebeau, A History of Florida (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971), pp. 105-10.

[32]Rufus Kay Wyllys, "The Filibusters of Amelia Island," Georgia Historical Quarterly 12 (1928): 297-98, 301-3.

[33]Wyllys, "The Filibusters of Amelia Island," pp. 307, 309-10; Tebeau, A History of Florida, p. 112.

[34]Wyllys, "The Filibusters of Amelia Island," pp. 311, 313; Tebeau, A History of Florida, p. 112.

[35]Wyllys, "The Filibusters of Amelia Island," pp. 314-15, 320-21.

CHAPTER II

FILIBUSTERING IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1830 TO 1860

After a period of virtual inactivity, the 1830s ushered in a new age of filibustering. This renewed activity peaked during the decade of the 1850s. The filibusters sought support by proclaiming their expeditions to be expeditions of liberation, while actually they desired wealth and power. The press by 1850 either believed this propaganda or chose to remain silent. In Texas, newspapers became vocal in their reporting of the filibustering excursions. For the next thirty years, men plundered, murdered, and conquered in the name of filibustering.

The Texas Revolution is an enigma in the history of filibuster movements. Texans instituted the revolt and were supported by American men and arms. Americans throughout the United States held meetings in support of the Texans and collected money and supplies. Men embarked from New Orleans and other cities to offer their services to the Texans. A volunteer outfit organized in New Orleans, the "New Orleans Greys," contributed more than 100 men to the Texas cause. From Mobile a force of thirty men died while serving the Texas flag. John A. Quitman, who would win military fame in

the Mexican War of 1846 to 1848, led a group of forty Missisippians into Texas in April of 1836. David Crockett of Tennessee died at the Alamo along with other Americans serving in the Texas army. The outcome of this revolt was the defeat of Mexico and the independence of Texas.[1]

The Texas Revolution was unique for many reasons. The revolt had the support of the people throughout the province and not just in one small area. The Texas Revolution is the only filibustering expedition that was a success. This one fact places the revolt in Texas in a unique place in the annals of filibustering history.[2]

While men were heading south to aid the Texans, a group of men were organizing an expedition into Canada. The leader of the expedition was James Dickson, a mysterious person with apparently no verifiable background. Dickson arrived in New York and Washington in the winter of 1835 attempting to raise recruits for Texas. With little success he headed to Montreal, where he recruited a number of "half-breed" sons of the factors employed by the Hudson's Bay Company. The purpose of the expedition was to set up an Indian kingdom in California with Dickson as ruler. The expedition was to proceed to the Red River colony of the Hudson's Bay Company where an army of half-breeds would be recruited. From there the expedition was to head south to Santa Fe and

plunder the area to provide money for their assault on California. Mexican territory was the goal of the expedition.

On the night of 1 August 1836 sixty men left Buffalo, New York, for Canada. Dickson had aroused suspicion when he chartered a schooner, but the filibusters were not stopped by government officials. While the schooner was sailing up the Great Lakes, a temporary setback befell the little group. The schooner, sailing past Detroit, was hailed by a steamboat and ordered to lower sail. On board the steamer was the sheriff of Detroit with a posse seeking several cattle rustlers. Since Dickson and his men could not disprove the charge, the sheriff towed the schooner into port and several of the men were arrested. The parties reached a settlement through the mediation of a retired American general, John McNeil, Jr., who had met Dickson in Washington. The sheriff released the men, and their expedition proceeded as planned.[4]

The Dickson expedition faced cold, starvation, and loss of life as it proceeded toward the colony. The representative of the Hudson's Bay Company in North America, George Simpson, had learned of the activities of Dickson. Simpson believed that the expedition intended to seize the colony and establish its own trading colony. He warned the colony of the impending invasion. When the filibusters arrived at

the settlement of Pembine on 20 December, only a dozen men remained, including Dickson. The expedition thus ended far short of its intended goal. This effort illustrates two areas of thought that would become prevalent in the 1850s: 1) acquisition of the Spanish southwest; and 2) the possible annexation of Canada. Only the first was acted upon, while the second remained a topic of discussion.[5]

During the decade of the 1840s, the American attitude toward expansion solidified into a national ambition while the activities of the filibusters waned. The support that expansionism received was national since in every social and economic class the doctrine had followers. The term "manifest destiny" was not a part of the American vocabulary until used in Congress in 1846, but the conditions were present in the country to produce a following prior to John L. O'Sullivan's article espousing manifest destiny.[6]

Manifest destiny was a philosophy conceived in the United States. Several factors account for the popularity of this doctrine. The first was a fear in certain sections of the country of a shortage of good, fertile land. For years many had believed the territory of the United States was endless, now people were having doubts. A second factor in the growth of manifest destiny was the great advances in transportation and in communication which opened up new lands for occupation by Americans. Finally, the growing sectional

strife created, in the United States, an attitude in which the southern states deemed additional territory essential if they were to survive. The press, by the continual mention of manifest destiny, was the principal force spreading the doctrine throughout the United States.[7]

In the decade of the 1840s the expansionists added the last part of the doctrine of manifest destiny--the regeneration of backward peoples. This addition was brought on by the American perception of Mexico and her people. Annexation, however, in the view of the expansionists, must be postponed until the people had become "Americanized" through constant contact with Americans. When the United States judged the people to be properly qualified, they could only then apply for annexation.[8]

The war with Mexico, 1846-1848, ushered in a new phase of American expansion. The "all Mexico" campaign went through a phase which would change the philosophy of American expansion. The issue of slavery in the newly conquered territory caused the attitude toward expansion to be divided along sectional lines. By 1850 both northerners and southerners could still advocate manifest destiny, but they could not agree on what territory should be acquired. Also, the two sections could not concur as to which institutions would be permitted in the new possessions. The issue of manifest destiny was now controlled by sectional attitudes.[9]

Interest in the acquisition of Cuba was strong in the southern states and in New York City. Southerners viewed Cuba as a means to maintain equality with the free states in the Senate. They also thought its acquisition was necessary in order to preserve slavery in the United States. Southerners saw the activity of the British in trying to get Spain to abolish the institution as a direct threat against American slavery. To many southerners the "africanization" of Cuba meant the destruction of the Cuban society and a direct threat against the peculiar institution in the southern states. When a filibustering expedition was set to sail to Cuba, southerners supported the expedition.[10]

In 1849 an exile from Cuba entered the United States. Narciso Lopez, a Venezuelan by birth, had been the Spanish governor of Trindad, Cuba, until forced to flee for his life for being involved in an insurrection against the Crown. Once in the United States, Lopez contacted the Cuban junta in New York City and advocated an expedition against Cuba. The junta supplied some of the financial backing while prominent businessmen in New York supplied the rest. Lopez wanted, as commander of the expedition, a man with a well-known military reputation. After contacting and being refused by both Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee, Lopez decided to lead the expedition himself. Several former American officers of the Mexican War were recruited, among

them Robert M. White, who had been a second lieutenant in the Independent Company of Louisiana Volunteers.[11]

"Colonel" White collected men off the coast of Mississippi on Round Island. On 11 August 1849 President Zachary Taylor issued a proclamation warning Americans not to join the expedition, and United States' naval vessels imposed a blockade on Round Island. In addition, government officials seized supply vessels which were being outfitted in New York. Finally, the men on Round Island surrendered to the naval commander, and Lopez's first attempt to take control of Cuba had ended.[12]

Lopez, undaunted by the failure, began to prepare for a second attempt. He moved his base of operations to New Orleans, where the climate of opinion was more sympathetic to this type of activity. The expedition took on a southern character as a result of this action. Lopez recruited and formed three battalions: the Mississippi, the Kentucky, and the Louisiana. The expedition left New Orleans in three waves with the Kentucky Battalion embarking on 25 April 1850 on board the Georgiana. The rendezvous point was Contoy Island off the coast of Mexico, which they reached on 7 May. The Louisiana Battalion left New Orleans on 2 May followed five days later by Lopez and the Mississippi Battalion. By 14 May the two battalions had reached Contoy Island and had begun preparations for the final assault against Cuba.[13]

On the night of 18 May the expedition sailed past the lighthouse at the bay of Cardenas. The filibusters landed, and the assault on Cuba began. The resistance of the Cubans was greater than Lopez had anticipated. No Cuban nationals rallied around Lopez's banner. Lopez, fearing a Spanish blockade of the bay, ordered a retreat. The Americans reloaded the supplies on board the ship, and on 19 May the Cuban liberating army departed Cuba. Lopez wanted to reland, but the men refused. A Spanish man-of-war, the Pizarro, located the American vessel, the Creole, which contained the Americans and followed them to Key West, Florida. The Americans surrendered to the military commander at Key West. The second attempt to take Cuba had terminated in failure.[14]

The final attempt to conquer or liberate Cuba took place in the summer of 1851. New Orleans received word that an uprising had begun on 4 July in the district of Puerto Principe. Lopez, wanting to take advantage of the hostile mood in Cuba, hurriedly organized his expedition. The final expedition of Narciso Lopez left New Orleans on 5 August 1851. At Bahia Honda, Cuba, the expedition landed. The filibusters suffered heavy casualties at the hands of the Spanish. Prior to the arrival of the expedition, the leaders of the Cuban uprising had been captured, and the filibusters received no support from the Cubans. The

Spanish either killed or captured the men of the expedition. Lopez met his death on 1 September 1851 at the hands of an executioner.[15]

The desire to liberate Cuba remained, but no serious attempt was made to send an expedition to the island. Instead, Mexico again became the object of the filibusters. Mexico was invaded from two directions. The expeditions from Texas were few in number compared to the expeditions launched from California. The situation on the Texas-Mexico border had, since the end of the Mexican War, developed into a struggle between the merchants of Texas and the Mexican border patrol. While the war had been in progress, the merchants had been allowed to bring their products into Mexico duty free. Since the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ending the war, Mexico had imposed high import duties. The merchants retaliated by smuggling their goods into Mexico, but the Mexican troops often confiscated the wagons. When Jose Maria J. Carvajal in September of 1851 announced the El Plan de la Loba and began a rebellion in northern Mexico, the Texans supported the insurgents.[16]

Carvajal launched his attack from the Texas side of the Rio Grande on 20 September 1851. The town of Camargo easily fell to the insurgents. Carvajal next attacked Reynosa with the same successful result. Matamoros, the commercial link to Brownsville, Texas, was the ultimate objective of Carvajal.

He placed the town under siege on 20 October and intermittent fighting commenced. Two days later Carvajal withdrew from Matamoros. He sent Colonel John S. "Rip" Ford to Austin to gather new recruits. Before any recruits could arrive, Carvajal attacked Cerralvo on 26 November but was forced to flee to Texas. On 20 February 1852 Carvajal again crossed the Rio Grande and attacked Camargo with little success. Carvajal, while trying to reorganize his forces, was arrested twice for violation of the neutrality laws. By 1853 Carvajal had ceased being a threat on the Texas-Mexico frontier, but the Indian menace remained.[17]

The Indians created a serious problem for the Texans living on the fringes of civilization. The Lipan tribe had been raiding the Texas frontier and seeking safety on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande. Governor Elisha M. Pease ordered a Texas Ranger company into the field and gave command of the company to Captain James H. Callahan. Pease instructed Callahan to pursue the Indians "wherever they may be found."[18]

Callahan followed the Indians to the Rio Grande. His company consisted of eighty-eight men. Near the border, the Rangers met a group of men who sought to join a new Mexican revolt in progress. These men joined the expedition, increasing the number of rebels to over 110. The Texans crossed the Rio Grande, and on 3 October 1855 they met a

combined force of Mexican troops and Lipan Indians. The Texans retreated to Piedras Negras and seized the town on 4 October. Realizing his position was difficult to defend, Callahan ordered the town burned, and the Texans fled across the Rio Grande on the sixth, carrying their booty from the town's inhabitants. The state mustered all the Rangers out of service on 20 October 1855 at the end of their enlistment period.[19]

The southern migration route to California also served as a source of several American excursions into northern Mexico. The men who took part in these raids were typical of those who would join the filibustering expeditions launched from California. In May of 1848 the pueblo of Nuro in Sonora was invaded by a band of Americans. This group of eighteen men robbed, burned and terrorized the Mexican inhabitants. A problem develops in trying to differentiate between an actual filibustering expedition or an outlaw band. The attacks on the small Mexican villages can possibly be explained by a need for food and water, but these raids did show a lack of respect for Mexican property and territory. The raid on Nuro was probably an act by outlaws, but the attack on Cieneguilla in 1849 was a well planned invasion.[20]

On 18 May 1849 three men rode into the town of Cieneguilla, Sonora. The leader, a "Dr. Robert," was well-dressed and professed a warm friendship with the residents.

Cieneguilla stood near a gold field that had been active since 1771. Three days later about thirty Americans rode into the mining community and were placed in local homes by Dr. Robert. These Americans lived off the hospitality of their hosts for nearly two weeks. On Sunday morning, 3 June, they attacked and seized the inhabitants of the town. The filibusters beat the local priest, abused the women, and looted the town. After accomplishing their task, the men headed north toward American territory. Possibly, this was a group of border ruffians, but they do fit the criteria for a filibuster.[21]

The Cieneguilla episode illustrated the total lack of regard for the Mexican as a person. The expansionists saw the Mexicans as an inferior race, and the Americans easily perpetrated actions like these on them. These early raids quite possibly instilled in the Mexican a hatred of all Americans. This might account for the reception many of the filibusters received in Sonora and Baja California. One thing is certain, these were the type of men who migrated to California and became filibusters. These men were accustomed to a violent life and had little regard for private property.[22]

The first unquestionable filibustering expedition from California was led by Joseph C. Morehead. Mexico attracted the filibusters for several reasons. First, the nation had

a vast frontier which meant to many men a chance to rebuild their fortunes and a chance for adventure. Secondly, Mexico administered its frontier territory with a loose hand and to many, it seemed ripe for the picking. Finally, the filibusters envisioned the people of Mexico as being under a repressive regime and assumed any action taken by the filibusters would be welcomed. Morehead's purpose for invading Mexico was to aid the revolutionists in Sonora and Baja California at whose request he agreed to come.[23]

Morehead, quartermaster general of California, had been ordered to aid General Joshua Bean in subduing the Yuma Indians in the West. Instead of sending the military supplies to the punitive force, Morehead sold most of the arms and ammunition to purchase a ship, the Josephine, to carry his men to Mexico. He used the remaining supplies to equip his expedition which he divided into three groups. The first was to go overland to Sonora. The second group was to sail to La Paz, while the third, under the command of Morehead, was to sail to Mazatlan.[24]

In June of 1851 the La Paz group of about 200 men had reached its destination. By August, however, this group of men had dispersed. Morehead arrived in San Diego with forty-five men on 23 April. These men deserted the expedition because of a lack of supplies and disputes among the men and officers. Finally, with new recruits and fearful of arrest

by federal officials, Morehead left for Mazatlan on 11 May 1851. The Mexican authorities had been warned of the filibustering expedition and when the Josephine arrived in port, the authorities seized the ship. Fortunately for the Americans, no contraband had been loaded on board, and so, the filibusters were not detained. The subsequent events of the expedition are not recorded, but it is believed that the filibusters retained their miners' disguises and returned to the United States.[25]

The Morehead expedition represented the dominant Anglo-American influence in California, but a small group of French nationals were to play a major role in the filibustering expeditions to come. The French began to come to California in large numbers in 1849. California was envisioned as a land of abundant wealth. Once the French arrived in California, however, the actual situation became one of abuse and prejudice. The strong anti-foreign sentiment in the United States was directed toward the French, although it was not as strong as with some ethnic groups. The French refused to become United States citizens and instead clung to the country of their birth. Because they did not have the right to vote, the politicians neglected them. Also, the French tended to remain isolated from the Anglo-American population, even refusing to learn English.[26]

It was probably natural that the French would see Mexico as a land of opportunity. The fabled gold of Sonora was a major attraction. Also, the French saw the sparsely settled and ill-defended territory as a possible addition to the empire of France. Mexico recognized the vulnerability of its northwestern lands and was willing to allow the French to colonize the area. The French, finally, were receptive to the Mexican offer of employment and settlement. These attractions were the stimuli for the French expeditions into Mexico.[27]

The first two French expeditions into Sonora were not filibustering expeditions. Instead, they were government-sanctioned colonization projects. Charles de Pindray led the first attempt in 1851 to 1852. Pindray had received permission from the Mexican counsul in San Francisco to establish a colony of gold seekers in Sonora in return for military protection for the Mexican inhabitants against the Indians. On 26 December 1851 Pindray arrived in Guaymas with about eighty men. They were cordially received by the Mexican officials, who granted them land in the Cocospera Valley. In the spring of 1852 they attempted to start a small agricultural community but trouble with local officials developed. General Miguel Blanco, military commander of Sonora, learned of Pindray's actions against the French republic and his subsequent flight. He ordered

supplies not to be sent to the French colonists. Pindray attempted to negotiate with the officials but met with no success. Finally, one night a shot was heard, and Pindray was found dead. With the loss of their leader, the Frenchmen struggled through the summer of 1852, but the expedition was at an end.[28]

The Frenchman, M. Lepine de Sigondis, led the second colonization expedition into Mexico. The early favorable reports from the Pindray colonists inspired Sigondis, and in March of 1852 about eighty men, mainly French nationals, sailed to Guaymas. The predominant occupation of the men was mining. Upon arriving at Guaymas, they learned of a new regulation which had been imposed by Blanco. The new law required them to enlist in the Mexican army and pay a tithe to the church. Apparently they accepted these terms, for they attempted to mine in the Santa Cruz Valley. However, Mexican enthusiasm and support waned, and the expedition dispersed after several unsuccessful attempts to find gold.[29]

The importance of these two French expeditions is that they paved the way for the filibustering expedition of Count Gaston de Raousset-Boulbon, a French nobleman. The colonization schemes of Pindray and Sigondis indicated that the Mexican officials were willing to permit the French in Sonora. Their desire to protect their citizens and to retain the territory from American encroachment provided the

opportunity for Raousset-Boulbon to lead a group of men into Sonora. Raousset-Boulbon realized the possibilities which a sparsely populated territory might render, and he embarked on a scheme which combined mining with filibustering.[30]

The French Consul to San Francisco, Patrice Dillon, encouraged Raousset-Boulbon in his colonization scheme and also wrote a letter of recommendation to the French minister to Mexico. In February of 1852 Raousset-Boulbon visited Mexico and won the support of President Mariano Arista and the French-Mexican banking house of Jecker-Torre and Company. An agreement was completed, and they formed a company, the Compania Restauradora de la Mina de la Arizona. The banking house was to provide the financial means for Raousset-Boulbon to equip and transport his men to Sonora for 50 percent of the company's grant. The Mexican government required Raousset-Boulbon to furnish at least 150 men and protect the frontier inhabitants from the Indians while working the mines. Raousset-Boulbon returned to San Francisco and began his recruiting drive.[31]

Raousset-Boulbon easily recruited men because of the difficulties the French faced in California and because of the tempting fortunes to be made. He excluded Anglo-Americans from the expedition because of the Mexican immigration laws. On 19 May 1852 Raousset-Boulbon, with

approximately 200 men, left San Francisco on board the Archibald Gracie.[32]

Upon arrival at Guaymas on 1 June the Frenchmen discovered a changed attitude in Mexico with regard to their mission. Mexican officials refused to comply with the contract agreed upon by Raousset-Boulbon. The Mexicans required the French to remain in Pozo, a pueblo near Guaymas, for over a month. Raousset-Boulbon tried to persuade the Mexicans to relinquish the supplies due them, but the Mexicans refused. Finally, the Mexicans ordered the expedition to Saric, near the former Pindray camp, and directed Raousset-Boulbon to meet personally with Blanco. Raousset-Boulbon refused to comply and instead sent one of his officers to confer with Blanco. The Mexican leader informed the emissary that they had only one of three courses of action: 1) renounce their French citizenship and become Mexican soldiers; 2) obtain passports for the Arizona territory, but they would not then be granted mineral rights; or 3) reduce their numbers and with a Mexican leader proceed with the Restauradora company. Raousset-Boulbon viewed this as an infringement upon his rights and stood in defiance of the order.[33]

The French expeditionists accepted the military preparation of Raousset-Boulbon. The filibusters moved into the

town of Madelena, an action which confused the Mexican military commanders. The Mexicans remained stationary until Raousset-Boulbon committed himself to one objective. On 6 October 1852 the French left the town headed for Hermosillo, but the Mexicans thought the filibusters were headed for Ures. The attack on Hermosillo proved to be a costly victory for the French. Many key officers were killed in the engagement. Raousset-Boulbon became ill with periods of unconsciousness. Orders were issued, and the filibusters began the march toward Guaymas, hoping to obtain reinforcements and supplies.[34]

Nearing the town of Guaymas, the French consular agent met the filibusters and advocated peace. Raousset-Boulbon listened, but before he could respond, he lapsed into unconsciousness. While Raousset-Boulbon remained unable to exercise command, the French filibusters negotiated directly with the Mexicans. The Mexican government allowed the French to return to San Francisco. Raousset-Boulbon recuperated at Mazatlan and returned to San Francisco as a hero.[35]

When Raousset-Boulbon arrived in San Francisco, he discovered that another person was organizing a filibustering expedition under the guise of a colonizing enterprise. William Walker of Tennessee intended to establish an independent republic in the Mexican province of Sonora. Walker

believed that a small band of men could easily conquer the province. He justified the presence of armed Americans in Sonora as a fulfillment of the obligation of the United States to prevent Indian raids into Mexico. Walker believed that an armed conquest of Sonora would save the inhabitants from a government that left them at the mercy of the Indians. Walker used the expansionist doctrine of aid to backward people as the major justification for his expedition.[36]

Walker raised money by issuing bonds in the name of the Independence Loan Fund. He chartered the brig Arrow and loaded supplies on board. General Ethan Allen Hitchcock, commander of the Pacific Division of the United States Army, grew suspicious of Walker's activities and on 22 September 1853 ordered the Arrow seized by his soldiers and delivered to the United States marshall. Walker challenged Hitchcock in court, but the general refused to obey the court's ruling in Walker's favor, stating that his authority came from President Millard Fillmore. Walker, impatient over the delay, chartered the Carolina and with forty-five men sailed on 16 October for Mexico.[37]

The First Invasion Battalion of the Republic of Sonora arrived at La Paz on 3 November. The filibusters captured the unsuspecting governor, Rafael Espanosa, and secured the port town in less than thirty minutes. Lower California was

next declared independent from Mexico. Walker realized that a small force could not hold La Paz, so an order was given to leave on 6 November. Before the men left, they satisfied their desire for wealth by plundering the town and vicinity. As the filibusters were clearing the harbor, they met and captured a Mexican ship. The Americans added the name of Juan C. Rebollendo, the new governor, to the list of prisoners. On 29 November the expedition landed at Ensenada, and Walker proclaimed the small port city the capital of his newly established country.[38]

While at Ensenada, the filibusters raided the nearby ranches. Walker led one pillaging expedition on 2 December. The filibusters seized and bound the occupants. Two hostages were taken to ensure the safety of the filibusters. This action created an unrelenting enemy for Walker. Antonio Maria Melendrez, a bandito and son of the owner of the ranch, swore vengeance upon Walker and hounded him throughout Baja and Sonora. On that same day, a Mexican force of about sixty men overtook Walker before he reached Ensenada. After a brief engagement, Walker managed to enter Ensenada and prepare for a siege which began on 5 December. A patrol sent out on the fourteenth by Walker surprised the Mexicans, who fled in confusion.[39]

The filibusters faced a grave situation. They suffered from a lack of food supplies which was not helped by the

arrival of reinforcements on 20 December. The Mexican population resented their presence and were hostile. The filibusters were not used to the military discipline which Walker imposed, and on 25 January 1854 about fifty men deserted for California. By 12 February Walker had grown fearful of a Mexican attack and ordered his approximately 140 men to San Vicente.[40]

At San Vicente, Walker issued a proclamation ordering all citizens of his republic to report to him within five days. Failure to report meant punishment, which the people knew Walker was capable of inflicting. On 1 March approximately forty men renounced their Mexican citizenship. Walker reported that a magnificent ceremony had occurred. In reality, the filibusters rounded up fifteen Indians and twenty-five Mexicans and forced them to take an oath of allegiance. On 20 March Walker with 100 men left San Vicente to conquer Sonora followed by Melendrez and his men.[41]

Walker's force was depleted by desertions. When he decided on the sixth or seventh of April that the enterprise was doomed, he had only about thirty-five followers. Melendrez and his force met up with Walker five days after he began his retreat from Sonora. Always avoiding direct contact with the filibusters, Melendrez employed guerilla tactics. On 17 April the filibusters arrived at San Vicente,

hoping to join the small force left in command of the town. Instead, the men had been killed. Walker realized his only hope of survival was to cross into the United States. The filibusters left San Vicente on 19 April and headed for San Diego. They reached the American border on 8 May 1854, and Walker surrendered to a detachment of United States troops. Walker had begun his expedition with over 200 men. By the time he surrendered, desertion and death had reduced Walker's filibustering force to thirty-five.[42]

The Walker filibustering expedition instilled a fear for their frontier territory in Mexican officials. Many were willing to endorse again the idea of allowing the French to colonize in Sonora. Raousset-Boulbon, learning of this position, went to Mexico City in 1853 to obtain permission to bring colonists into Mexico. No agreement, however, could be reached between the two parties, so Raousset-Boulbon returned to San Francisco, intent on invading Sonora.[43]

Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, President of Mexico, became worried over reports of Raousset-Boulbon organizing a filibustering expedition. The Mexican official devised a plan which he hoped would circumvent Raousset-Boulbon's expedition. He instructed the Mexican consul in San Francisco to sign foreigners, especially Frenchmen, to a contract allowing them to settle in Mexico at state expense. Santa

Anna hoped this scheme would entice men away from Raousset-Boulbon's expedition. Furthermore, the French consul, Patrice Dillon, was requested by the Mexican consul to aid in the recruitment of French citizens. Dillon, who had sent Raousset-Boulbon to Mexico in 1852 and 1853, informed his countrymen of the Mexican plan. Thus, Dillon and Raousset-Boulbon recruited Frenchmen with the understanding that once in Mexico they would become a part of Raousset-Boulbon's expedition. The Mexican plan, in essence, permitted the filibuster leader to transport his men to Mexico without incurring any expenses.[44]

After a delay caused by American officials, the Challenge arrived in Guaymas on 19 April 1854 with over 400 men. Santa Anna instructed the Mexican military commander, General Jose Maria Yanez, to incorporate the men into the Mexican army. The Mexican force numbered only 200 men which caused alarm among local officials. Raousset-Boulbon left the United States on 23 May for Guaymas only to meet an unanticipated situation. Many of the French troops hesitated joining the filibustering expedition. Finally, on 13 July 1854 the filibusters attacked the Mexican garrison. Although the filibusters outnumbered the Mexican troops, the Mexican force was better trained than the invaders. After three hours of fighting, the Mexican force captured the

entire French filibustering expedition, who were seeking asylum at the French consulate.[45]

The Mexican officials reacted leniently toward their prisoners. While the officials sent most of the Frenchmen into the Mexican interior, they allowed a few to return to San Francisco. Raousset-Boulbon, however, found the Mexican officials quite hostile. They sentenced him to death by a firing squad. After two unsuccessful attempts as a filibuster leader, Raousset-Boulbon met his death in Mexico.[46]

In 1857 a former classmate and friend of William Walker launched an expedition into Sonora. Henry A. Crabb envisioned himself as a liberator answering a call for help from the Mexican people. In March of 1856 Crabb visited Sonora and through his Mexican wife's relatives contacted revolutionists in the area. One Ignacio Pesqueira and Crabb came to an agreement. Crabb was to bring a group of Americans into Mexico posing as colonists, but in reality, they were to aid the revolutionists. While Crabb was in California dabbling in politics and organizing the expedition, Pesqueira succeeded in his bid for control of the province. In 1857 Pesqueira became governor.[47]

Crabb had been a member of the California legislature from 1852 to 1854 and was a leader in the Know-Nothing party. When he returned to California in 1856, state elections were in progress. Believing that a Know-Nothing

victory in the California legislature would mean a seat in the United States Senate, Crabb worked diligently in the election. Crabb's senatorial dream was not to be realized, so he decided to fulfill his contract with Pesqueira. He formed the Arizona Colonization Company with support from influential men in California politics. On 22 January 1857 California newspapers recorded Crabb's departure with about 100 men.[48]

The expedition moved overland to Fort Yuma and then to the Gila-Colorado junction which it reached on 1 March. By this date desertion had reduced the number of filibusters to about ninety. On 12 March the filibusters moved up the Gila River into Mexico. Crabb issued a statement upon arrival in Mexico that he had been requested by leading officials to aid the people of Sonora. A report of reinforcements caused Crabb to leave a company of twenty men under the command of Captain F. S. McKinney at the Cabeza Prieta Tanks. Crabb proceeded toward the town of Sonita, where a relative lived.[49]

On 1 April, upon nearing Caborca, the filibusters met and engaged a Mexican force. The Americans fought their way into the town and established themselves in several adobe buildings. The Mexicans, however, held a strategic position in a fortress-styled church. Crabb realized the hopelessness of the situation and asked for terms for surrender. The

Mexicans responded--"unconditional." On 6 April the Americans surrendered. The next day the Mexican people vented their wrath by executing fifty-nine Americans, including Crabb.[50]

Not only Cuba and Mexico but also the countries of Central and South America were viewed as potential filibustering objectives. This area of the Western Hemisphere was seen as possible American acquisitions. The filibusters considered the people backward and in need of American guidance and support. In 1851 the attempt of an Ecuadoran exile to regain his lost presidential office opened up opportunities for American filibustering.[51]

Juan Jose Flores had been president of Ecuador until his removal in 1845. Touring the world to solicit aid, he organized an expedition in which men from the United States sailed to Panama to join men from South American countries in a joint expedition against Ecuador. The American force sailed from San Francisco under the command of Alexander Bell of Alabama. The group of forty Americans brought the total of Flores' force to between 700 and 1,000 men. The expeditionary force, however, could not land in Ecuador with confidence of success. Several expeditions attempted raids, but the casulaties were heavy. By 1852 the Americans had become discouraged and returned to the United States the best way they could.[52]

The most famous American filibuster was William Walker, who had been involved in the filibustering expeditions in Mexico in 1853 and 1854. His exploits in Nicaragua would gain him fame and support throughout the southern United States. Born in Tennessee in 1824, Walker, at five feet, five inches tall, did not look the part of a filibuster. Throughout his life, Walker was not sure of his calling. As a physician, lawyer, and journalist, he failed to find a profession which he enjoyed. A restless spirit swept over him as he moved westward to California. Walker, never afraid to speak his mind, made many political enemies in California as an editor. Finally, the lure of gold in Mexico and riches in Nicaragua became the impetus for his filibustering expeditions.[53]

On 16 June 1855 Walker arrived in Nicaragua to take part in the civil war going on there. He quickly gained control of the country. The apparent reason for Walker's expedition was a lust for adventure and a desire for the spoils of war. His men, including some professional soldiers, were not involved in the slavery controversy. When Walker reinstated slavery in Nicaragua in 1856, his objective was support from the southern United States. Many southern slavery expansionists supported Walker's regime. The vicissitudes of the Nicaraguan civil war, however, caused Walker to flee for the United States in 1857.[54]

Walker launched a second expedition in November of 1857. However, before he could establish himself, United States naval officers arrested his men while still in Nicaragua for violation of the neutrality law. The southern press attacked Commodore Hiram Paulding for his arrest of Walker. The shipwreck of the Susan thwarted Walker's third attempt to attack Nicaragua. Walker launched a fourth and final expedition against Nicaragua in April of 1860. He proved unsuccessful and died by firing squad on 12 September 1860.[55]

Throughout the 1850s the press in the United States and Texas commented on the activities of the filibusters, and debated the questions the filibusters raised. The right to invade a foreign country, the right of the United States to expand into this conquered territory, and the question of slavery expansion into these areas became topics of deep concern. In Texas, the press appeared to be proponents of filibustering, but as the debate continued any earlier concensus fell apart. During the decade of the 1850s personal beliefs and beliefs concerning duty to country and state divided the Texas press. The filibusters caused this anguish as seen by the editorials of the 1850s.

CHAPTER II ENDNOTES

[1]Quitman organized an expedition to invade Cuba in 1854 and 1855, but pressure from President Pierce caused the expedition to be disbanded. See Gene M. Brack, Mexico Views Manifest Destiny, 1821-1846: An Essay on the Origins of the Mexican War (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1975), p. 74; David M. Vigness, The Revolutionary Decades, The Saga of Texas Series, edited by Seymour V. Connor, vol. 2 (Austin: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1965), p. 175; Robert E. May, "John A. Quitman and the Southern Martial Spirit," Journal of Mississippi History 41 (1979): 162; Frederick Merk, History of the Westward Movement (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), p. 262.

[2]William C. Binkley, The Texas Revolution (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952), pp. 65-67.

[3]Martin McLeod, "The Diary of Martin McLeod," Grace Lee Nute, ed., Minnesota History Bulletin 4 (1932): 351-52.

[4]Grace Lee Nute, "James Dickson: A Filibuster in Minnesota in 1836," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 10 (1923): 128-30.

[5]Nute, "James Dickson," pp. 131, 134; Marshall Texas Republican, 21 February 1850.

[6]Frederick Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 40; Julius W. Pratt, "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny,'" American Historical Review 32 (1927): 798.

[7]Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History, pp. 50-51, 55, 60.

[8]Ibid., pp. 24, 33; Albert K. Weinberg, Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History (1935; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), p. 124.

[9]Paul F. Lambert, "The Movement for the Acquisition of All Mexico," Journal of the West 11 (1972): 317; Robert E. May, The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire: 1854-1861 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), p. 21.

[10]Lester D. Langley, The Cuban Policy of the United States: A Brief History (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 28; C. Stanley Urban, "The Africanization of Cuba Scare: 1853-1855," Hispanic American Historical Review 37 (1957): 29-30.

[11]Robert Granville Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba: 1848-1851 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915), pp. 43-46; Charles H. Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), pp. 47-48.

[12]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 50; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions, p. 55.

[13]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 52, 57-60; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions, p. 77.

[14]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 62-66.

[15]Ibid., pp. 74-79, 88.

[16]J. Fred Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters and the Gadsden Treaty," Hispanic American Historical Review 5 (1922): 159-60; Ernest C. Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 55 (1951): 205-8.

[17]Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," pp. 209, 213, 217, 220, 222, 229.

[18]Ernest C. Shearer, "The Callahan Expedition, 1855," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 54 (1950): 431-32.

[19]Ronnie C. Tyler, "The Callahan Expedition of 1855: Indians or Negroes?" Southwestern Historical Quarterly 70 (1976): 580-81; Shearer, "The Callahan Expedition," pp. 432, 436, 450.

[20]The identity of the leader is not known, but "Dr. Robert" was the name used by the Mexican inhabitants to describe their assailant. Rufus Kay Wyllys, The French in Sonora, 1850-1854: The Story of French Adventurers from California into Mexico (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932), pp. 49-51; Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters," p. 156.

[21]Consuelo Boyd, "Forgotten Filibuster," Journal of Arizona History 20 (1979): 7-10.

[22]Boyd, "Forgotten Filibuster," p. 9; Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters," p. 156; Joe A. Stout, Jr. "Idealism or Manifest Destiny?: Filibustering in Northwestern Mexico, 1850-1865," Journal of the West 11 (1972): 350.

[23]Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," pp. 348-50; Wyllys, The French in Sonora, p. 52.

[24]Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 350; Wyllys, The French in Sonora, pp. 52, 54.

[25]Wyllys, The French in Sonora, pp. 54-55; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 160; Joe A. Stout, Jr. "Joseph C. Morehead and Manifest Destiny: A Filibuster in Sonora, 1851," Pacific Historian 15 (1971): 66.

[26]Rufus Kay Wyllys, "The French of California and Sonora," Pacific Historical Review 1 (1932): 338, 340-42.

[27]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 168; Wyllys, The French in Sonora, pp. 56-57.

[28]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 168; Helen Broughall Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters in Sonora," California Historical Society Quarterly 18 (1939): 5; Wyllys, The French in Sonora, pp. 59-60, 64; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 352.

[29]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," pp. 6-7; Wyllys, The French in Sonora, p. 64.

[30]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 7; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 353; Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters," p. 163.

[31]Abraham P. Nasatir, "Guillaume Patrice Dillon," California Historical Society Quarterly 35 (1956): 319; Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," pp. 11-12.

[32]Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 353; Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 12.

[33]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," pp. 12-13; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 354.

[34]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," pp. 14-15.

[35]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 172; Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 15.

[36]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 173, 184, 191.

[37]Ibid., pp. 191-93.

[38]Ibid., pp. 194-95; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 355.

[39]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 198-99.

[40]Ibid., pp. 200-3.

[41]Ibid., pp. 203-6.

[42]Ibid., pp. 208-9.

[43]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 16; Nasatir, "Guillaume Patrice Dillon," p. 320; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 185.

[44]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 16; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 210-12.

[45]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 17; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 215; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 357.

[46]Metcalf, "The California French Filibusters," p. 18; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 215-16.

[47]Rufus Kay Wyllys, "Henry A. Crabb--A Tragedy of the Sonora Frontier," Pacific Historical Review 9 (1940): 183, 185-86; Joe A. Stout, Jr., "Henry A. Crabb--Filibuster or Colonizer?" The Story of an Ill-Starred Gringo Entrada," American West 8 (1971): 9.

[48]Wyllys, "Crabb," pp. 184, 187; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 357.

[49]Wyllys, "Crabb," pp. 188, 190; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 357.

[50]Wyllys, "Crabb," pp. 190-91; Stout, "Idealism or Manifest Destiny," p. 358.

[51]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 164.

[52]Ibid., pp. 164-67.

[53]Ibid., pp. 175-83.

[54]May, A Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, pp. 91, 93, 106, 110.

[55]Ibid., pp. 115, 129-31.

CHAPTER III

CUBA AND NARCISO LOPEZ

For years the United States regarded Cuba as a prospective strategic acquisition. Cuba, the gateway to the Gulf of Mexico, was considered detrimental to commerce if possessed by a potential enemy. John Quincy Adams, as secretary of state, extented the policy of no transfer to Cuba which would be maintained by his predecessors. The no transfer directive stated that the United States would not permit "the transfer of European colonies in the Western Hemisphere to another non-American power." The United States established this policy when the nation was formed, and extended it to other areas of the Western Hemisphere as the security and interests of the nation dictated. Although the acquisition of Cuba by the United States was the ultimate goal, the government of the United States felt compelled to assure the Spanish sovereignty of Cuba to avoid a diplomatic crisis with Great Britain or France.[1]

The American population, with some reservations, accepted this policy of no transfer. Many Americans considered Spain a tyrannical monarchy clinging to its only valuable, remaining possession in the Americas. The United States public viewed the Cubans as an oppressed populace who

sought American help. Many Americans envisioned Cuban independence and annexation to the United States as the salvation for the people of the "Pearl of the Antilles." Southern support for annexation increased after the Mexican War because of the controversy over slavery expansion in the United States Congress.[2]

A group of Cuban exiles, realizing the possibilities from such American support, began soliciting American aid to establish an independent Cuba. A number of such exiles founded the Havana Club in New York City to secure aid for the independence of Cuba from Spain and its annexation to the United States. In 1849 Narciso Lopez, an exiled Cuban general, sought the aid of the Club. He proposed an immediate invasion of the island from the United States with himself as the commander of the expedition. The Havana Club, however, felt an American should lead the expedition since they believed Lopez to be too impulsive.[3]

Lopez did have a flare for the theatrical. A Venezuelan by birth, he managed to convince American supporters of his love for his Cuban homeland. When Lopez's ill-fated Bahia Hondo expedition arrived in Cuba in August of 1851, he marched upon the shore dressed in a white jacket and proceeded to kiss the soil of his beloved Cuba. The Americans present failed to see the hyprocrisy in Lopez's actions. As a young man, Lopez had achieved fame while

in the Spanish army fighting Simon Bolivar. In 1843 Lopez was sent to Cuba, where he won the friendship and patronage of the governor general, who awarded the office of governor of the state of Trinidad to Lopez. With the arrival of the new governor general, Lopez was forced to retire to private life. Lopez instigated an insurrection against the government in 1849 but fled Cuba with the failure of the revolt. Angry over his treatment by the Spanish government, he acquired a hatred against Spain and sought American help for his revolutionary activities.[4]

In order to acquire American aid, Lopez advocated a program which would appeal to the expansionist sentiment in the country. In New York City and in the southern states, the desire to acquire Cuba was strong. Lopez stressed the need to not only free Cuba from Spanish control but also annex the island to the United States. The Havana Club, however, was worried about Lopez's ultimate goal. Lopez, however, in trying to foster Cuban support for his revolt, stressed independence only. The Havana Club desired annexation. Lopez, realizing the confusion which his stands had presented, reversed his Cuban position by adhering to the doctrine of self-determination.[5]

Lopez began his quest for Cuban independence at a banquet he hosted in Trinidad on 4 July 1849. Following the dinner, he lowered the Spanish flag, and while raising the

"Stars and Stripes" above Cuba, called for "annexation and liberty." The Spanish government sentenced Lopez to death, but he escaped to the United States. He arrived in New York and became an active member of a group planning an invasion of Cuba: the Round Island expedition.[6]

As Lopez began to organize the expedition, his relationship with the Havana Club became strained to the point that he established a second junta operating in New York City. Lopez realized an American was needed to lead the expedition, but no one contacted would accept the position. Jefferson Davis politely refused while suggesting Major Robert E. Lee. Lopez spoke to Lee, but Lee declined, stating that he would feel uncomfortable accepting a commission while an officer in the United States Army. Finally, Lopez recruited several men who had served in the Mexican War. Robert M. White, a second lieutenant in the Regiment of Louisiana Volunteers, became the commanding officer on Round Island. But Lopez, failing to persuade a well-known American to lead the expedition, became the supreme military commander.[7]

White sent the men whom he recruited to Round Island, an island off the coast of Mississippi. The supplies for the expedition were purchased in New York and loaded upon ships in the harbor. The Havana Club, realizing the need for such an enterprise, partially funded the expedition.

Lopez, however, was unaware of the difficulties which were to plague the expedition.[8]

News of Lopez's activities reached Washington, D.C., and on 11 August 1849 President Zachary Taylor issued a proclamation warning Americans not to join the expedition forming on Round Island. The State Department issued orders for the seizure and confiscation of the two supply ships docked at New York City. The secretary of the navy dispatched the squadron based at Pensacola, Florida, to Round Island, and by 4 September Commodore V. M. Randolph had successfully blockaded Round Island and a period of inactivity commenced. The men on Round Island faced an inadequate supply of food and a high level of emotional frustration. One man killed a fellow filibuster before the expedition surrendered to the United States Navy. Thus, Lopez's first attempt to liberate Cuba ended in a victory for the Taylor administration. Spain, likewise, applauded the administration's triumph.[9]

As Lopez attempted to launch his first expedition, a serious diplomatic crisis erupted between the United States and Spain. The Spanish consul kidnapped a former Havana jailer from New Orleans. Juan Francisco Garcia y Rey had aided three Cuban prisoners implicated in an annexation plot to escape to the United States. When Garcia arrived in New Orleans, the captain general of Cuba authorized the Spanish

consul to keep Garcia under surveillance, and on 5 July 1849 the consul placed Garcia on board a ship and returned him to Cuba.[10]

Once the press discovered the abduction of Garcia from American soil, especially the New Orleans papers, it severely attacked the Spanish officials involved and demanded the release of Garcia. The Taylor Administration negotiated for the release of Garcia, while trying to avoid a possible armed confrontation. The New Orleans press looked upon this episode as another example of Spanish despotism in Cuba. The anti-Spanish feelings which this episode produced became a factor in developing public support for Lopez.[11]

The newspapers in Texas received most of their information from the New Orleans newspapers. Thus, Texas papers often reflected a strong influence of the papers from which they acquired information. The opinions expressed by the Texas editors, however, were their own opinions, even if they quoted at length from the New Orleans papers.

New Orleans, as the largest metroplitan area in the South and the commercial center for the Mississippi Valley, had many newspapers established in the city. The Picayune, a Whig journal, favored the Cuban independence movement and supported the right of American assistance. A second Whig organ, the Crescent, favored annexation of Cuba but abhored

any military means of acquisition. Two Democratic papers, the Louisiana Courier and the Daily Delta, ardently supported the immediate annexation of Cuba. While both of the latter justified filibustering expeditions, the Daily Delta was the most radical in opinion. A fifth paper, the Bee, took a moderate stance with regard to Cuba and filibusterism.[12]

The expedition of Lopez and the abduction of Garcia sparked considerable attention in the New Orleans and the Texas press. The newly established newspaper at the state capital, the Austin Texas State Gazette, felt that the result of the abduction might "be the conquest of Cuba." By far this was the most radical stand taken by a Texas weekly. Most Texas papers assumed a conservative viewpoint in order to acquire all the information before passing judgment. All the papers, however, expressed outrage "over the action which the Spanish consul at New Orleans perpetrated upon an inhabitant of that city."[13]

The dominant issue in the abduction case was Spanish invasion of American territory. If a weekly felt that the Spanish consul forcibly returned Garcia to Cuba, Spain was guilty of invading United States territory. The press expected the government to respond in the proper manner so "that it may teach this consul that though kidnapping by Spanish emissaries is done with impunity on the coast of

Africa, it is a dangerous experiment in the territory of the United States." The Texas State Gazette, after evaluating the information and concluding its validity, reported that the abduction of Garcia and the refusal by the Cuban officials to allow the American consul in Havana to interview him created a situation which only war could ease. "It is not possible that our government can brook such insults and indignities to the national honor without demanding satisfaction." The Northern Standard in Clarksville denounced the forcible abduction of Garcia from New Orleans. It called for the federal government to seek reparations from Spain while warning foreign governments "that they cannot carry out upon our shores, the infernal schemes which have characterized the despotisms of the old world. . . ."[14]

Two Texas papers failed to become embroiled in the Garcia abduction controversy. The federal district attorney arrested the Spanish consul in New Orleans, Don Carlos De Espano, and held him for trial. The Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register felt the situation was "assuming a serious character" but failed to express an opinion on the matter. The paper deemed the settlement of the controversy in the courts sufficient. The Galveston Weekly News contended that Garcia returned to Cuba voluntarily to act as a government witness in a trial. The

Garcia abduction controversy, for the Galveston paper, was a situation kept alive by the "patriotism of the good citizens of New Orleans."[15]

The Garcia abduction case was an important element in arousing the ire of the press against Spain while contributing to the support Lopez received for his Round Island expedition. When President Taylor dispatched the naval squadron to Round Island, the Texas Republican of Marshall assumed the fleet was headed to Cuba to demand the release of Garcia not to interfere with Americans exercising their rights to aid a people in oppression. While attention focused on the Garcia controversy, elsewhere, the Texas press devoted more space to the expedition being organized against Cuba.[16]

When the press in Texas learned of Lopez's expedition, they expressed surprise at the air of secrecy surrounding the destination. The Galveston Weekly News reported that "the getting up of secret 'expeditions' is becoming fashionable. It adds wonderfully to their interest to keep their end and object in impenetrable darkness." The early reports of the Round Island expedition contained no criticism of the suspected purpose of the expedition. The Texas press appeared to see nothing criminal or morally wrong in the potential filibustering expedition.[17]

The presidential proclamation of 11 August 1849 warning citizens not to join the Round Island enterprise and the

ensuing naval blockade caused some consternation and condemnation in the columns of the Texas papers. The most vocal in their attack upon the federal government's actions were the editors of the Texas Republican, J. Patillo and R. W. Loughery. In an editorial entitled "The Administration Bewildered-Cuba-Round Island" the Texas Republican contended:

> An amazing fright seems to have seized the Administration, which has caused it to blunder into unconstitutional and unprecedented errors, as will appear by the following extracts, all growing out of the fact that a few of the citizens of the United States are preparing to go somewhere, either to Cuba, or to some of the Mexican states, or somewhere else; perhaps to California-nobody knows. Rumor, however, suspects some unlawful design, and the Administration, in its Rough and Ready manner, has determined to see that no mishap shall follow the movement.

The editors saw in these actions a despotic power obstructing the truth to maintain control of the government and, in the process trampling on the rights of the Americans involved.[18]

The Texas Republican believed that infringement upon the rights of individuals was the gravest error committed by the government. Indeed, crucial to the doctrine of filibustering was the right of an individual to leave the United States for the expressed purpose of aiding an oppressed people to freedom. The federal government, by blockading Round Island, had prohibited the men from exercising

this right. The Texas Republican considered the proceedings "a great outrage on the liberties of American citizens when they are not permitted to depart peaceably from their native country . . . ." If the government or its representative have denied an individual certain liberties, "it becomes proper for the people to know by what authority they act. If the error lies at the door of the President, he is subject to impeachment; if at the door of public officers, they should be removed, and otherwise dealt with, as required by law."[19]

In Houston, the Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register believed the president was premature and without justification in issuing the orders to prevent the expedition from sailing.

> We doubt whether they have yet placed themselves in such as to render themselves liable to the penalties prescribed by the acts of congress. It is said that they have not a single stand of arms, consequently they cannot be arrested as "an armed expedition" and it is also asserted that the men are not enlisted.

The naval blockade of the island was deemed illegal since "the president in his proclamation does not order the military or naval officers to cut off the supplies of the offenders nor to disperse them . . . ." The Houston weekly tended to downplay criticism while informing its readers of the progress and end of the expedition.[20]

The Texas State Gazette offered little criticism throughout the course of the affair, although it reported Taylor as being popular in Spain. The weekly acknowledged the large amount of press criticism of the presidential proclamation and naval blockade. The paper felt that Taylor had not acted on mere rumor but "was unquestionably in possession of certain information that such an expedition was being organized." The editors did report in a humorous light the panic which the expedition caused among leaders in the United States, Cuba, Mexico, and Central America.[21]

The papers avoided labeling the Round Island expedition as a filibustering attempt. Instead, if the object of the expedition were discussed at all, the men were said to be exercising their "rights" as Americans. The Texas Republican reported that if the thirteen colonies had "been thus treated by France, during the Revolution, it is doubtful whether our liberty had ever been achieved."[22]

The issue of Cuban annexation was a popular topic in Texas. The press was generally in favor of annexation. Although most professed altruistic motives for their sentiments, the underlying theme was security for the South within the United States from northern criticism. This theme reoccurred throughout the decade as the majority of the newspapers in Texas became more radical in their opinions. Nevertheless, the support for Cuban annexation was real.

The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register and the Texas Republican quoted at length an article from the New York Herald which stated that all the people of Cuba desired annexation. The Galveston Weekly News reported that residents of Cuba would welcome the "American liberators" in their struggle for freedom. The weekly also disavowed the knowledge of a southern "movement in organization or contemplation" to add Cuba to the Union. The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register felt the question of annexation would be raised in Congress in December because the issue could only "be delayed-it cannot be suppressed."[23]

The interim period between Lopez's first and second expeditions was filled with rumors of invasions and discussions about annexation. In February of 1850 the Texas Republican concluded that the United States was "large enough" since the government was having problems administering the territories it already possessed. The Texas State Gazette voiced an opposite opinion:

> At any cost Cuba must be ours; for it is the key which locks and unlocks the gulf of Mexico, and, in our possession, will secure unquestioned supremacy upon this continent. If, by any arrangement with Spain, its acquisition be possible, every consideration of national interest and security demands that it be made. The proverbial pride of Spain may, for a season, reject all terms, but in the end her weakness is bound to yield to the revolutionary tendencies of Cuba itself every day, ripening into a resolved purpose to enfranchise themselves from tyranny and oppression.

The Galveston Weekly News reported the Cubans were actively seeking freedom, while Spain sought British and French aid in maintaining possession of the isle. The Texas State Gazette addressed the Cuban annexation question in terms of the controversy facing the country:

> Yet nothing could be more timely, nothing more beneficial to the interests and durable peace of this confederacy, than the freedom of Cuba, if that freedom were to be promptly followed by annexation. We absolutely require some weight at the South to maintain the healthy balance of the Union, something to calm the distrust of the enfeebled South, and prevent the overstrong North from becoming dictatorial and aggressive. There must be equally to insure harmony and confidence . . . . The actual requirement of the crisis is to maintain the equipoise of the Union, by the addition of States like Cuba, which would be closely allied to the North by commercial interchange, and to the South by social sympathies.[24]

Lopez, following the collapse of the Round Island expedition, attempted to organize a second assault upon Cuba from Washington, the headquarters of his junta. While in Washington he discussed Cuban annexation with John C. Calhoun, who liked the idea but felt the time was not right for such a move. Lopez was only able to obtain marginal support for his expedition in the North, so he decided to move his operation to New Orleans where southern support was the strongest.[25]

During the trip from Washington to New Orleans, Lopez stopped in mid-March at the residence of John A. Quitman, governor of Mississippi. They discussed the forthcoming

enterprise, and Lopez offered the command of the expedition to Quitman. The governor was to be the general-in-chief of the Cuban Army, while Lopez was to retain control of the civil administration of the island. Quitman, however, refused the offer to lead the expedition. He stated that the duties of governor prohibited him from undertaking such an enterprise. Quitman, not wanting to close the door permanently, told Lopez that if the Cubans rebelled, his objections would be ended and he would accept command. A second reason for Quitman's refusal was that the Havana Club had approached him with a similar offer. Quitman was offered a large sum of money along with command of the liberating army. Quitman might have refused Lopez "so as not to foreclose more promising arrangements with the Havana Club." The governor, nevertheless, remained in contact with Lopez and advised him on military strategy.[26]

The citizens of New Orleans responded to Lopez's proposal for a second expedition with enthusiasm. He quickly organized and collected men and money. John Henderson, Quitman's contact with Lopez in New Orleans, contributed about $25,000 to the enterprise while Lawrence J. Sigur, owner of the Delta, used his newspaper to advertise for men and sell Cuban bonds. Men volunteered from Kentucky, Mississippi and Louisiana, giving the expedition a southern character. Lopez, in order to circumvent the neutrality

laws of the United States, organized the expedition to mislead both American and Spanish officials.[27]

Lopez divided his personnel into three battalions, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Kentucky. The Kentucky battalion would be the first to sail from New Orleans. Under the pretext of a ship filled with California emigrants, the battalion was supposed to stop at Mujeres, an island off the coast of Yucatan, to await the arrival of Lopez and the other two battalions. The Spanish, however, learned of Lopez's arrangements and complained to Secretary of State John M. Clayton. They informed the American government that if the Americans were captured, they would be treated as pirates and subject to internationally accepted modes of punishment. Clayton responded that the United States could not prohibit a group of men from leaving the country headed for California.[28]

On 25 April 1850 the Georgiana, with the Kentucky battalion aboard, left New Orleans for Mujeres. Instead of landing at the appointed destination, the Georgiana arrived on 7 May at Contoy, a deserted island near Mujeres. The Louisiana battalion, commanded by Roberdeau C. Wheat, left New Orleans on 2 May followed by Lopez and the Mississippi battalion five days later. After a rendezvous at sea, the two ships, the Susan Loud and the Creole, arrived at Contoy on 14 May. Immediately, the expedition began to lose men.

The Creole went to obtain water at Mujeres, where thirteen men deserted the expedition. Before Lopez left Contoy for the assault on Cuba, he permitted the members of the expedition who did not wish to proceed to Cuba to return to the United States on board the Georgiana. Lopez's force declined from 570 to 520 men.[29]

The secrecy with which Lopez had organized and executed his second expedition forced the press to rely on rumors for information. The Texas Republican in April reported that an American naval vessel had been sent to Cuba to intercept another invasion. The details presented of the Lopez expedition were essentially correct, but the weekly inaccurately reported the place of rendezvous to be Haiti, not Mujeres. The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register reported that an expedition had been launched but did not know the details: "One thing is certain, that a formiddable expedition has been organized, and that it either has landed or will soon land on the shores of Cuba." The Clarksville Northern Standard on 1 June reported that an expedition had left New Orleans "to revolutionize the Government, or rather to assist the inhabitants in doing so." The Texas State Gazette published an article from the New Orleans Picayune in which the reported size of Lopez's army was 10,000 men.[30]

The weeklies showed no sign of condemnation for this second filibustering expedition of Lopez. A few papers were

confident of a victory for the American force. The Northern Standard believed that following the landing on Cuba "there is little doubt of their success afterwards." The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register refused to make a prediction, saying "time only can determine" the outcome. Texas newspapers exhibited no qualms or reservations in accepting and approving of this type of expedition. No paper condemned the launching of the expedition as a violation of American laws, and the term "filibuster" was not used.[31]

The assault, which began on the night of 18 May, proved a failure for the filibuster leader. Lopez chose to make a night landing to avoid detection by the Spanish garrison stationed at Cardenas. He successfully navigated the tricky harbor, and placed men and supplies on shore during the pre-dawn hours. Lopez's plan called for the capture of the towns of Cardenas and nearby Matanzas. Lopez hoped to organize native resistance in the surrounding mountains before the final assault against Havana.[32]

The battle of Cardenas began when the Spanish detected the filibuster force. The noise caused by the landing of supplies had alerted the garrison. The governor of Cardenas sent an urgent dispatch to Matanzas asking for help. The filibusters launched an immediate attack upon the city. The Spanish resistance proved inadequate, and by dawn on 19 May,

the three hours of combat had resulted in an American victory. The filibusters had burned down the governor's palace in a successful attempt to dislodge the Spanish troops. The invaders took the governor and lieutenant governor prisoner. The reported American casualties were seven dead and fifteen wounded. During the evening a force of 120 Spanish lancers attacked the filibusters. Fifty of the lancers charged the American position, resulting in the death of all but one lancer.[33]

Lopez's force was too small for a successful assault against the Spanish soldiers stationed on Cuba. The filibusters hoped to offset this disadvantage by rallying the Cuban people to their standard. Lopez, not wanting to anger the inhabitants of Cardenas, posted guards at local stores to prohibit looting by his men. The citizens treated the filibusters cordially but did not trust their seemingly altruistic motive. Some fled to ships in the harbor or to the hills to avoid the "pirates" who had invaded their town. Lopez was disappointed that no one responded to his call for revolt, although thirty men stationed at the garrison returned with the filibusters to the United States.[34]

Lopez gave the order for withdrawal with a heavy heart. He realized that without local support his men could not withstand the Spanish force descending upon Cardenas. Lopez ordered the previously unloaded supplies placed on board the

Creole. While sailing out of the harbor, the Creole became lodged upon a sandbar. Lopez ordered all arms and supplies to be thrown overboard which allowed the Creole to float free. Lopez, however, regained some of his lost enthusiasm and wanted to try a second landing. At a council of war, the question was put to a vote of the men. The fervor for Cuban independence had died down, and a large majority voted for a return to the United States.[35]

While the Creole headed out of Cuban waters, the Spanish naval vessel Pizzaro discovered the fleeing filibusters. A fierce race commenced between the two vessels. The Creole dropped anchor under the guns of a United States naval vessel docked in the harbor at Key West. The Spanish captain, refusing to create an international incident, withdrew from Key West.[36]

The Texas press waited in anxious anticipation for news arriving from Cuba. All the weeklies spoke optimistically of the anticipated results. The Marshall Texas Republican, reacting to the rumors, printed an exuberant headline:

> Invasion of Cuba:
>
> Landing of Gen. Lopez-Fall of Cardenas-Marching of Troops to that City-Great excitement throughout the island-unprotected situation of Havana-Plans of Gen. Lopez, etc., etc.

It went on to report that "the first blow has been struck, and there is every reason to believe that, ere this, this

beautiful island, that has so long labored under the despotism of Spain is--Free."[37]

The Clarksville Northern Standard optimistically reported that its readers:

> expect to hear of a successful landing of these auxilaries, a hearty welcome by that portion of the Creole inhabitants, who have the spirit to act bravely the island sentiment in favor of American nationality, the flying to the breeze, in this richest and most beautiful of the Antilles, of the flag of republican freedom, and the commencement of an eventful conflict between the adverse system of self government and despotism which may be short and decisive
> . . . .

The paper defended the expedition against reported northern ridicule by saying that all Americans should support such a "noble" objective. "It is a free will to tender of arms and counsels, to answer the appeals of a people anxious to throw off a galling yoke, and to assimilate [sic] themselves in principle, in feelings and in institutions with their defenders and allies."[38]

The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register expressed concern over President Taylor's actions. The president had ordered the home squadron to intercept the expedition before it landed in Cuba. The weekly feared that if only part of the expedition was allowed to land, the Spanish would institute a massacre "like that of the Alamo or Goliad." The paper warned President Taylor that

> If by the unnecessary [sic] interference of President Taylor, the van guard of the revolutionary army should be captured and massacred to appease Spanish vengeance, he will acquire a notoriety and unlike that which attaches to the Autocrat of Russia or the butcher Hanao.

The Texas State Gazette failed to editorialize on the impending outcome of the expedition and, instead, reserved judgment while printing the news of Lopez's filibustering expedition.[39]

When the sudden and unexpected news of the failure of the expedition arrived, Texas papers expressed bewilderment. The Texas Republican and the Northern Standard acquired the news from the New Orleans Picayune. The Northern Standard, paraphrasing the New Orleans paper, reported that Lopez had failed to attract the people to his standard during his brief period on Cuban soil. It felt Lopez was disorganized and his "abandonment of the enterprise . . . will defeat the expedition, and exercise a very unfavorable influence over any future attempts at revolution." The Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register felt the expedition was "ill-fated and most ill-conducted."[40]

The reaction to the failure of the expedition was brief and directed towards Lopez. The Marshall Texas Republican and the Clarksville Northern Standard viewed the leader to be unduly cautious. They cited the failure to remain on the island as a sign of Lopez's inability to lead such an expedition. On the other hand, the Austin Texas State Gazette

retorted to the denunciations of Lopez by printing a brief biographical sketch of the general. The paper spoke of Lopez's military exploits and his compassion for the Cuban people as admirable qualities. The Austin weekly stated that "Gen. Lopez is in the prime of life and may yet behold his 'ever faithful' Cuba a brilliant star in the American constallation."[41]

The collapse of the Cuban expedition did not dampen the Texas newspapers' spirit for Cuban annexation to the United States. The Texas State Gazette on 29 June published an article describing the tax burden of the Cuban people. The weekly concluded that "they are the most taxed people on the face of the earth. To an American it is wonderful how they have so long endured it in silence." The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register through the months of July and August attempted to vindicate the motive behind the filibustering expedition. Publishing a statement made by the Kentucky regiment, the weekly stated the belief that revolution was imminent when the expedition left, and no information present could contradict the sincerity of Lopez on this matter. The weekly printed the denials that the expedition was "a mercenary invasion of Cuba" but

> . . . being animated by that noble ambition which warms in the heart of the truly brave and generous, they were willing to offer themselves on the altar of freedom and were anxious that their friends might have an opportunity to wreath their brows with victorious laurels in so noble a cause.

The Houston paper went on to say that the expedition was encouraged by "many distinguished men in our country." The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register refuted a statement by the National Intelligencer that the men were actually California emigrants who were forced to go to Cuba. The weekly, relying on the statements of R. B. Wheat, commander of the Louisiana battalion, pointed to the absurdity of the allegations and commended Wheat for "the purity of his motives in embarking in it."[42]

The men who assaulted Cardenas and returned to the United States fared better than a group who were arrested by the Spanish upon the high seas. These men, known as the Contoy prisoners, had refused to sail with Lopez and elected to remain on Contoy Island. The men were returning to the United States abord the Susan Loud and Georgiana when the Spanish stopped and arrested them. The Spanish imprisoned thirty-nine men and fifteen crew members on the charges of piracy.[43]

The United States government objected to the arrests for several reasons. First, although the men were guilty of violating Americans laws, no Spanish law had been broken. Secondly, the charge of piracy did not apply since no crime at sea had been committed. The Spanish replied that these men were part of an expedition whose expressed purpose was to invade Cuba. As members of such an expedition, they had

surrendered their rights to protection by any nation and were subject to punishment. While the two countries argued the legal technicalities of the issue, a maritime court in Cuba tried the men. The court found all but three not guilty and released them. The Spanish court sentenced the master of the Georgiana and the mates of both vessels to an African penal colony, but the Spanish government granted the men a pardon on 16 November 1850.[44]

The response of the Texas press to the Spanish arrests varied. The two papers which reacted most angrily to the seizure were the Texas State Gazette and the Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register. The Austin weekly saw this as a deliberate Spanish attempt to discredit the government of the United States, not only in the eyes of the world but also in the eyes of the American people. The Texas State Gazette boldly remarked,

> No other government of Christendom with the remotest pretensions to a fourth rate standing, would have submitted as patiently as ours to the insulting conduct of the representative of Spain in the island of Cuba.

The Northern Standard in its only remark upon the subject quoted this article from the Texas State Gazette at length.[45]

The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register pictured the Spanish as cruel and inhuman in their treatment of the Contoy prisoners. The Houston weekly first reported that the Americans had been captured and that the Spanish intended to execute them. In response, it felt that

> the fate of Cuba is sealed, for such a spirit of vengeance would be aroused throughout the Union, that thousands of volunteers would abandon their native land to crush forever the tyrant power of Spain in this most lovely and fertile of the Western Isles.

The Houston paper also reported that the Spanish were hopeful that the yellow fever outbreak on the island would kill most of the prisoners and thus avoid a rupture with the United States. The paper applauded the reported measures taken by President Taylor to force the release of the prisoners. The Democratic Telegraph stated that if the Contoy prisoners were not released, they would be rescued by American forces. The Texas papers, however, reported the release of the Contoy prisoners without much fanfare.[46]

The final chapter to the second Lopez filibustering expedition centered in the city of New Orleans. Secretary of State Clayton had ordered all United States district attorneys in the South to arrest Lopez for violation of the neutrality laws. In Savannah, Georgia, federal officials arrested but released him for lack of evidence. On 7 June 1850 Lopez arrived in New Orleans to begin a third expedition. A grand jury had been convened at New Orleans, and despite reluctant witnesses, the jury issued a true bill against Lopez and fifteen other man, including Governor Quitman. The trials were to begin that winter.[47]

The only person to be actually tried was John Henderson, one of Lopez's financial backers. The government brought

Henderson to trial three times, each time the jury could not decide on his guilt or innocence. After the third unsuccessful attempt, the District Attorney, Logan Hunton, in March of 1851 entered a nolle prosequi against Henderson and the remaining defendants. The major controversy of the trial was the indictment of John A. Quitman. Quitman, at first, believed that as governor he was immune from arrest by federal officials. By February, Quitman had changed his mind and resigned from the governorship of Missippi on 3 February 1851. He arrived in New Orleans in time for the third trial of Henderson and the subsequent dismissal of all charges.[48]

The Texas press reacted negatively towards the federal government for instituting the trials. The Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register felt that it would be "very difficult to empannel an American jury that has not already been implicated in similar crimes." The case of John A. Quitman sparked strong feelings towards the government. The Texas Republican felt this was an attack against the South and a violation of states rights:

> If, therefore the Government desires to raise an issue with Gov. Quitman and Judge Smith, under the act of 1818, we trust that the state of Mississippi will see that the violations of its sovereignty perpetrated last September in the blockade of a portion of the state, and in the interruption of the rights of persons under the protection of her laws, will be inquired into, and the parties aiding and directing such unlawful proceedings, be held to a strict accountability.

The Galveston Weekly News felt that Quitman's resignation would be supported by "every friend of State Rights." Both the Texas State Gazette and Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register felt that the trials were an embarrassment to the federal government. The Austin paper called the trials "disgraceful and malicious" while the Houston weekly regarded them as "the most ridiculous [sic] efforts to display the power of the Federal government that has been attempted since the days of the gag laws."[49]

While the trials were being held in New Orleans, Lopez began to prepare for his third and final expedition to Cuba. The federal government frustrated the initial preparations when port authorities in New York City seized the Cleopatra. On 27 April 1851 President Millard Fillmore issued a proclamation warning Americans not to enlist in the expedition. Federal officers arrested the organizers in New York. The government, however, did not involve Lopez in the legal proceedings. Instead, he tried unsuccessfully to raise the needed capital to free the Cleopatra. The timing of the governmental seizure forestalled Lopez from launching his project when news arrived of the Cuban uprising of 4 July 1851.[50]

The Cuban uprising was an ill-fated attempt at independence. On 2 July, 1851, Cuban civil authorities learned of a plot against the government, and the captain general of

Cuba, Jose de la Concha, sent troops to stop the rebellion at Puerto Principe. Joaquin de Aquero, leader of the revolt, despite knowledge that Lopez's transportation had been seized, issued his declaration of independence on 4 July. The Spanish army pursued and killed in battle the few men who responded to the call. The Spanish soldiers prevented the revolt from spreading to the towns. Aquero, along with other revolutionists, met his death on 12 August. The news of the revolt spread quickly throughout the United States. The press in the South knew of the failure of the revolt but discarded the information as a Spanish attempt to prevent Americans from aiding the revolutionists.[51]

When the unexpected news of the revolt began to arrive in New Orleans, Lopez did not have the means to launch an expedition. Lawrence J. Sigur had purchased the Pampero, a coastal packet, with the money from the sale of his interest in the New Orleans Delta. Unfortunately, the Pampero was on a voyage and would not arrive in New Orleans until the first of August. Lopez used the time to recruit men for the expedition. When the Pampero arrived in New Orleans, approximately 500 men desired to embark for Cuba. Lopez, to avoid a reported governmental seizure of the packet, ordered the expedition to sail on Sunday, 3 August 1851.[52]

The Pampero sailed from Lafayette Street among cheers of well-wishers on a Sunday morning. Reaching the mouth of the Mississippi River, the filibusters loaded arms and ammunition on board. The Pampero, a small steamer, was overcrowded, so Lopez reduced the size of the force by about 100 men. These men were to be among the anticipated second wave to be launched from New Orleans. On 5 August, the Pampero steamed for the Saint Johns River in Florida to obtain more arms which had been stockpiled nearby.[53]

The Lopez expedition arrived in Key West on the tenth fearing that they would be seized by United States naval vessels. Instead, a cheering crowd greeted the filibusters. Lopez, realizing time was precious, altered his plan by sailing directly for Cuba that evening without picking up the needed arms, which he arranged to have sent later. The next day, the Americans discovered the Pampero to be sailing directly for Havana and was "within view of sentinals at Morro Castle." Lopez ordered the ship to head west where on the afternoon of 11 August the expedition arrived in the Bay of Cabenas. Two Spanish sailing vessels, anchoring in the bay, forced the Americans to flee once again. That evening the Pampero sailed into Bahia Hondo, where the filibusters unloaded their supplies throughout the night. On the morning of 12 August 1851, the American filibusters began their fatal assault against the Spanish.[54]

Lopez's first objective was the village of Las Pozas about ten miles away. Lopez ordered an artillery battalion consisting of 120 men under the command of William L. Crittenden, nephew of the United States attorney general, to remain and guard the supplies until adequate transportation could be found. News of Lopez's approach had alarmed the residents, so that when the filibusters arrived in Las Pozas later in the day, the village was deserted. Two ox carts were commandeered and sent back to Crittenden, whose men began the slow, tedious process of moving the supplies.[56]

Lopez remained at Las Pozas that night anticipating Crittenden's arrival. While the men ate breakfast on the morning of 13 August, a Spanish force numbering between 400 and 800 men surprised them. The Americans, after a two hour battle, managed to repel the Spanish troops. The filibusters' losses were twenty-five killed and twenty-five wounded. While Lopez was engaged at Las Pozas, Crittenden was repulsing a Spanish attack on the supply train. After several volleys, the Spanish troops fled, Crittenden, with about eighty men, pursued the fleeing force while leaving forty men behind to guard the supplies. The small company decided that guarding the provisions was impossible and joined Lopez that evening at Las Pozas.[56]

The Americans, fearing a second attack, left Las Pozas on the morning of the fourteenth. The wounded were left behind in the hope they would be cared for by the Spanish.

When the Spanish entered the town, they killed all the wounded men in compliance with the directive issued by General Concha. The captain general had promised that all filibusters would be immediately executed upon their capture. The Americans had hoped native resistance would develop. When they left Las Pozas, the filibusters discovered "that Lopez had no supporters and no plans except hastily improvised ones based on vague rumors . . . ."[57]

During the next ten days, the Americans traveled in a circle in an attempt to find food and support. The only food available was what could be pilfered from the Cubans. On 21 August Lopez sacrificed his horse so that his men might have a decent meal. The weather was a constant problem for the filibusters. A hurricane developed which caused the Americans to endure four days of rain. The high level of enthusiasm of the men soon deteriorated. Many abandoned their weapons in disgust and blamed Lopez for their troubles. On the twenty-second of August the men protested to Lopez and demanded that they return to the coast in an effort to escape to the United States.[58]

On 23 August, near San Cristobal, the Spanish attacked the ragged band of filibusters for the last time. Since the vast majority were unarmed, they fled into the woods. The Spanish captured and executed several filibusters. On 26 August orders arrived from Concha saying that those men

who surrendered would not be executed and this resulted in the surrender of most of the filibusters. The Spanish finally captured General Lopez on the twenty-ninth of August and executed him four days later.[59]

The plight of Colonel Crittenden and his men was to be a catalyst in the condemnation of the Spanish and later Lopez himself. Crittenden, after departing from the supply train on 13 August, tried to reach Lopez by an alternate route. The Spanish, however, blocked all routes to Lopez, so the small band, after a brief engagement, decided to make their way to the coast. They sailed in four small vessels in the hope of reaching Key West. On the second day of their attempt, a Spanish naval vessel captured the small group and brought them to Havana.[60]

Concha ordered that the fifty Americans, their numbers having been reduced since the thirteenth, be executed on the morning of 16 August. In order to ward off any international repercussions and to eliminate a pretext for the United States to declare war, Concha allowed two lawyers to record the confessions of the prisoners. The American filibusters wrote letters to their families and friends which many American newspapers published. These letters helped to fuel the flame of indignation against Spain. At eleven o'clock on the sixteenth, the members of Crittenden's company were executed. The Spanish sentenced the remaining

men of the Lopez expedition to prison terms but pardoned them before most began serving their terms.[61]

The press in Texas had been aware that another filibustering expedition was being organized, but they did not have any details. The Galveston Weekly News in December of 1850 reported that "the original elements still furnish food to keep alive the spirit of revolution among the oppressed and discontented peoples of Cuba." The press anticipated receiving the news that a revolution had broken out on the island. The Texas State Gazette, quoting the Savannah News, reported that rumors were circulating that a revolt had begun on the island. If the rumors proved unfounded, it would be just a matter of time before an actual revolt began on the island.[62]

During the month of May the papers reported the news of another filibustering expedition. The Telegraph and Texas Register on 2 May reported that men were traveling through the southern states in search of a point of rendezvous which had not been disclosed by the expedition leaders. The paper discredited rumors that a large body of men had assembled in Texas. The Houston weekly two weeks later reported that this expedition proved to be only a rumor. The men who were assembling at various points never sailed. The Telegraph and Texas Register did report the gathering of men

in Georgia in anticipation of a revolt occurring in Cuba. These men were part of the Cleopatra expedition.[63]

The presidential proclamation concerning the Cleopatra confirmed in the minds of the editors the existence of an actual expedition. The Texas Republican published the proclamation while the Texas State Gazette editorialized that "some very satisfactory evidence of the existence of such a design has been communicated to the President, inasmuch as he had deemed it of sufficient importance to make it the subject of a proclamation." The Galveston Weekly News reported the actual details of the seizure. The Texas State Gazette relied on the Savannah News for information which proved to be a sketchy description of the men who were to join the expedition. The papers did not offer an opinion on this attempt but only reported the news of the events.[64]

The Texas press continually kept the issue of Cuba before its readers during the early summer months. The Telegraph and Texas Register reported that the Cleopatra was "old and rotten" and unseaworthy. "It is this rotten old hulk, that has been sold by northern speculators to aid in the glorious cause of freedom, and the Americans who have participated in this base fraud are more deserving of ignominy." The Galveston Weekly News published a letter to the editor from a person in New Orleans. The letter described the high level of emotion in the Crescent City in

favor of a filibustering expedition. The Texas Republican quoted an article from the Savannah News which contended that an expedition would be launched before the end of the summer. The Texas State Gazette reported that an expedition against Cuba was still being formulated. The Austin weekly declared that a "great number of young men have pledged themselves to the enterprise, and are prepared to embark at the first favorable moment . . . ."[65]

The papers also keptthe readers informed of events occurring on the island. The Northern Standard reported that a Spanish subject who allegedly served as a pilot for the Cardenas expedition had been executed. The Texas State Gazette and the Telegraph and Texas Register reported that Cuban officials were in a constant state of alarm due to fear of an invasion. The people of Havana were "frequently thrown into a panic by the firing of salutes by vessels on the coast." The papers reported the arrests of suspected revolutionists by the captain general. The Telegraph and Texas Register reported those arrested to be the wealthy and respected members of the planter class. The Texas State Gazette, quoting a letter from a resident of Cuba published in the New York Sun, stated that these arrests were a signal for revolt. The Northern Standard and the Texas State Gazette reported the dismal failure of an alleged Cuban conspiracy in May.[66]

The Texas press received the news of the Cuban revolt of 4 July 1851 with enthusiasm. The Marshall Texas Republican spoke of the revolt in fiery terms:

> The war for liberty has been commenced, and is likely to result in the overthrow of tyranny on the island. The pulsation of many hearts will quicken at this intelligence. Cuba is destined to be free.

The Northern Standard expressed similar sentiments of success. The weekly also spoke of the future of the island in terms of southern aspirations:

> Their efforts will doubtless meet a warm response in every American heart, particularly in the South, whose lands may, at sometime not distant, be greatly strengthened by the acquisition of that fair island to our union of States.

The Houston Telegraph and Texas Register printed the Cuban Declaration of Independence in its entirety without comment.[67]

The Austin Texas State Gazette cautiously responded to the news of the Cuban revolt. The weekly qualified its statements by saying that information was sparse in regards to the actual events but felt the revolt was "sufficient to furnish the world an evidence of their desire to be free . . . ." The paper felt that "if we have not been misled . . ., we regard the overthrow of the power of Spain a result as certain as anything which rests in speculation." The Austin weekly warned the United States government not to interfere with any attempts to aid the Cuban revolutionists.

As for the future of Cuba, the weekly advocated "immediate annexation." The Texas State Gazette felt it was Cuba's destiny to be a part of the United States.[68]

The Galveston Weekly News pictured the revolt in such a manner as to create an illusion of greatness in the minds of the readers. This inaccurate reporting might have been the result of either an intense desire for Cuban independence or a lack of information. The weekly reported the Cuban patriot force to number over 5,000 men and the Spanish garrison in Havana to be on the verge of joining the patriots. The Spanish soldiers were only awaiting Lopez's arrival in Cuba. The revolt, the Galveston paper stated, had the support of most Cubans, including the free Negroes and mulattoes. The Galveston Weekly News even printed an address where people could send money to aid the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom.[69]

The Texas press acknowledged the arrival of the filibusters on the island of Cuba but with little fanfare. The Telegraph and Texas Register was more concerned over the lack of information eminating from the patriots.

> If they have actually organized a revolutionary government, it seems very strange that no communications have been received at New Orleans which furnish satisfactory evidence that a single town or a city is in the hands of the insurgents.

The Texas State Gazette reported that Lopez's expedition had landed safely and successfully engaged the Spanish twice,

resulting in the death of 438 Spanish troops. The Galveston Weekly News was the only paper to note Lopez's arrival with zeal:

> General Lopez has safely arrived on the Island with the gallant band of chivalrous spirits who sailed with him from New Orleans; and Victory, Triumphant, Complete Victory, will, no doubt, hence forth hover over his course and perch upon his standard![70]

The press had to rely on information obtained from people who had just returned from Cuba. This information, at times, proved overly optimistic in its appraisal of the war effort. The first substantial news from Cuba, however, was the capture and execution of Crittenden's men. Three Texas newspapers carried the same headline:

> Fifty-one Americans Captured and Butchered in Cold Blood!

The Galveston Weekly News, the Telegraph and Texas Register, and the Northern Standard relied on the New Orleans Picayune for their information. The Spanish were depicted as blood-thirsty murderers who "brutally murdered" the American prisoners. The papers pictured a gruesome scene:

> After the first discharge of the infantry, those who were not instantly killed were beat upon the head until life was extinct. The corpses were then horribly mutilated by a blood-thirsty mob.

The Texas State Gazette reported that "the mangled corpses were interred amid the shouts and curses of a blood-thirsty

rabble." All the papers agreed that it was a "painful" duty to report such shocking news.[71]

The response to the deaths of the Americans was varied. The Northern Standard responded hostilely towards the Spanish government.

> The despotism of the Spanish monarchy, has been so long maintained by cruelty and terror that the officials of that power look upon inhuman butcheries which they perpetrate with delight, . . .

The weekly went on to say that this massacre would act as a catalyst for Cuban liberty. "The bloody execution at Havana will do more towards Cuban independence than all other causes contained." The Galveston, Austin, and Marshall newspapers printed some of the letters from those who had been executed. The Galveston Weekly News prefaced the letters by saying that "they will no doubt, be perused with deep, but melancholy interest, by all who have eyes to read, minds to understand, and hearts to feel."[72]

During the few weeks that remained before news of Lopez's capture and death arrived, the press speculated on what was actually happening on the island. The fate of the small band was continually on their minds. The Telegraph and Texas Register believed the patriots were still in command of the situation since the Cuban journals had failed to announce "the defeat of the 'filibusters' with the most glowing accounts of Spanish valor." The Houston weekly,

however, felt that if Lopez did not receive reinforcements soon, he and his men would share Crittenden's fate. The Galveston Weekly News and the Telegraph and Texas Register reported that they expected a second expedition to land on the eastern portion of the island. Both papers felt, however, that it was up to the Creole population to be the decisive force in the revolt. The Northern Standard reported Creole support by saying "that the country people carry their blood hounds with them and insist upon using them against the troops." The paper also noted that over 4,000 Spanish troops had gone over to Lopez's side. The Galveston Weekly News acknowledged that conflicting reports were coming from Cuba but stated that Lopez with additional aid would be able "to complete the overthrow of the Spanish authorities."[73]

The news of Lopez's defeat and capture was not totally unexpected. The Telegraph and Texas Register accepted the news without question while reporting that the filibusters "have been sacrificed to appease Spanish vengeance." The Texas Republican, due to a lack of recent newspapers, reported that "a rumor is circulating that Gen. Lopez has been captured . . . ." The paper did concede that the reports were probably correct and that Lopez had been executed. The Galveston Weekly News reported that as anticipated the Cuban expedition had come to a "gloomy" end.[74]

The Texas State Gazette, quoting the Delta, wrote the most eloquent ending to the Cuban expedition:

> Thus has terminated a gallant effort to achieve independence for the people of a neighboring island. It originated in pure and patriotic motives, and contemplated a noble design. Those who embarked on it, hazarded everything. Their efforts, and their motives, deserve the respect of all good men.

The Austin weekly responded to an editorial by the National Intelligencer, which called the expedition "the vilest attempts at robbery . . . ." The paper defended the motives and the men of the expedition. The Texas State Gazette felt that anyone who could write such sentiments was a pawn to be used by the despotic Spanish monarch.[75]

The Texas press did not condemn Lopez and his men for their attempt to liberate Cuba. A question, however, emerged as to who was responsible for the defeat. The letters from Crittenden's men placed the blame on Lopez. According to these letters, Lopez had deceived them by promising a large Creole force which never materialized. The Texas State Gazette reported that this was the opinion of government officials in Washington.[76]

The Texas press, for the most part, placed the blame on the native population of Cuba. The Northern Standard and the Texas Republican believed that the Creole population had missed a golden opportunity and were angry at their own timidity. The Galveston Weekly News spoke harshly:

> One thing appears to be now well ascertained, and that is that the population of Cuba richly deserves the chains they wear. They would neither furnish reinforcements nor supplies to those who risked everything to give them liberty.

The Telegraph and Texas Register printed some "interesting particulars" from a speech pertaining to the expedition. Lopez was said to have neither "deceived, or in any way acted dishonorably towards the men . . . ."[77]

The issue of Cuba quickly dissipated in the Texas press. The papers kept the readers informed on the conditions of the prisoners, but little was said as to what the next step should be. The Northern Standard reported "that the struggle in Cuba is over for the present. But the sword is only whetted for future conflict." The Texas Republican quoted a lengthy article from the Daily Picayune, describing Cuba's destiny as entwined with the growth of the United States.[78]

The press in Texas never condemned the stated purpose of the Lopez expedition: to free the oppressed in Cuba. Instead, they wrote of the duty of Americans to aid in this liberation. The Texas State Gazette, moderate in terms of filibusterism, never failed to defend that stated purpose. While the issue of the South and Cuba was discussed, most Texas newspapers, however, avoided the controversial topic. If Cuban annexation had been possible, the press in Texas would have been entirely supportive, especially since the

acquisition would have helped the South in the Union. The Galveston Weekly News became, by the third expedition, the strongest advocate of the filibustering expeditions, a trait which would continue throughout the decade. The most moderate paper was the Texas State Gazette. The early warlike stand expressed by the latter paper was an emotional outburst triggered by the Garcia Affair.

The press in Texas supported the idea of a filibustering expedition to Cuba. The men involved were expressing their rights as Americans to aid an oppressed people to freedom. The Texas press never faltered in its belief that the actions of the filibusters were right and in accordance with the principles of the United States. They admired and respected Lopez for his courage to attempt to fulfill his dream of liberation. The Texas press was a firm believer that the filibuster leader was a caring and sensitive man, responding only to the cries of an oppressed people.

The Texas press, however, was not tolerant of the people who failed to remove their own shackles. The newspapers quickly placed the blame on the Cuban people for the failure of Lopez. They could not accept the idea that Americans were responsible for the collapse. This theme of American superiority and invincibility would persist throughout the decade.

In Mexico, the Texas press discovered a new oppressed populace and a new dashing leader. The press would use the same altruistic arguments to arouse support for the revolt. The same pattern of support and disillusionment developed in the Mexican enterprise. The Texas press continued to support filibustering.

CHAPTER III ENDNOTES

[1]Lester D. Langley, The Cuban Policy of the United States: A Brief History (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), pp. 18, 50; John A. Logan, Jr., No Transfer: An American Security Principle (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 1, 157-58.

[2]Austin Texas State Gazette, 6 October 1849; Basil Rauch, American Interest in Cuba: 1848-1855 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 34; Harry C. Allen, Great Britain and the United States: A History of Anglo-American Relations, 1783-1952 (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1955), p. 432; Langley, The Cuban Policy of the United States, pp. 28, 51.

[3]Charles H. Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), p. 47.

[4]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 79; James Jeffrey Roche, The Story of the Filibusters (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891), p. 22; Langley, The Cuban Policy of the United States, p. 27.

[5]Rauch, American Interest In Cuba, p. 108; Langley, The Cuban Policy of the United States, p. 27.

[6]Austin Texas State Gazette, 6 October 1849.

[7]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 47-48.

[8]Ibid., pp. 47, 50.

[9]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 50; Robert Granville Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba: 1848-1851 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915), pp. 54-55; Rauch, American Interest In Cuba, p. 120; Austin Texas State Gazette, 22 September 1849.

[10]Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions, p. 51.

[11]Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions, pp. 51, 53; Rauch, American Interest In Cuba, p. 115; Chester Stanley Urban, "New Orleans and the Cuban Question During the Lopez Expeditions of 1849-1851: A Local Study of 'Manifest Destiny,'" Louisiana Historical Quarterly 22 (1938): 1110-12.

[12]Urban, "New Orleans and the Cuban Question," pp. 1097-99.

[13]Austin Texas State Gazette, 1 September 1849; Marshall Texas Republican, 16 August 1849.

[14]Marshall Texas Republican, 16 August 1849; Austin Texas State Gazette, 8 September 1849; Clarksville Northern Standard, 29 September 1849.

[15]Austin Texas State Gazette, 1 September 1849; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 6 September 1849; Galveston Weekly News, 15 August 1849.

[16]Marshall Texas Republican, 23 August 1849.

[17]Galveston Weekly News, 15 August 1849.

[18]Marshall Texas Republican, 11 October 1849.

[19]Marshall Texas Republican, 11 October 1849 and 18 October 1849.

[20]Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 13 September 1849.

[21]Austin Texas State Gazette, 27 October 1849, 8 September 1849 and 22 September 1849; Clarksville Northern Standard, 29 September 1849.

[22]Marshall Texas Republican, 24 January 1850.

[23]Marshall Texas Republican, 8 November 1849; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 27 September 1849 and 8 November 1849; Galveston Weekly News, 17 September 1849 and 24 September 1849.

[24]Clarksville Northern Standard, 2 March 1850; Marshall Texas Republican, 21 February 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 2 March 1850 and 9 March 1850; Galveston Weekly News, 18 February 1850.

[25]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 51-52; John Hope Franklin, The Militant South, 1800-1861 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1956), p. 280, footnote 29.

[26]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 53-54; Ray Broussard, "Governor John A. Quitman and the Lopez Expeditions of 1851-1852," Journal of Mississippi History 28 (1966): 109.

[27]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 56.

[28]Ibid., pp. 57-59.

[29]Ibid., pp. 57-62.

[30]Marshall Texas Republican, 18 April 1850; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 30 May 1850; Clarksville Northern Standard, 1 June 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 1 June 1850.

[31]Clarksville Northern Standard, 1 June 1850; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 30 May 1850.

[32]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 62; Austin Texas State Gazette, 15 June 1850.

[33]Austin Texas State Gazette, 15 June 1850.

[34]Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, pp. 69-70.

[35]Broussard, "Governor John A. Quitman and the Lopez Expeditions," p. 113; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 65-66; Roche, The Story of Filibusters, pp. 25-26.

[36]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 66-67; Broussard, "Governor John A. Quitman and the Lopez Expeditions," p. 113.

[37]Marshall Texas Republican, 6 June 1850.

[38]Clarksville Northern Standard, 8 June 1850.

[39]Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 8 June 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 8 June 1850.

[40]Marshall Texas Republican, 6 June 1850; Clarksville Northern Standard, 8 June 1850; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 6 June 1850.

[41]Clarksville Northern Standard, 6 June 1850; Marshall Texas Republican, 8 June 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 29 June 1850.

[42]Austin Texas State Gazette, 29 June 1850; Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 18 July 1850 and 7 August 1850.

[43]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 67.

[44]Ibid., p. 69; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 81.

[45]Austin Texas State Gazette, 22 July 1850; Clarksville Northern Standard, 17 August 1850.

[46]Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 13 June 1850, 4 July 1850, 18 July 1850 and 7 August 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 10 August 1850.

[47]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 68; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 78.

[48]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 70; Broussard, "Governor John A. Quitman and the Lopez Expeditions," p. 115.

[49]Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 4 July 1850 and 14 March 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 22 March 1851 and 13 July 1850; Galveston Weekly News, 18 February 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 22 March 1851.

[50]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 71-74; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 83.

[51]Rauch, American Interest in Cuba, p. 156; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 77-78; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 89.

[52]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 75-76.

[53]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 76; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 91.

[54]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 77-79; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 94.

[55]Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 96; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 80.

[56]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 81-82; Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, pp. 99-100.

[57]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 82-83.

[58]Ibid., pp. 83-85.

[59]Ibid., pp. 86-88.

[60]Caldwell, The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba, p. 101.

[61]Ibid., pp. 102, 112.

[62]Galveston Weekly News, 3 December 1850; Austin Texas State Gazette, 3 May 1851.

[63]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 2 May 1851 and 16 May 1851.

[64]Marshall Texas Republican, 17 May 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 17 May 1851 and 31 May 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 20 May 1851.

[65]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 13 June 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 3 June 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 28 June 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 26 July 1851.

[66]Clarksville Northern Standard, 7 June 1851 and 16 August 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 6 June 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 14 June 1851, 21 June 1851 and 19 July 1851.

[67]Marshall Texas Republican, 10 August 1851; Clarksville Northern Standard, 16 August 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 15 August 1851.

[68]Austin Texas State Gazette, 9 August 1851.

[69]Galveston Weekly News, 12 August 1851.

[70]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 22 August 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 30 August 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 26 August 1851.

[71]Galveston Weekly News, 26 August 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 29 August 1851; Clarksville Northern Standard, 6 September 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 30 August 1851.

[72]Clarksville Northern Standard, 13 September 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 2 September 1851; Austin Texas State Gazette, 13 September 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 13 September 1851.

[73]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 27 August 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 26 August 1851 and 9 September 1851; Clarksville Northern Standard, 13 September 1851 and 20 September 1851.

[74]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 12 September 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 20 September 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 9 September 1851.

[75]Austin Texas State Gazette, 20 September 1851 and 27 September 1851.

[76]Austin Texas State Gazette, 27 September 1851 and 13 September 1851.

[77]Clarksville Northern Standard, 27 September 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 20 September 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 9 September 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 17 October 1851.

[78]Clarksville Northern Standard, 27 September 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 20 September 1851.

CHAPTER IV

CONFLICTS ALONG THE RIO GRANDE

In 1851 commerce between the United States and Mexico sparked a revolution in the northern provinces of Mexico. Jose Maria J. Carvajal led the revolt, which the merchants of Brownsville, Texas, the gateway for this lucrative trade, financed. The men who participated in this filibustering expedition were men accustomed to the violent life: veterans of the ill-fated Lopez expedition, former Texas Rangers, and border ruffians figured prominently among those who responded to the call to arms. This expedition, launched from Texas, plagued the Rio Grande Valley for years. Although the Carvajal expedition was small and unsuccessful, the adventure confirmed the suspicions of Mexican officials that the United States wanted to take the northern provinces of Mexico. The Carvajal expedition occurred while similar adventures were being launched from California.[1]

When the war with Mexico had begun in 1846, the United States Army marched into Mexico followed closely by the American merchants. The United States established its own tariff in the occupied zone and invited the merchants to bring their goods into the area. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo protected these merchants by stipulating that all

goods brought into the occupied areas were not subject to import duties or confiscation upon the departure of the American forces. After the withdrawal of the American army, the Mexican government, however, failed to fulfill this part of the treaty.[2]

The merchants along the border realized the potential monetary gain from this trade. The Mexican government, however, was in the process of reestablishing its industrial foundation and had imposed high tariff duties to prohibit American goods from entering the country. This protective tariff angered many Americans and a profitable smuggling conspiracy developed along the Rio Grande. The Mexican custom officials would occasionally seize the contraband, and the American owners would, if possible, steal the goods back. On 20 July 1850 the Mexican authorities established a military guard along the river to end the smuggling. This created additional animosity between the merchants and the Mexican government.[3]

The American merchants were not the only group opposed to the tariff. The inhabitants of northern Mexico desired American products for their high quality and opposed the policy of their government. This opposition errupted into a revolutionary movement in September of 1851. The revolutionists met at La Loba, Mexico, and formulated El Plan de la Loba. They demanded constitutional and tariff reforms

including the withdrawal of the army from the northern provinces. They selected Jose Maria J. Carvajal as leader of the revolutionists. The Mexican military presence forced Carvajal to flee to the United States, where he contacted local merchants, who agreed to support the movement. He consented to allow the merchants to introduce their goods into Mexico duty free and also consented to allow the return of runaway slaves to the United States. Carvajal, with the money acquired from the merchants, began to recruit his men at Rio Grande City.[4]

Jose Maria J. Carvajal was born into an old Spanish family whose ancestor allegedly arrived in the New World with famed explorer Francisco Pizzaro. The exact date of birth for the filibuster leader is not known. Carvajal was born in San Antonio, probably in 1810. The details of his life are sparse but a few events are known. In 1823 Carvajal went to Lexington, Kentucky, where he worked for a few years as an apprentice saddlemaker and tanner. He later moved to Bethany, Virginia, and attended school. Carvajal became acquainted with Alexander Campbell, the noted revivalist, under whose influence Carvajal renounced Catholicism and became a Protestant.[5]

In 1830 Carvajal returned to Texas as a surveyor. He became active in politics and represented Bexar in the legislature of Coahuila and Texas. Carvajal became a friend

of Stephen F. Austin and married the daughter of Martin de Leon, an empressario. He fled to New Orleans with the De Leon family when the Texas Army forced them into exile during the Texas Revolution. Carvajal from that moment on never considered himself a Texan. When the war with Mexico commenced, Carvajal commanded a Mexican division against the United States. The revolt which Carvajal led was an attempt to fulfill his desire for an independent northern Mexico.[6]

Carvajal collected about 200 men, Americans and Mexicans, at Rio Grande City. On 20 September 1851 Carvajal and his army of filibusters crossed the Rio Grande and without opposition captured Camargo. When news of the expedition reached other Mexican towns, such as Mier and Guerro, they announced their support for Carvajal and adopted the Plan of La Loba. Carvajal established camp in the conquered town and waited for the arrival of his second-in-command, John S. "Rip" Ford. Ford arrived in the filibuster camp on 1 October with about thirty former Rangers who had been recently mustered out of service. Carvajal commissioned Ford a colonel and placed him in command of the American troops. Among the American volunteers was Roberdeau Chatham Wheat who had served with Lopez in Cuba and would serve with Walker in Nicaragua. A brother-in-law of Jefferson Davis, Joseph D. Howell, commanded a volunteer group of

sixty men from New Orleans. With such men in his force, Carvajal advanced toward Matamoros.[7]

The advanced guard of Carvajal's force reached Matamoros and prepared to lay siege to the town on 20 October 1851. The fighting would continue for the next ten days. About 400 men who lived in and around Brownsville joined the filibusters. Some of the men would return to their homes at night and return to the besieged town the next day. Ford and his men repeatedly tried to capture the main plaza of Matamoros. During one of these attempts Ford received a wound to his head and was taken to Brownsville, where he remained during the attack on Matamoros. On 30 October Carvajal raised the siege and retreated from the city. The reasons for Carvajal's withdrawal are unknown, but the threat of an approaching Mexican army and a lack of adequate medical facilities may have caused him to re-evaluate his position in Matamoros.[8]

Carvajal's course of retreat was along the Mexican side of the Rio Grande. Instead of crossing over into the United States, Carvajal attacked the town of Cerralvo on 26 November. Cerralvo contained about 220 Mexican troops, who successfully resisted the invaders. After a two day engagement, Carvajal decided to withdraw from the town. The filibuster leader received rumors of an approaching Mexican force and felt it useless to continue the attack. At this

point, Carvajal and his men retreated across the Rio Grande, where he began to prepare for a second invasion.[9]

When the filibusters retreated across the Rio Grande, however, many deserted the movement. Carvajal attempted to recruit new men, but a lack of funds hindered him. "Rip" Ford went to Austin to try to recruit men but reported to Carvajal that the recruiting drive was a failure. Nevertheless, Carvajal managed to acquire enough men for a second invasion of Mexico. On 20 February 1852 Carvajal crossed the Rio Grande with about 200 men and attacked the town of Camargo. The next day a Mexican force met the filibusters in battle and most of the filibusters retreated from the field of battle. Carvajal, with about eighty men, remained and repulsed the Mexican force which retreated.[10]

In Washington, D.C., the Fillmore administration noted the filibuster activity in Texas. On 24 September 1851 the president instructed the commander of the western division of the army to stop the expedition. Fillmore issued a warning to the American public on 22 October. However, the army was unable to fulfill its orders until 8 March 1852. While Carvajal was on his way to Brownsville on the American side of the river, Lieutenant John Gibbons, United States Army, arrested him. After posting bond for his appearance at the June session of the District Court, Carvajal was able to attend rallies supporting the Mexican revolt. At

the subsequent trial, the jury found Carvajal not guilty of violating the neutrality law of 1818.[11]

Carvajal's dream of establishing an independent republic based on American principles was virtually at an end. On 26 March 1853 a small force sacked the town of Reynosa and demanded a $30,000 ransom. Only $2,000 was raised by the poor residents of the town. While Carvajal was at Rio Grande City, Major Gabriel R. Paul on 31 March surprised and arrested him and took the filibuster to Brownsville. Carvajal was unable to post bail, so he remained in jail until May. Following his release in May, Carvajal failed to launch another filibuster expedition. Rumors circulated for the next few years that Carvajal was amassing men for another attempt, but the reports proved to be false. He continued an active career but only involved himself in the political turmoils of Mexico. The disturbances along the Rio Grande, however, remained, and Texans occasionally crossed the river in sizable enough numbers to keep fears of a filibustering expedition alive in Mexico.[12]

The Texas press followed with intense interest the revolution in Mexico. The Carvajal expedition, occurring shortly after the collapse of the Cuban expeditions, tended to renew latent feelings of excitement and conquest while distracting their attention from the Cuban disaster.

The Houston Telegraph and Texas Register reported that:

> The disasters that have attended the Cuban expedition may tend to advance the cause of the patriots of the Republic of Sierra Madre, for hundreds of volunteers that are prevented by the agents of President Fillmore from embarking for Cuba, will now join the stand of the Mexican patriots, and establish free institutions throughout the whole of Northern Mexico.

The Texas press again used the image of an oppressed people rising up in revolt to justify the expedition. The Telegraph and Texas Register in July, 1851, began to report ominous signs emanating from the Rio Grande Valley. The paper reported that if a fugitive slave treaty were not negotiated between the governments of the United States and Mexico, the difficulties "may prove far more serious than those relating to the Cuban invasion." The Houston weekly stated that men were already preparing for an invasion of northern Mexico.[13]

The press in Texas was aware of the rumors circulating about a possible revolution in Mexico and voiced their opinions as to why such a revolt might occur. Most agreed with the Galveston Weekly News that the Mexican trade restrictions fostered the ill feelings among the inhabitants of northern Mexico.

> We believe the truth of the matter is, that the late rigid enforcement of the restrictive commercial laws of Mexico along the Rio Grande, operating almost as oppressively as a blockade upon the ports, is rapidly preparing the population this

> side of the Sierra Madre for revolt. They have seen, and have been compelled to feel the vast difference between our free and their restricted system of commerce.

The Telegraph and Texas Register reported that the Mexican government would not allow its citizens who had exchanged property in the United States for merchandise to bring these goods into the country duty free. It stated that if the Mexican government continued to enforce the restriction, Carvajal would invade the country. The Marshall Texas Republican printed a statement by a man "who is well posted up by Mexican affairs." This article spoke of the financial difficulties between Mexico and its European creditors, who sought Mexico's mineral wealth and transit rights. The writer believed that Mexico would seek annexation to the United States and thus avoid its credit responsibilities.[14]

Most of the Texas newspapers, however, did not promote annexation. Instead, they editorialized the will of the people and extolled the virtues of American democracy. The Galveston Weekly News spoke of the high prices in Mexico which the Mexicans were not "accustomed to obtain from the American traders." It praised the United States occupation of northern Mexico during the Mexican War. The paper believed the inhabitants were able to receive for the first time the fruits of their labor. The Galveston Weekly News spoke of the blessings bestowed by the United States upon

the lowly Mexican. The weekly, speaking with expressions of manifest destiny, stated:

> The fact is, they have probably been too long conversant with the superior blessings enjoyed under our Government ever again to be contented under their own. But how the present revolt will terminate we must leave unintelligible .[15]

The Telegraph and Texas Register, angered over presidential involvement in the Cuban expeditions, envisioned a futuristic "Republic of Sierra Madre." The mission of the new country was to rescue Cuba from Spanish tyranny.

> When the new Republic is established, who is to prevent the victorious troops who have achieved its independence, from fitting out in their own ports and under their own Flag, an expedition capable of subverting the power of Spain in Cuba?

The Houston weekly thought that the new republic would be the tool of the southern "chivalry." The paper stated that "no human power can resist them--no disasters can appal. Their battle cry will never cease until this beautiful Island is rescued from the accursed grasp of tyranny." The Telegraph and Texas Register was the only paper to express a desire to use the new country as a base from which filibustering expeditions could be launched.[16]

The press in Texas was confident of a victory over Mexican forces even before the expedition crossed the Rio Grande. The Galveston Weekly News stated that from the first inclinations of a revolt they believed the Carvajal expedition would meet with success. The weekly said that this

opinion "was based upon the fact, that they were, for the first time, deliberately and judiciously projecting their plans of operation, without any intention of going precipitately to work, before everything was arranged for the purpose." It stated that with the expected arrival of the Texas Rangers their belief in success grew stronger. The weekly stated its belief, which the Marshall Texas Republican copied, in the ability of the Rangers by saying:

> All that will be necessary to ensure success to the revolutionists, with such reliable auxiliaries as Texas Rangers are, will be, determination of purpose, concert of action, and, above all, rigid fidelity, in every instance, and under all circumstances, to their chivalrous allies.

The Telegraph and Texas Register reported that General Francisco Avalos had "removed a portion of his property to Brownsville, in anticipation of the success of the revolutionary party." The paper also stated that Carvajal had the support of not only the Mexican troops but also the merchants on the Texas side of the Rio Grande. The Mexican soldiers, the paper expected, would flock to the standard of Carvajal.[17]

The report that the expedition had commenced elicited a subdued statement in the press, but its excitement was evident. The Clarksville Northern Standard reported that "at last the movement has commenced. We do not know but good may come of it, to the depressed masses of the country--they cannot well be worsted . . . ." The Telegraph and

Texas Register reported this news with the banner--"War Begun." The Houston paper reported that Carvajal's force had been successful and was "probably at this time in possession of Matamoros." The Galveston Weekly News continued this optimistic discourse by reporting that Camargo, Mexico, had been occupied by Carvajal's force. The weekly also reported the news that two Cuban companies which had been on Mustang Island now were fighting with the filibusters "to relieve them from their disappointment in the Cuban enterprise." The Texas Republican believed the expedition was "already" successful.[18]

The one paper which did not support Carvajal's filibustering expedition was the Austin Texas State Gazette. The paper reported the events but failed to make a conclusive comment. The weekly deemed the size of the American force involved in the expedition not adequate to supply a victory, only large enough "to be troublesome." It felt the leader, Carvajal, unsuited for the position.

> Canales and Carbajal [sic] are said to be the leaders, they are both shrewd and capable men, but in our opinion, utterly void of principle or patriotism, and let the present affair result as it may, they will reap the benefit.

The weekly, however, asserted that the men involved should not be prosecuted by the federal government. The Austin

Texas State Gazette did not condemn the principle of filibustering, only this particular expedition.[19]

As with the Lopez expeditions, the Texas press was not prepared for failure. The Texas Republican on 22 November 1851 reported that "there can be little doubt that Matamoros, fell into the hands of Carvajal on Friday or Saturday last." The Telegraph and Texas Register printed a similar optimistic appraisal of the events in Matamoros. It praised the actions of the filibusters, especially Carvajal. The Northern Standard, quoting the Rio Bravo, reported that all "have faithfully discharged their duty." The Clarksville weekly commended Carvajal for punishing looters and posting guards in the town, while it chided the Mexican force for not doing the same. The Texas Republican printed the news that the invasion had stimulated trade, and during a three day period, $300,000 worth of merchandise had been moved into the Matamoros area. With such positive reports, Carvajal's retreat was a shock.[20]

The Brownsville Rio Bravo, supplied the Texas papers with the information for the siege on Matamoros. Thus, with the information published in many of the Texas papers coming from the same source, the press in Texas voiced similar opinions. The Texas Republican quoted an article from the Brownsville paper which, speaking in a chauvinistic, manifest destiny tone, placed the blame for failure on the

Mexican filibusters and depicted them as meek and fearful of direct combat, while portraying the Americans as men who would obey an order even if it meant death. It described Carvajal as a man who had lost the respect and command of his troops. The Brownsville Rio Bravo wailed that if "Rip" Ford had not been wounded, the Americans would have supplied the expected victory.[21]

The press noted the retreat from Matamoros, the attack on Cerralvo, and the withdrawal across the Rio Grande. Most newspapers, however, showed little interest in the outcome of the expedition. They continued, nevertheless, to report that Carvajal was organizing men and supplies and that a second invasion was imminent. The enthusiasm and hope present in the early reports were lacking in the statements published after the withdrawal from Matamoros. Instead, the press began a discussion on the merits of such enterprises and on the future of Mexico.[22]

The Rio Bravo led the discussion and dictated the tone to be followed in the Texas press. The Houston Telegraph and Texas Register quoted the following from the Rio Bravo:

> They deserve a better fate, and we hope, in the hour of need, God will raise them up defenders, and bear his mighty arm in their cause . . . . For ourselves, we shalt never cease to cry against oppression, in every shape, to lift up the down trodden from the earth,--to strike at the lofty head of despotism, and mingle our plaudits and encouragement with the shouts of those who are battling for the rights of man. Thus ends the first, but thus shall not end the second act in this drama.

The Houston weekly spoke of the situation facing the inhabitants of northern Mexico. The forces of the central government and the forces of Carvajal placed the people in a "deplorable condition." The inhabitants, attempting to remain neutral, "dare not side with either party, and are wholly unable to protect themselves against the invasions of the savages." The lawlessness of the border area increased due to the armed conflict.[23]

The press, by January of 1852, began to reevaluate its position on the Carvajal expedition. The enthusiasm once present waned. The Rio Bravo continued to extol the virtues of the expedition but clarified its position on a new republic.

> We want no little Republic of this sort on this continent to exist under our guardianship, or to serve as a theater for European intrique, to endanger our free institutions, to disturb our peace and tranquility . . . . We are in favor of rescuing its inhabitants from oppression and misery; but we do not desire to see the country itself detached from the rest of Mexico . . . .

The San Antonio Ledger, however, declared the expedition had received more publicity than it deserved. In a frank statement the paper declared that "it was generally regarded as a humbug in the beginning, and has proved such in the end."[24]

The San Antonio paper noted that "Rip" Ford had abandoned his attempt to recruit men in the Austin area because

of a lack of sympathy for the expedition. The San Antonio Ledger captured the growing sentiments in Texas by stating that

> The people on the Rio Grande were suffering no oppressions; there was no yoke on their necks which they desired to throw off; they were left by the supreme government of Mexico to do pretty much as they pleased, and if they had any grievances to complain of, Carvajal was the last man they would have called upon to redress them.
>
> This is evident, from the fact that no considerable portion of the inhabitants joined the movement . . . .[25]

This cautious attitude, developing in 1852, was in sharp contrast to the wreckless expressions of sympathy found in the papers of October and November of 1851. The early accounts based their sentiments on rumors without waiting for the hard facts. By March of 1852 most editors had become less gullible and more cautious. One such editor was J. Patillo of the Texas Republican. In one article on Carvajal he wrote:

> Carvajal has made no movement since the last dates. Reports were very contradictory as to the number of men under him and as to the operations intended. Some estimate his force at 500 to 1000. I do not believe though, he has received any considerable accession of numbers, and set down his force about 300.

The San Antonio Ledger ridiculed the New Orleans Picayune correspondent in Brownsville for printing statements which were not true. The paper said that he "either draws upon his imagination, or has been greatly deceived."[26]

During 1852 the support once found in the Texas press had turned to criticism of Mexico and its people. This criticism probably had two sources: 1) frustration over the Carvajal expedition; and 2) renewed Mexican civil strife. The Brownsville Flag spoke bluntly in an article published in January of 1853:

> If our greaser neighbors don't keep peace among themselves, however, the Fillibuster [sic] will have to step over and settle matters for them. We don't need their country, but to permit our neighbors to be constantly quarrelling with and slaughtering each other is insufferable.

The Nueces Valley of Corpus Christi expressed its disgust with Mexico by saying that:

> Our advices from the wretched, shrivelled, abortive Government--if Government it can be called--prove what we have always believed, that the people of Mexico are totally unfit for self-government.[27]

The press in Texas did not abandon Carvajal. It followed him in and out of Mexico and through the American legal system. The Texas State Gazette reported in March of 1852 that a federal grand jury had issued true bills of indictments against Carvajal and some of his men for violation of the neutrality laws. In the same article, the Austin weekly reported that Carvajal would resume operations "soon." The Texas Republican stated that Carvajal had attended the Corpus Christi Fair in May of 1852 and gave a "well received" speech on the late expedition. In August of 1852 the Galveston Weekly News reported that the intense

emotions caused by the filibustering expedition were still present in Brownsville "resulting in bloodshed and assassinations."[28]

The Carvajal expedition, like most filibustering excursions, had ended in failure. The reaction the enterprise caused in the Texas press was a combination of wishful thinking and pent-up frustration. The Carvajal expedition, occurring so close to Lopez's invasion of Cuba, was used to ease the depression which Lopez's defeat had caused among filibuster supporters. The press joined the bandwagon, hoping the expedition would succeed. Since most favored aid to an oppressed people, Carvajal's expedition received the support of the press in Texas, but when the tide turned against Carvajal, the press described those same people as unworthy to receive democratic principles. The press depicted the inhabitants of northern Mexico early as an oppressed people in need of aid. After the Carvajal expedition failed, the Texas press regarded these same men and women as a people without the will to resist oppression. The press in Texas had reversed its altruistic interpretation of manifest destiny to the traditional one: aid to an oppressed people became scorn for an inferior race.

The Carvajal expedition was the first expedition to be described as a filibustering force in the Texas press. The use of the term "filibuster" was becoming more widely accepted by 1852 in the Texas press. The filibustering

expedition was not condemned as wrong by the newspapers. Instead, most supported the expedition and envisioned a democratic republic emerging from the backward northern province. Carvajal, however, quickly shattered the illusion with his retreat from Matamoros. The press, afterwords, failed to express the same level of support for Carvajal as it had in the beginning. The Austin Texas State Gazette, critical of Carvajal's strength, exhibited an attitude common to the press in Texas. If the expedition proceeded unfavorably, withdraw support and criticize the native populace without condemning the principle of filibusterism.

The conflict along the Rio Grande continued after Carvajal's demise. This time, the Texas Rangers instigated the violence. In October of 1855 a company of Texas Rangers, led by James H. Callahan, crossed the Rio Grande into Mexico and engaged a Mexican detachment. The Rangers withdrew to Piedras Negras, a small Mexican border town. They sacked the town and set fires to cover their retreat into Texas.[29]

A question has been raised as to whether this was an actual filibustering expedition. The stated reason for crossing the Rio Grande was the chastisement of the Lipan Indians for raids into Texas. If Callahan's actions resulted from a spontaneous desire to punish the Lipan Indians, the expedition should not be classified as a filibustering excursion. Some historians, however, believe that

Callahan crossed the river in pursuit of runaway slaves. They based this conjecture on the belief that a group of San Antonio residents approached Callahan and requested him to lead his Ranger company into Mexico to recapture their runaway slaves. If this theory is correct, the Callahan expedition must be considered a planned filibustering movement. Whether this was an actual filibustering expedition or not, the Callahan expedition sparked editorial comment on American expansion and on filibustering movements in the Texas press.[30]

The issue under debate was not whether Callahan was wrong or right but whether the invasion of a friendly neighbor by an armed civilian force was justified. The San Antonio Herald staunchly defended Callahan and the principle of filibustering. The weekly stated that if the institutions of the United States failed to protect its citizens, the people were justified in arming themselves and invading a neighboring country in pursuit of security. The San Antonio Herald believed that the Indian menace was a legitimate reason for filibustering excursions into Mexico.[31]

The Austin State Gazette issued a qualified approval of the use of filibustering expeditions but did not believe that they were a deterrent against violence on the frontier. It stated:

> . . . if the Governor of Texas is to send an expedition into the field to enter the dominions of a friendly country at peace with our government, we desire that it shall be done, if done at all, by the representatives of the people, in their legislative capacity, and not at the bidding of a squad of fillibusters [sic], who are seeking to obtain a foothold in Mexico.

The Austin State Gazette condemned the editor of the Austin State Times, John S. "Rip" Ford, for his call for an expedition into Mexico. The State Gazette felt that such action would cause a border war and would not protect the people living on the frontier. It said that the people of Texas were "sick and tired of the fillibustering [sic] propensities of our neighbor of the 'Times.'"[32]

While the debate raged over the merits of filibustering excursions, the Texas press discussed the broader issue of Mexico and its future relations with the United States. The Marshall Texas Republican quoted at length an article published in the New Orleans Delta advocating the annexation of Mexico. The article stressed the economic gains for the United States, pointing out that the annexation of Mexico "would be an immense gain to this country, and a splendid stride on the road which our 'manifest destiny, compels us to travel." The Galveston Weekly News chided the Houston Telegraph and Texas Register for its belated advocacy of the annexation of Mexico. The Galveston Weekly News, a strong supporter of filibustering excursions, stated that "the

Houston Telegraph goes for the annexation of Mexico. It is a believer in 'manifest destiny'--hear it: . . . ."[33]

As the press in Texas discussed the issue of filibustering and manifest destiny, its attention slowly turned toward Nicaragua. The exploits of William Walker strengthened many newspapers' beliefs in filibustering and manifest destiny, while a few adopted opposing views. Nevertheless, the Callahan expedition into Mexico sparked a debate which raged in the press for the next five years. The debate illustrated that Texans were not of one mind on the issue of filibustering.

CHAPTER IV ENDNOTES

[1]J. Fred Rippy, "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande, 1848-1860," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 23 (1919): 98.

[2]Rippy, "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande," pp. 94-5; J. Lea and Lillian J. Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1954), pp. 98-9.

[3]Ernest C. Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 55 (1951): 205, 207; J. Fred Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters and the Gadsden Treaty," Hispanic American Historical Review 5 (1922): 159; Rippy, "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande," p. 96.

[4]Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," p. 208; Stambaugh and Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley, p. 99; Rippy, "Anglo-American Filibusters," p. 160; William J. Hughes, Rebellious Ranger: Rip Ford and the Old Southwest (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), p. 100; John Salmon Ford, Rip Ford's Texas, ed. Stephen B. Oates (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963), p. 196.

[5]Stambaugh and Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley, p. 97.

[6]Harbert Davenport, "General Jose Maria Jesus Carabajal," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 55 (1952): 475-82; Stambaugh and Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley, pp. 97-98; Rippy, "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande," p. 96.

[7]Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," p. 209; Charles H. Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), p. 152; Hughes, Rebellious Ranger, pp. 101-02.

[8]Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," pp. 210, 213, 217; Hughes, Rebellious Ranger, pp. 102-03.

[9]Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," p. 220; Stambaugh and Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley, p. 100.

[10]Hughes, Rebellious Ranger, pp. 103-4; Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," p. 222.

[11]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, p. 152; Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," p. 223; Ford, Rip Ford's Texas, p. 204.

[12]Stambaugh and Stambaugh, The Lower Rio Grande Valley, pp. 100-1; Shearer, "The Carvajal Disturbances," pp. 226-29.

[13]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 12 September 1851 and 18 July 1851.

[14]Galveston Weekly News, 12 August 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 3 October 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 20 September 1851.

[15]Galveston Weekly News, 7 October 1851.

[16]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 12 September 1851.

[17]Galveston Weekly News, 2 September 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 18 October 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 5 September 1851.

[18]Clarksville Northern Standard, 18 October 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 10 October 1851; Galveston Weekly News, 7 October 1851; Marshall Texas Republican, 18 October 1851.

[19]General Antonio Conales was expected to join Carvajal. Instead, he led the Mexican forces against the filibusters. See Austin Texas State Gazette, 4 October 1851 and 24 January 1852.

[20]Marshall Texas Republican, 8 November 1851 and 22 November 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 7 November 1851; Brownsville Rio Bravo, 29 October 1851, cited in Clarksville Northern Standard, 29 November 1851.

[21]Brownsville Rio Bravo, 5 November 1851, cited in Marshall Texas Republican, 6 December 1851 and Clarksville Northern Standard, 20 December 1851.

[22]Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 9 January 1852; Marshall Texas Republican, 17 January 1852; Austin Texas State Gazette, 13 March 1852.

[23]Brownsville Rio Bravo, n.d. , cited in the Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 28 November 1851; Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 9 January 1852.

[24]Brownsville Rio Bravo, n.d. , cited in the Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 19 December 1851; San Antonio Ledger, n.d. , cited in the Marshall Texas Republican, 31 January 1852.

[25]San Antonio Ledger, n.d. , cited in the Marshall Texas Republican, 31 January 1852.

[26]Marshall Texas Republican, 13 March 1852; San Antonio Ledger, n.d. , cited in the Marshall Texas Republican, 31 January 1852.

[27]Brownsville Flag, n.d. , cited in the Austin Texas State Gazette, 8 January 1853; Corpus Christi Nueces Valley, n.d. , cited in the Austin Texas State Gazette, 7 August 1851.

[28]Austin Texas State Gazette, 13 March 1852; Marshall Texas Republican, 6 June 1852; Galveston Weekly News, 3 August 1852.

[29]For a more complete history of Callahan expedition see Ronnie C. Tyler, "The Callahan Expedition of 1855: Indians of Negroes?" Southwestern Historical Quarterly 70 (1967): 574-85 and Ernest C. Shearer, "The Callahan Expedition, 1855," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 54 (1950): 430-51.

[30]For a discussion of the subject see Tyler, "The Callahan Expedition of 1855," pp. 574-85, Shearer, "The Callahan Expedition," pp. 430-51, J. Fred Rippy, "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande, 1848-1860," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 23 (1918): 91-111, Paul Neff Garber, The Gadsden Treaty (Philadelphia: Press of the University of Pennsylvania, 1923), pp. 160-61 and Walter Prescott Webb, The Texas Rangers: A Century of Frontier Defense (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1935), pp. 136-46.

[31]San Antonio Herald, 9 October 1855.

[32]Austin State Gazette, 20 October 1855 and 24 November 1855.

[33]Marshall Texas Republican, 22 September 1855; Galveston Weekly News, 2 October 1855.

CHAPTER V

CONFLICT AND DISCORD:
WILLIAM WALKER IN NICARAGUA

Nicaragua in 1855 was a country torn apart by constant civil strife. The people of this Central American country had been subjected to civil disruptions since 1830. The population was a heterogenous collection of Spanish-Indians, pure-blooded Indians, whites, and Negroes. Visitors to Nicaragua could not help but notice this disruption of the country, and some saw Nicaragua as a land of opportunity. William O. Scroggs, in his 1916 book Filibusters and Financiers, suggests that Nicaragua was ripe for a filibustering expedition. If William Walker had not arrived in Nicaragua on 16 June 1855 and had not quickly established himself in that war-torn country, Scroggs theorizes that someone else would have reaped the notoriety and publicity.[1]

Walker's arrival in Nicaragua was not a hastily conceived idea but a well negotiated plan designed to take advantage of the political turmoil. In 1853, the president of Nicaragua had died, and in the subsequent election, Fruto Chamorro was elected to the presidency. Chamorro was a member of the Legitimists, a political faction situated

around the town of Granada. Chamorro's opponent in the election was Francisco Castellon, a member of the Liberal party whose headquarters was in Leon. The Liberal party objected to the outcome of the election, and the new president promptly banished the party leaders, including Castellon.[2]

In an attempt to strengthen the office of the president, Chamorro asked for and was awarded a new constitution on 30 April 1854. The new constitution, instead of easing the political discord, precipitated a new revolution. Castellon, who had fled to Honduras, used this new constitution as a pretext for an armed confrontation. On the fifth of May a band of Liberal exiles from Honduras attacked the towns around Leon and drove the Chamorro factions from the area. The Liberals, calling themselves "Democrats," adopted a red ribbon as their color and soon established a new government in this captured territory with Castellon as president. The Democrats turned their attention toward the Legitimist stronghold of Granada. The Democrats, unsuccessful in their first assault, placed Granada under siege.[3]

In August, Byron Cole, a friend of William Walker, approached Castellon with an offer of American assistance. Castellon proved receptive to the idea, and the two men reached an agreement. In a formal contract, Cole agreed to bring 300 men to Nicaragua to serve in the Democratic army.

Cole departed Nicaragua for California and presented Walker with the contract. Walker, who had been found not guilty in a subsequent trial for violation of the neutrality laws, was employed at the Democratic State Journal when Cole contacted him. After careful inspection of the contract, Walker refused to sign the document, stating American neutrality laws as the reason. Walker, however, suggested that if the contract were for a colonization grant, he might be interested. Cole returned to Nicaragua and obtained a new contract for the admission of 300 colonists to Nicaragua who would have the right to bear arms forever. Walker consented to this new contract and began to prepare for his expedition.[4]

Walker's main problem was not the recruitment of men but solicitation of funds. Unable to raise the needed capital, he issued stock in his enterprise to merchants who would furnish the needed supplies. Walker managed to charter the Vesta, an old brig, on which he loaded men and supplies. The stockholders, however, became dubious of the value of their stock and obtained a writ of attachment seizing the Vesta for failure to pay a debt. Walker, through gentle persuasion and a mutual friendship, obtained the release of the vessel. On 4 May 1855 fifty-eight men, nicknamed "the Immortals," sailed for Nicaragua.[5]

After a grueling five week voyage, Walker arrived in Realejo on 16 June 1855. Since Walker's initial contact

with Castellon in 1854, several changes had taken place in Nicaragua. First, Chamorro had died, and Jose Maria Estrada, a moderate, had succeeded to the presidency. Second, Castellon had replaced his commander of the Democratic army with Jose Trinidad Munoz, a man considered to be the most capable soldier in Central America. Finally, the Democratic war effort was deteriorating rapidly, illustrated by abandonment of the siege of Granada.[6]

Walker, however, was not disturbed by these changes. Receiving permission from Castellon to lead an independent American command, Walker with his fifty-eight men, designated as the la Falange Americana, set sail in the Vesta for an assault against the town of Rivas, located a few miles west of Lake Nicaragua. The control of this town were necessary if Walker was to control the transit route across Nicaragua as well as Nicaragua itself.[7]

On 29 June 1855, the attack on Rivas commenced. Walker, confident in his success, boldly attacked the plaza, forcing the defenders to flee. Walker's men, however, were in a vulnerable position and took refuge in several adobe houses. After four hours of fighting, the Americans rushed from their fortifications, startling the Legitimist soldiers. Instead of an attack, the Americans retreated to safety. Walker suffered six dead and five seriously wounded, although he admitted only one casualty. The Americans, fleeing to

San Juan del Sur, commandered a schooner and sailed to Realejo. Walker's first military action in Nicaragua had ended in failure.[8]

Few newspapers in Texas noticed Walker's early exploits. Instead, the Callahan expedition and the subsequent discussion on Mexico's annexation distracted them. The Clarksville Standard, however, devoted more attention to Walker than to Callahan. The newspaper reported the sailing of the Walker expedition from California saying that it "sailed under direct invitation of the Castillion [sic] or democratic party of Nicaragua." The Standard noticed the military setbacks of the Castellon government, causing speculation that the war was about to end in July of 1855. Although the newspaper noted the arrival of Walker in Nicaragua, the Standard appeared to be unsure of the future of Nicaragua and the role Walker would play in it.[9]

The Galveston Weekly News was less cautious in describing the Walker expedition. Walker's arrival was to be the signal for the erruption of "hostilities, it is said, will commence and 'bloody work is expected, as they are all desperate men and selected for the occasion.'" The weekly labeled the attack on the town of Rivas a success and stated

that many men had joined Walker's standard. The newspaper, upon hearing the news of the defeat, quickly placed the blame for the defeat on the Nicaraguans, not on Walker. The Americans were "betrayed," the weekly reported, when the Nicaraguans "fled, leaving Walker and his men to fight it out as best they could."[10]

One reason for the cautious attitude of the Standard and other Texas newspapers was the sailing of the Henry L. Kinney expedition to Nicaragua. Kinney for years had been a land developer in Texas. Born in Pennsylvania in 1814, he experimented with several occupations, such as farming, the military, business, and politics. In 1838 he migrated to Brownsville, Texas, and began to acquire land. Following the war with Mexico, Kinney reportedly owned over 500,000 acres in Texas which he opened up for settlement. Kinney became interested in Nicaragua when he acquired a questionable land grant to over 22,000,000 acres in the Mosquito territory. Kinney organized the Central American Land and Mining Company to colonize his acreage. The Nicaraguan government, however, did not recognize this land grant since the grant was made by an Indian "king" who had been installed by the British. The American government, believing Kinney intended to conquer Nicaragua, reestablish slavery, and annex the country to the United States, informed Kinney

of his violation of American neutrality. The federal government arrested Kinney on 29 April 1855.[11]

The Clarksville Standard, along with the Austin Texas State Gazette, reported the assemblage of the Kinney expedition. The Standard mentioned the sailing of the expedition and Walker's anxiousness to join forces. The Galveston Weekly News, however, reported the problems Kinney was having with the government and his subsequent arrest for violation of the neutrality laws. Possibly, this reported collapse of the Kinney expedition caused the Galveston weekly to feel optimistic about Walker's chances.[12]

The Texas newspapers, however, did not realize the conflict which would arise between these two filibuster leaders. Kinney had purchased land in the Mosquito territory; land which Nicaragua claimed. Kinney also had organized a company to colonize the area. When he set sail with eighteen followers, many felt his intentions were to join Walker in Nicaragua. In reality, both men became fierce rivals for the same prize--Nicaragua.[13]

Walker continued his drive to subdue Nicaragua despite his defeat at Rivas. After an urgent plea for aid from Castellon, the Americans marched to Leon. At the Democratic capital, Walker and Castellon clashed verbally over the next military objective for the Americans. Walker proposed a second attack on the transit route, while Castellon and

Munoz desired to divide the Americans among the native troops. Walker objected and ordered his men to Chinandega, where his wounded had been recuperating. Once at Chinandega, Walker disobeyed Castellon's orders by marching to Realejo and boarding the Vesta for a second attack on the transit route.[14]

The Americans, landing at San Juan del Sur, learned that the Legitimist general, Santos Guardiola, was moving towards Rivas in an effort to crush the American phalanx. On 2 September Walker left San Juan del Sur for Virgin Bay, which they reached on the third. While eating breakfast at Virgin Bay, Guardiola's force attacked the forty-five Americans and 125 natives. After a short but deadly encounter, Walker's men overwhelmed Guardiola's force. Walker did not lose a single American, while the native casualties were only three. The Legitimist loss, however, was about sixty men. Walker had now established himself as a military power in Nicaragua. The Galveston Weekly News noted this first victory for Walker and his "colonization" party.[15]

Walker returned to San Juan del Sur, where he learned from Legitimist deserters that General Ponciano Corral had left Granada to reorganize the Legitimist forces in Rivas. Realizing the vulnerable position of the capital, Walker decided to attack Granada. On 11 October 1855, a combined force of 400 men left San Juan del Sur for Virgin Bay,

where they commandeered the transit company's lake steamer, La Virgen. On the thirteenth, the Americans and Nicaraguans marched into the surprised city of Granada, having only fired a few shots. Walker succeeded in capturing not only the capital but also the Legitimist's arsenal. On 14 October the citizens adopted a resolution offering the provisional presidency of Nicaragua to Walker. The government was to be a coalition between the Democrats and Legitimists. Walker declined, however, suggesting that Corral be named the new president. Corral refused the nomination, also.[16]

Walker was not disturbed by the obstinacy of Corral. On 22 October, Walker executed Mateo Mayorga, the secretary of foreign affairs, for the Legitimist attack on the steamer San Carlos, which was carrying civilian passengers for California. Walker informed Corral that if he failed to sign a peace treaty, other Legitimist government officials would be executed. Corral agreed and went to Granada where he negotiated terms for a surrender from Walker.[17]

These terms created a new government in Nicaragua. The treaty provided for a provisional president to serve for fourteen months or until an election could be conducted. Patricio Rivas became the new president of Nicaragua. The government contained a council of ministers appointed by the president. Corral was appointed minister of war, while

Walker was designated commander in chief of the army. Both Corral and Walker had not acted on behalf of their respective governments, but both parties agreed to abide by the terms.[18]

The Galveston Weekly News continually kept its readers abreast of Walker's activities in Nicaragua. The paper noted the capture of Granada and Walker's refusal of the presidency. On 27 November, it proclaimed that "Gen. Walker is still in Granada, and in quiet possession of the entire transit route, and of nearly all the Republic of Nicaragua." The weekly enhanced this joyous proclamation with the news that John H. Wheeler, United States minister to Nicaragua, had formally recognized the new government. The Clarksville Standard reported that some "highly interesting" news had been received from Nicaragua. The paper noted that Walker had provided security in Granada for people and property and that the citizens were "so much delighted at this that they assembled en masse, and invited him to become their President, which he declined . . . . He attended a jubilee at their church, where he was annointed [sic] by the priest, who proclaimed him as being the saviour of their country." The Standard concluded by saying that "thus the enemy of Walker had fled before him in every instance except one, in the vicinity of the transit route, and

peace and plenty are now looked for as the result." Walker's early victory in Nicaragua had evoked no criticism in the Texas press.[19]

The Standard reported the execution of War Minister Corral for high treason. Corral had grown fearful that the Legitimists were losing control of the government and had opened negotiations with Legitimist leaders in exile to return with aid. The dispatches of Corral fell into the hands of Walker, who ordered an immediate court martial. The court, composed entirely of Americans, found Corral guilty of high treason and condemned him to death. Walker ordered the sentence carried out despite intense opposition from the people of Granada. On 8 November 1855, Corral met his death at the hands of his executioners. Walker had succeeded in gaining control of the government.[20]

On 4 December 1855 the Galveston Weekly News wrote that "Walker's new Government appears to give entire satisfaction to the people." In Washington, however, the Franklin Pierce administration was upset over Walker's actions in Nicaragua. The president issued a proclamation on 8 December warning the public not to join any filibustering expedition to Nicaragua. The federal government alerted port authorities and seized vessels. The press in Texas reported these events without comment. Pierce also refused to receive Parker H. French, Nicaraguan minister to the United States,

because of the ill-feelings, magnified by Walker, between the United States and Great Britain over Central America. The Galveston weekly noted Pierce's determination not to recognize the new government in Nicaragua. The paper furthermore recalled French's activities in Texas:

> We presume some of our citizens of Texas have not forgot the celebrated Capt. French, who, a few years ago, succeeded in imposing upon some of the merchants of San Antonio, by forging the names of Howland & Aspinwall. The same personage is now Minister Plenipotentiary from Nicaragua to our Government.

The caliber of Nicaragua's representative caused Pierce's actions not to be condemned in the Texas press.[21]

Despite these tacit approvals of government action, the press continued to speak favorably of Walker's Nicaragua. The Clarksville Standard reported that Walker's force had increased to 1,000 men. The Galveston Weekly News, by far the most vocal advocate for Walker in the Texas newspapers, reported that "Gen. Walker has quiet possession of the country, and emigrants are flocking thither from California in crowds . . . ." The weekly also spoke highly of the agricultural potential of the country:

> As far as it [a letter from Nicaragua] related to the agricultural development of the country, it confirms the views we have entertained all along. Not only all the tropical products . . . but many of the staples of the Southern States can be cultivated . . . .

A few newspapers began to notice Walker and especially Nicaragua.[22]

One such paper was the Austin State Gazette. The favorable reports received from Nicaragua caused the paper to call the country "the bright star of hope of the 'Young American' at the present time." The weekly promoted emigration to Nicaragua by saying:

> The present is certainly a fine opening to the young men of the South, and worth of the best talent and character. Central America is superior to Mexico for purposes of commerce . . . . . Success to every true-hearted American who may seek its shores.

The Austin paper felt that the arrival of men and factory equipment were "all favorable indications . . . for a great revolution in central America." Unfortunately, the newspaper failed to anticipate Walker's success as fragile and faltering.[23]

During the spring of 1856, Walker continued to consolidate his power in Nicaragua. By misleading President Rivas as to his true motives, Walker had the president on 18 February issue a decree nullifying the charters of the Accessory Transit Company. Cornelius Vanderbilt, the owner, became a powerful opponent of Walker. Walker immediately granted the rights to the transit route to his friends Edmund Randolph and Alexander P. Crittenden. This action alienated Walker from the Nicaraguan members of the government and caused many, such as Rivas, to join Walker's enemies in an attempt to topple the American.[24]

When Rivas signed a decree stating Nicaragua's title to the Mosquito territory on 8 February, he settled the conflict between Walker and Kinney. Kinney promptly sought an audience with Walker, who received his rival with coolness. Walker had Kinney arrested and forcibly removed from the country. Walker had eliminated his only opponent in Nicaragua and believed himself to be in control.[25]

The press in Texas reacted to the nullification of Kinney's title to the Mosquito territory with disbelief and outrage. The Austin State Gazette stated that "we cannot permit ourselves to believe, that the Walker government has disgraced itself by any wanton violation of the rights of property." The Clarksville Standard spoke of the "boldness" of the action but failed to express an opinion. The Galveston Weekly News responded to the takeover of the company with defiance. The paper wrote:

> This property is owned by citizens of the United States, in whose behalf our Government will interpose, but in what manner we cannot conjecture, except by our armed force; for, so long as [the] Rivas Government is not recognized at Washington, diplomacy is out of the question.

The Galveston weekly, however, approved of the seizure of the Mosquito territory from Kinney. The paper, citing the New Orleans Picayune, stated that this action was the "most effective way to carry out the Monroe doctrine in Central America." The Standard reported the events leading to

Kinney's expulsion from Nicaragua. The Clarksville paper again remained neutral in opinion.[26]

In March, the attention of the Texas press and citizens turned towards Nicaragua with increasing interest. On 4 March, Costa Rica instigated military operations against Nicaragua. The war lasted two months with Costa Rica withdrawing from Nicaragua and thus saving Walker from military defeat. Throughout the summer and fall, Nicaragua, the neutrality laws, and the filibusters were topics of discussion. During this period, however, the press in Texas began to show signs of disharmony, although the unanimity of opinion in favor of Walker remained intact. Since Walker rode the crest of popularity in the United States in 1856, some papers might have withheld their opinions of Walker waiting for a more auspicious occasion. Some might have jumped on the Walker bandwagon hoping their fears would not materialize. No matter how the editors felt, the summer and fall of 1856 were a prolific period in press writings on Walker.

Of immediate concern was the war raging between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. The newspapers in Texas placed descriptions of the battles in their columns, often without comment. The Marshall Texas Republican wrote that a report of Walker's defeat had caused "considerable excitement" in New Orleans. The paper quoted an article from the New

Orleans Crescent, saying that "it will be seen that it [the defeat] will not seriously affect Walker or his prospects." The Clarksville Standard expressed surprise at the defeat of an American force. The paper, speaking in the terms of American racial superiority embodied in manifest destiny, stated:

> Such a thing as a positive defeat of Walker's men, in anything approximating an equal show of forces by the contending parties, was never dreamed of for an instant. We think it more the probable that the accounts are exaggerated, but that Walker's party had experienced a reverse of fortune, is no doubt true.

The Standard felt that if the defeat had destroyed "the odor of invincibility," Walker's "complete downfall would not surprise us the least."[27]

The defeat and route of Louis Schlesinger's combined force of Americans, Germans, and French did not substantially hurt Walker's military exploits. Schlesinger, a European revolutionist who had seen action with Lopez in Cuba, commanded this battalion because of knowledge of the three languages. The withdrawal of the Costa Rican forces from Rivas on 26 April 1856 substantiated the Galveston Weekly News' appraisal of the situation as not "serious." Political turmoil in Costa Rica facilitated President Juan Rafael Mora's immediate return with his army. The Marshall Texas Republican reported the capture of Rivas, first by the Costa Ricans, and Walker's subsequent occupation of the town in

April. The Austin State Gazette spoke of the glorious death of J. W. Jennings, a resident of the city, at the battle of Rivas:

> He received the fatal wound with his face to the foe-foremost in the fight, and on a battle field-glorious to the names of every Nicaraguan, and ever to be memorable in the wold's [sic] history of brave deeds in behalf of liberty.

The State Gazette, witnessing the end of hostilities in Nicaragua, noted that "the South is deeply concerned in the stability and prosperity of Walker's Government in Nicaragua."[28]

The form of Walker's government drastically changed on 29 June 1856. President Rivas wished the American presence in Nicaragua to decrease in numbers. Walker saw this as an attempt to erode his power in the country. Rivas, fearing retaliation from Walker, called for new presidential elections to be held on 29 June. Before the elections could be held, Rivas fled into the interior and began organizing clandestine operations against Walker. Walker, nevertheless, proceeded with the election. On 29 June 1856, the people of Nicaragua elected Walker president of Nicaragua despite increasing native resistance.[29]

The press in Texas expressed confidence in a Walker victory. The Austin State Gazette felt that Walker's election would create "a better state of things." The Galveston Weekly News asserted that Walker's election was a "revolution" but a peaceful one. Both newspapers, however,

foresaw difficulties for the new president. The State Gazette felt that Walker could not stop "until all [of] Central America is under the dominion of American Nicaraguan influence." The Galveston weekly expressed the opinion that "the hostility which exists against Walker arises from prejudice against the people of the United States . . .," and Walker could expect reinforcements from the American people.[30]

The Galveston Weekly News was the leading advocate in Texas for emigration to Nicaragua. The paper reported departures, printed letters, and campaigned vigorously for the Nicaraguan cause. A typical plea for emigration read:

> Ho, for Nicaragua!-Capt. Lockridge will leave Galveston on the 3rd or 4th of September, with one hundred and fifty, or more, young men for Nicaragua. There are a few vacancies for the "right sort," so that those who desire joining the expedition have yet a chance. Apply to Mr. P. R. Edwards of this city.

The paper also printed tantalizing letters from Texans regarding Nicaragua. These letters depicted Nicaragua as a virtual "paradise" and advocated emigration to this lush land.[31]

Since the press in Texas seemingly approved of the Walker filibustering expedition, the newspapers devoted time to defend the filibustering practice and to advocate the repeal of neutrality laws. The Galveston Weekly News reminded

its readers that Walker was "invited to Nicaragua, to aid the liberalists . . ." in their war against the Legitimists. It wailed:

> If it is criminal to aid Nicaragua now, it was criminal in Lafayette to join the American Revolution. If it is wrong to send men and means to assist Walker, it was wrong in the people of the United States to send men and means to Texas--to furnish ships (though on credit) to defend the Texas coast, or the "twin sisters" that thundered on the field of San Jacinto.

The Marshall Texas Republican defended the filibusters against charges of murder, plunder, and rapine by saying:

> Not so with the fillibusters [sic]. They have other and nobler aspirations. Good government, wise and salutory laws, a protection of life and property, follow their movements.

The Marshall paper, in response to an English reporter who had spoken sarcastically of manifest destiny, said that "his own account of Walker and the character of the Americans under his command, goes very far to show that this popular sentiment has a reasonable foundation."[32]

The newspapers realized that if Nicaragua were to be free, Americans must be permitted to go to Nicaragua without government interference. If men did not have to contend with the neutrality laws, the Nicaraguan cause and similar causes might be settled swiftly. The Galveston Weekly News felt "that the liberty of American citizens is curtailed beyond the extent required by the law of nations . . . ."

The Austin State Gazette declared that the neutrality laws were a "great obstacle in the way of Americans on the ocean . . .," and, along with the Galveston weekly, favored John A. Quitman's actions in the House of Representatives to abolish the neutrality laws. The State Gazette proclaimed that the responsibility of the federal government was

> to interpose no unneccessary [sic] obstacles in the way of those citizens, who while expatriating themselves, seek to aid the cause of human liberty in oppressed lands. The Neutrality laws are contrary to the spirit of the constitution and form those cobwebs in the progress of civilization, which, sooner or later, must fall before its colossal strides.

The press envisioned manifest destiny as being stronger than the neutrality laws.[33]

While the newspapers in Texas discussed the merits of filibustering, Walker became embroiled in a second war which would eventually force him to flee Nicaragua. On 18 July 1856 the nations bordering Nicaragua entered into an alliance against Walker. Honduras, Guatemala, El Savador, and later Costa Rica recognized Rivas' government as the rightful government of Nicaragua and promised military aid. By September, the combined forces of Latin Americans began their assault on the Americans controlling Nicaragua.[34]

As early as July, the Texas press had anticipated such a war. The Marshall Texas Republican reported "that the feeling against Walker is increasing very much, and that

between the several adjacent States an invasion of Nicaragua will shortly be made with forces 9,000 strong." The Galveston Weekly News presented the news "that Walker's popularity is over-rated and that the indications are unfavorable for peace and quiet." It attacked the people of Nicaragua for their lack of support for Walker by saying:

> They entertain the Spanish jealousy of foreigners. Under the pressure of circumstances growing out of their civil war, they have yielded some reluctant and insincere support to Walker, but it is apparent that they are always ready to betray him, when the opportunity occurs.[35]

The majority of the Texas newspapers remained confident in their belief that Walker would triumph. The editors often prefaced critical or unfavorable accounts with a warning that the article might be exaggerated. The Galveston Weekly News suggested that certain unflattering articles about Walker were "being made in certain quarters at the North to operate to the prejudice of Gen. Walker and his success in Central America; and that those influences have been made to bear upon President Pierce." The Marshall Texas Republican criticized the source of many reports since they originated from British sources at Greytown. The paper expressed its "great faith in the genius, valor, and intrepidity of Walker."[36]

While the allied armies encircled the Americans, the press in Texas maintained its positive attitude by finding

avenues in which to vent its anxieties. The Austin State Gazette condemned the native population and applauded American involvement by saying:

> They are ignorant, superstitious and arrogant, and opposed to all immigration of Americans, and to all improvements. In Central America the latter have become actually necessary, by reason of a transit route to California, and the spirit of civilization is forcing the event now transpiring.

The Galveston Weekly News believed that the former owners of the Accessory Transit Company were furnishing material aid to the Central Americans. The paper, however, ended on a high note by saying "that Walker will not only triumph over all the natives of Central America, but also over the New York monopolists."[37]

A few papers began to heed the ominous signs eminating from Nicaragua. The Clarksville Standard printed a negative opinion of Walker and his chances:

> We are waiting to hear something from the bold adventurer. Late accounts lead us to believe that his game is most played out. Late reinforcements may save him for the moment; but we apprehend that the waste of human life, necessary to maintain his position, is too great-that he has committed blunders in his internal and external policy; and that he has but the one qualification for his enterprise--undaunted courage; and is too reckless of his men.

The paper, however, believed Walker's expedition into Nicaragua was "the most gallant enterprise ever recorded since the days of Cortes and Pizarro." The Clarksville weekly declared

that Walker had instilled into Nicaragua the "germ of progress" while arousing "an intense hatred of the people of the United States . . . ." When the news arrived of Walker's flight from Nicaragua, most papers in Texas were unprepared for this event.[38]

By April Walker's position in Nicaragua had become tenuous at best. The transit route had been seized by Costa Rican troops, ending all hope for a relief expedition. Walker's position at Rivas was deplorable. Surrounded by the enemy, with food for only a few days, and men deserting daily, Walker was in no condition to make demands when on 30 April Captain Charles Henry Davis, United States Navy, contacted him. Davis told Walker that the Costa Ricans would permit the Americans to leave if Walker recapitulated. On 1 May 1857, Walker surrendered and left Nicaragua arriving in New Orleans on 27 May. Walker's first expedition to Nicaragua had ended.[39]

When the news of Walker's surrender arrived, a sense of loss appeared in the Texas press. The Austin State Gazette reported the news of the capitulation by saying that "the cause of Nicaragua is for the time defeated. Her sun has gone down. Gen. Walker has returned to the United States." The Austin weekly stated that the surrender "may be considered as terminating the Nicaraguan campaign." The Galveston Weekly News told of the surrender:

> The intelligence from Nicaragua is both interesting and curious. We were prepared to hear of the evacuation of Rivas by Gen. Walker, but did not expect him to surrender to an American naval officer.

The Marshall Texas Republican spoke of the hardships facing the Americans prior to the surrender without commenting on capitulation. All three newspapers spoke of the intense emotional outburst in New Orleans when the "conquering hero," Walker, returned.[40]

Upon arriving in the United States, Walker immediately set about organizing a second expedition which destroyed the unanimity present in the Texas press for the first filibustering expedition. Sectional sentiment became more apparent as editors endorsed Walker's new enterprise. Also, the timidity of some Texas newspapers disappeared as editors voiced their objections to Walker and filibustering in general. This show of disharmony in the Texas press had never materialized during the earlier filibustering expeditions. Walker's second attempt caused some newspapers to abandon their guise of support, while other weeklies inferred objections without dropping support.

The Galveston Weekly News continued to be the leader in extolling Walker's expedition. It envisioned Central America as the only hope for the South. The Galveston paper spoke of the expedition with expressions of manifest destiny quite evident:

> We believe the great question of slavery must be seriously affected, if not, in fact, controlled by the changes that are now going on and must, sooner or later, be consummated, in the territory of Central America and Mexico . . . . The present ignorant, indolent and semi-barbarous occupants of those rich and fertile regions that have for so many years been an unproductive wilderness, must, sooner or later, give way to a more enlightened race. Our Government may throw obstacles in the way, . . . but the spirit which animates them [filibusters] will still survive and finally triumph.

The weekly also stated that Walker had the support and endorsement "of many of the most prominent and influential men in the South . . . ."[41]

The question of slavery in Nicaragua for some Texas newspapers became the critical issue. Walker's decree of 1856 reinstating slavery had evoked little comment in the Texas press. After the collapse of the first expedition, slavery and its importance for the South became dominant themes in many Texas newspapers. Northern criticism of Walker was increasing while the country was engaged in a conflict over Kansas. Nicaragua, as a slaveholding country or as a slaveholding state, for many Texas weeklies became the only hope of salvation for the South. Walker, therefore, received greater support from some newspapers. Manifest destiny and the right to extend slavery into newly acquired territory became the key issues, and the press in Texas reacted against a northern threat to these rights.

Most Texas newspapers described Walker's subsequent attempts in terms of southern aspirations, and those newspapers which opposed Walker did not condemn those hopes.

The Austin State Gazette maintained this theme of southern salvation by continually expressing support for Walker. It expressed its sentiments on 8 August: "We hope the extention of Southern area will go on prosperously, and all our sympathies are with the friends of Nicaragua." The newspaper reported the organizing of a force at Galveston and spoke of the venture with dreams of southern aspirations:

> Our young men have a fine field in this new enterprise. For some years hence, great revolutions must necessarily take place in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean seas, wherein the Institutions of the South will be sustained and perpetuated.

The State Gazette, however, on 14 November clarified itself by saying:

> We will not conceal the fact that our sympathies have, all along, been with the "man of destiny," but we should regret, exceedingly, to see Gen. Walker make any move that would be in violation of our neutrality laws.[42]

In Texas the most adamant opponent to Walker was the Corpus Christi Nueces Valley. The paper's objections rested on opposition to war which the weekly felt was "too gloomy and sickening, even to sanctify the anticipated results." The Nueces Valley regarded the filibuster not as a hero but as a "reckless banditti" plundering the countryside. It asserted that:

> Central American advancement has been seriously retarded by the warlike movements--that a peaceful system of colonization would give the reigns of government into republican hands far sooner, more honorably, and satisfactorily than by the present course.

The Marshall Texas Republican quietly began to show signs of disenchantment when it published a list of American losses in Nicaragua. Without comment, the paper reported that 5,700 Americans had lost their lives in Walker's campaign.[43]

On 14 November 1857 Walker embarked upon his second expedition to conquer Nicaragua. The United States naval fleet in the area had orders to prevent Walker's landing but proved unable to stop the landing of 150 filibusters at Punta Arenas. Commodore Hiram Paulding, commander of the home squadron, interpreted his orders to read to prohibit the filibustering expedition. On 9 December, Paulding sent ashore 300 marines and trained the guns of three naval vessels on the filibusters. Walker, realizing the futility of resistance, surrendered to the American naval commander. Paulding placed Walker on board the Northern Light, and Walker returned to New York City on 27 December under his own recognizance.[44]

Most newspapers in Texas noted the sailing of the second Walker expedition without comment. The Corpus Christi Nueces Valley spoke cynically of the sloop of war Saratoga which "did not think proper to molest him." The Galveston Weekly News felt "exciting news" would soon be emanating

from Nicaragua. The news which the press received, of course, was the capture and surrender of the American filibusters.[45]

The actions of Commodore Paulding sparked sharp opinions in the Texas press. The newspapers, this time, either supported Walker or condemned filibustering. They based their stands on personal convictions and expressed them in a clear, concise manner. The Clarksville Standard felt Paulding was "grossly ignorant of the extent of his powers. . . [and] ought to be at once removed, as incompetent." The paper a few weeks later felt that Paulding believed his actions were correct; "nevertheless we think he should be reprimanded, at least."[46]

The Galveston Weekly News spoke of the arrest "as an outrage and insult to the South . . . ." The paper warned the South of the actions of the federal government:

> The recognition of slavery by Gen. Walker seems to have reversed the policy of our government . . . . We do not pretend to understand what may be the real policy of our government, but the demonstrations both to the North and the South of us, are of a kind to awaken the deepest interest in the slave States of this Union . . . .

It warned that Walker and Nicaragua were uniting the North against the South. The answer was all too obvious for the weekly:

> It is because here is a question (the Americanization of Central America,) which through the instrumentality of Walker

> might extend the domain of negro slavery. Such a question always unites northern public mind.[47]

The Austin State Gazette believed Commodore Paulding's actions wrong.

> This intermeddling of our navy officers with the affairs of other nations is highly to be deprecated, for it has almost uniformly occurred that the interference has been against those struggling for liberty, and in favor of the tyrant government which has sought to enslave the people and make them subservient tools and slaves of power.

The Austin weekly believed the time propitious for the abolition of the neutrality laws. The newspapers also envisioned Nicaragua as a struggle between the North and South.

> If filibusterism is to be opposed at the North only when it recognizes slavery . . . they [southerners] certainly would not feel much consciencious [sic] compunction in engaging in a little Southern, pro-slavery filibustering as an offset to Mr. Eli Thayer's Northern, abolition, blue-bellied-Yankee, nutmeg filibusterism.

The State Gazette predicted that an even bloodier Kansas would be Nicaragua's fate.[48]

The pro-Walker press in Texas maintained that the South was a united force behind filibustering. The Galveston Weekly News reported that they "have not yet seen any Southern paper of any party expressing any approval . . ." of President James Buchanan's condemnation of Walker. In reality the Texas press continued to be divided over Walker. The Marshall Texas Republican supported Buchanan for his

"wise and patriotic stand on this question . . ." and published articles from southern newspapers to show the divisions in the South on this issue. It finally in February of 1858 discarded its timidity and publicly proclaimed its opposition to filibustering.

> We are not advocate of [or] friend of filli-bustering [sic] ; but if we were, we do not think Gen. Walker the man for the occasion. His own friends admit that he is unacquainted with military science, while his civil career in Nicaragua proves him deficient in statesmanship. We regard him as nothing more than a reckless adventurer, seeking no other object than his own promotion . . . . And to consummate this work of folly, the lives of over 7,000 American citizens, it is estimated, have been sacrificed.

The paper concluded by saying that "we must aim at a higher standard of morals than that which sanctions individual enterprises gotten up from motives of cupidity or lawless ambition, designed to overthrow inferior governments, with which we are at peace." The Nueces Valley concurred with the Texas Republican that Buchanan was correct in his actions against Walker.[49]

Following his return to the United States, Walker would organize two more expeditions. The first set sail from Mobile Bay on 6 December 1859. Walker was not one of the 120 passengers on board the schooner Susan; instead, he chose to accompany the anticipated second wave. Unfortunately, on 16 December the schooner hit a sunken coral reef off the coast of the British colony of Belize. The British

rescued the Americans and transported them back to the United States. The third attempt evoked no comments in the Texas press.[50]

Walker's final expedition began on 16 June 1860 when he arrived on the island of Ruatan. Realizing British awareness of his presence, Walker decided to attack Trujillo, Honduras, with 110 men. On 5 August the American filibusters captured the town. The British, however, desired an end to the filibustering expedition. Two weeks later, the British warship Icaras arrived at Trujillo. Commander Norvell Salmon demanded the Americans capitulate, but Walker chose to retreat into the interior. On 3 September 1860, the British, along with Honduran forces, captured the American expedition. Walker surrendered to the British authorities, who incarcerated the men at Trujillo, and turned Walker over to the Honduran authorities, who ordered an immediate courtmartial. The Hondurans found Walker guilty and sentenced him to death. On 12 September 1860, Walker met death by firing squad in Honduras. His dream of conquest was at an end.[51]

The press in Texas paid little attention to Walker after his third fiasco. His autobiography, The War in Nicaragua, released in 1860, illustrated how disenchanted the public had become. The Marshall Texas Republican felt

Walker would have a difficult time selling the book. The newspaper commented: "The humbug of Nicaragua has had its run. The public want a new one, and a new man." The expedition also received little interest. Walker's debarkation received slight notices, while his death evoked little comment. The British abandonment of Walker "outraged" the Austin State Gazette but little else said. Most Texas newspapers reported only the events of his death without comment.[52]

By July of 1858, the press in Texas said little, if anything, about the expeditions to Nicaragua or the necessity of owning the country. Most papers became involved in the political issues of the day. National issues replaced Walker as the topic of interest. For instance, the State Gazette became a leading proponent for secession in 1860. Most of its editorials informed the readers of the opinions of southern leaders. It appears that Walker still interested the editors since they printed lengthy articles about his fourth expedition. These articles, however, were copies of those in New Orleans newspapers. The editors failed to set aside space to run editorials on Walker's death. The enthusiasm of the 1855 expedition had been lost by 1860 and only casual interest remained. The Texas press again was united--this time by a conspiracy of silence.

CHAPTER V ENDNOTES

[1]William O. Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers: The Story of William Walker and His Associates (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), pp. 82, 92.

[2]Ibid., p. 84.

[3]Ibid., pp. 84-85; Charles H. Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), p. 261.

[4]Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, pp. 85-86.

[5]Ibid., pp. 90-92; Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 268-70.

[6]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 273-74.

[7]Ibid., p. 276.

[8]Ibid., pp. 277-82; Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, pp. 109-10.

[9]Clarksville Standard, 30 June 1855, 14 July 1855, and 18 August 1855.

[10]Galveston Weekly News, 5 June 1855, 10 July 1855, and 17 July 1855.

[11]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 155, 257-59, 270-72.

[12]Clarksville Standard, 25 August 1855, 14 July 1855; Austin Texas State Gazette, 17 March 1855; Galveston Weekly News, 12 June 1855, 19 June 1855.

[13]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 272-73.

[14]Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, pp. 111-13.

[15]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 291-93; Galveston Weekly News, 9 October 1855.

[16]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 295-99.

[17]Ibid., pp. 300-1.

[18]Ibid., p. 302.

[19]Galveston Weekly News, 13 November 1855, 25 November 1855; Clarksville Standard, 22 December 1855.

[20]Clarksville Standard, 15 December 1855; Laurence Greene, The Filibuster: The Career of William Walker (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Publishers, 1937), pp. 128-33.

[21]Galveston Weekly News, 4 December 1855, 18 December 1855, and 25 December 1855; Clarksville Standard, 19 January 1856.

[22]Clarksville Standard, 8 March 1856; Galveston Weekly News, 1 January 1856, 15 January 1856.

[23]Austin State Gazette, 23 February 1856, 1 March 1856.

[24]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 315-16, 321.

[25]Ibid., p. 324.

[26]Austin State Gazette, 5 April 1856; Clarksville Standard, 29 March 1856, 22 March 1856; Galveston Weekly News, 18 March 1856, 11 March 1856.

[27]Marshall Texas Republican, 3 May 1856; Clarksville Standard, 3 May 1856.

[28]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 319, 328-29, 335-36; Galveston Weekly News, 29 April 1856; Marshall Texas Republican, 10 May 1856; Austin State Gazette, 17 May 1856, 14 June 1856.

[29]Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, pp. 197-201.

[30]Austin State Gazette, 26 July 1856; Galveston Weekly News, 22 July 1856.

[31]Galveston Weekly News, 17 August 1856, 22 April 1856.

[32]Galveston Weekly News, 27 May 1856; Marshall Texas Republican, 10 May 1856.

[33]Galveston Weekly News, 27 May 1856; Austin State Gazette, 17 May 1856, 7 June 1856.

[34]Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, p. 250.

[35]Marshall Texas Republican, 19 July 1856; Galveston Weekly News, 5 August 1856, 30 September 1856.

[36]Galveston Weekly News, 30 December 1856; Marshall Texas Republican, 7 February 1857.

[37]Austin State Gazette, 21 February 1857; Galveston Weekly News, 3 February 1857.

[38]Clarksville Standard, 10 January 1857, 21 February 1857.

[39]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 404-7; Scroggs, Filibusters and Financiers, pp. 294-99.

[40]Austin State Gazette, 6 June 1857, 13 June 1857; Galveston Weekly News, 2 June 1857, 9 June 1857; Marshall Texas Republican, 6 June 1857.

[41]Galveston Weekly News, 26 September 1857, 11 August 1857.

[42]Austin State Gazette, 8 August 1857, 19 September 1857, and 14 November 1857.

[43]Corpus Christi Nueces Valley, 10 October 1857; Marshall Texas Republican, 3 October 1857.

[44]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 414-19; Greene, The Filibuster, pp. 305-7.

[45]Corpus Christi Nueces Valley, 19 December 1857; Galveston Weekly News, 24 November 1857.

[46]Clarksville Standard, 9 January 1857, 23 January 1857.

[47]Galveston Weekly News, 5 January 1858, 16 February 1858.

[48]Austin State Gazette, 16 January 1858, 27 March 1858.

[49]Marshall Texas Republican, 20 February 1858, 6 February 1858; Corpus Christi Nueces Valley, 23 January 1858.

[50]Brown, Agents of Manifest Destiny, pp. 430-32.

[51]Ibid., pp. 449-55.

[52]Marshall Texas Republican, 28 April 1860; Austin State Gazette, 13 October 1860.

CHAPTER VI

THE SILENT MINORITY

The decade of the 1850s saw the Texas press separate into two opposing groups on the issue of filibustering. The basis for this division was the personal beliefs of the editors regarding the role filibustering should have in society. Throughout the decade, the debate over the three fundamental issues involved in filibustering evoked strong opinions. Although a lust for wealth drove most filibusters, the press justified territorial expansion along altruistic lines. By 1858, however, a few newspapers discarded this argument and condemned filibusters as lawless bands of ruffians plundering peaceful neighbors. The persecution complex which the South exhibited in the 1850s is evident in the staunch sectional arguments adopted by a few newspapers. The filibusters, for them, became the "saviours" of the South. Throughout the decade, the papers gradually drifted from a consensus in 1850 to discord by the date of William Walker's third attempt on Nicaragua in 1858.

This dissension was not evident when Narciso Lopez attempted to liberate Cuba. The press seems to have proclaimed altruistic motives for the filibusters' actions in

an attempt to convince the public that these men were not outlaws but heroes, risking their lives to free an oppressed people. The press never condemned the filibusters for their actions. Instead, their wrath centered on the constant interference from the United States government and on Cuban inactivity. The principles of the United States, the papers contended, allowed a person to join a revolution against an oppressive regime. The newspapers upheld the right to invade a foreign country and the right of the United States to expand into this area. The press discussed the sectional implications but quietly. The Texas press still regarded filibustering as a national endeavor, not a southern campaign for existence.

The Carvajal expeditions into Mexico sparked no dissent in the Texas press. Again the Texas press defended the expeditions on altruistic grounds. The racial overtones, however, were more evident during this period of 1851 to 1852. The superiority of the American over the Mexican justified involvement. The press spoke of the benefits which would befall the "lowly" Mexican if Mexico should become a part of the United States, although some newspapers did not describe annexation as an objective. When Carvajal failed in his quest, the newspapers condemned the Mexican as being unworthy of American attention. Sectional controversies failed to become a major rallying point in the press

at this time. Also, the press continued to condemn the government's attempts to prohibit the various expeditions.

The notoriety of the William Walker expeditions forced the Texas press to take a stand for or against filibustering. This course, however, did not seem apparent in 1855 when Walker launched his first attempt. The Texas press seemed united in support for Walker. The sectional issue between North and South became a rallying point for some newspapers. The formerly moderate Austin State Gazette and the Clarksville Standard became vehement in their support for Walker by 1858. Walker's proclamation reinstating slavery in Nicaragua, however, evoked little comment. The Austin State Gazette spoke only of the decree, not of its implications.[1] Possibly, the press in Texas avoided comment on the issue in 1856 to alleviate any northern criticism of Walker's regime.

When Walker failed in his second attempt to conquer Nicaragua, opposition to filibustering began to develop. A few newspapers realized that the Nicaragua cause was hopeless. The arguments against Walker, however, took a new direction as newspapers began to condemn the filibuster and his enterprise. Previously the press had held the filibuster aloof from the argument, but now he became the center of the criticism. Those newspapers which condemned the practice spoke of the participants not in glowing terms but

in defamatory words. From the reasons stated for their opposition, it appears that those newspapers which withheld their condemnation during the Lopez, Carvajal, and the first Walker expeditions did so in anticipation that those men would be successful. Only after success seemed impossible did those newspapers speak out. During the decade of the 1850s, a minority of the Texas press opposed filibustering for personal reasons but remained silent out of fear of humiliation and intimidation from their peers. The reticent newspapers, however, were loyal to the South and supported southern positions. As other issues, such as the presidential election of 1860, became more critical, the Texas newspapers lost interest in the filibusters. If the filibusters had achieved their objectives, interest would not have waned so drastically.

CHAPTER VI ENDNOTES

[1] *Austin State Gazette*, 8 November 1856.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Newspapers

Austin Texas State Gazette, 1849-55.

Austin State Gazette, 1855-60.

Clarksville Northern Standard, 1849-52.

Clarksville Standard, 1852-60.

Corpus Christi Nueces Valley, 1857-58.

Galveston Weekly News, 1849-59.

Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register, 1849-51.

Houston Telegraph and Texas Register, 1851-52.

San Antonio Herald, 1855.

Marshall Texas Republican, 1849-60.

Reference Works

Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language, 2 ed., S.V. "filibuster."

SECONDARY WORKS

Monographs

Allen, Harry C. Great Britain and the United States: A History of Anglo-American Relations, 1783-1952. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1955.

Bannon, John Francis. The Spanish Borderlands Frontier: 1513-1821. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Binkley, William C. The Texas Revolution. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952.

Brack, Gene M. Mexico Views Manifest Destiny, 1821-1846: An Essay on the Origins of the Mexican War. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1975.

Brown, Charles H. Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Caldwell, Robert Granville. The Lopez Expeditions to Cuba: 1848-1851. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915.

Ford, John Salmon. Rip Ford's Texas. Edited by Stephen B. Oates. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

Franklin, John Hope. The Militant South, 1800-1861. Boston: Beacon Press, 1956.

Garber, Paul Neff. The Gadsden Treaty. Philadelphia: Press of the University of Pennsylvania, 1923.

Greene, Laurence. The Filibuster: The Career of William Walker. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Publishers, 1937.

Hafen, Leroy R., and Rister, Carl Coke. Western America: The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1941.

Hughes, William J. Rebellious Ranger: Rip Ford and the Old Southwest. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.

Langley, Lester D. The Cuban Policy of the United States: A Brief History. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Logan, John A., Jr. No Transfer: An American Security Principle. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Marsland, William D., and Marsland, Amy L. Venezuela Through Its History. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1954.

May, Robert E. The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire: 1854-1861. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.

Merk, Frederick. History of the Westward Movement. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

_____. Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Rauch, Basil. American Interest in Cuba: 1848-1855. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Robertson, William Spence. The Life of Miranda. 2 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1929.

Roche, James Jeffrey. The Story of the Filibusters. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891.

Scroggs, William O. Filibusters and Financiers: The Story of William Walker and His Associates. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.

Stambaugh, J. Lea, and Stambaugh, Lillian J. The Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1954.

Tebeau, Charlton W. A History of Florida. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971.

Thorning, Joseph F. Francisco De Miranda: World Citizen. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1952.

Vigness, David M. The Revolutionary Decades. The Saga of Texas Series, edited by Seymour V. Connor, vol. 2. Austin: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1965.

Warren, Harris Gaylord. The Sword Was Their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943.

Webb, Walter Prescott. The Texas Rangers: A Century of Frontier Defense. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1935.

Weinberg, Albert K. Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History. 1935. Reprint. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

Wyllys, Rufus Kay. The French in Sonora, 1850-1854: The Story of the French Adventures from California into Mexico. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932.

Articles

Boyd, Consuelo. "Forgotten Filibuster." Journal of Arizona History 20(1979):7-26.

Broussard, Ray. "Governor John A. Quitman and the Lopez Expeditions of 1851-1852." Journal of Mississippi History 28(1966):103-20.

Davenport, Harbert. "General Jose Maria Jesus Carabajal." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 55(1952):475-83.

Devereaux, Linda Ericson. "Philip Nolan and His 'Wild Horses.'" Texana 12(1974):88-100.

Jordan, H. Glenn. "Philip Nolan: Trader or Filibuster?" Texana 12(1974):264-75.

Lambert, Paul F. "The Movement for the Acquisition of All Mexico." Journal of the West 11(1972):317-27.

McLeod, Martin. "The Diary of Martin McLeod." Edited by Grace Lee Nute. Minnesota History Bulletin 4(1932): 351-439.

May, Robert E. "John A. Quitman and the Southern Martial Spirit." Journal of Mississippi History 41(1979): 155-81.

Metcalf, Helen Broughall. "The California French Filibusters in Sonora." California Historical Society Quarterly 18(1939):3-21.

Nasatir, Abraham P. "Guillaume Patrice Dillon." California Historical Society Quarterly 35(1956):309-24.

Nute, Grace Lee. "James Dickson: A Filibuster in Minnesota in 1836." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 10 (1923):127-40.

Pratt, Julius. "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny,'" American Historical Review 32(1927):795-98.

Rippy, J. Fred. "Anglo-American Filibusters and the Gadsden Treaty." Hispanic American Historical Review 5(1922): 155-80.

_____. "Border Troubles Along the Rio Grande, 1848-1860." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 23(1919):91-111.

Shearer, Ernest C. "The Callahan Expedition, 1855." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 54(1950):430-51.

_____. "The Carvajal Disturbances." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 55(1951):201-30.

Stout, Joe A., Jr. "Henry A. Crabb--Filibuster or Colonizer?: The Story of an Ill-Starred Gringo Entrada." American West 8(1971):4-9.

_____. "Idealism or Manifest Destiny?: Filibustering in Northwestern Mexico, 1850-1863." Journal of the West 11(1972):348-60.

_____. "Joseph C. Morehead and Manifest Destiny: A Filibuster in Sonora, 1851." Pacific Historian 15(1971): 62-71.

Tyler, Ronnie C. "The Callahan Expedition of 1855: Indians or Negroes?" Southwestern Historical Quarterly 70 (1967): 574-85.

Urban, C. Stanley. "The Africanization of Cuba Scare: 1853-1855." Hispanic American Historical Review 37 (1957):29-45.

_____. "New Orleans and the Cuban Question During the Lopez Expeditions of 1849-1851: A Local Study of 'Manifest Destiny.'" Louisiana Historical Quarterly 22(1938):1095-1167.

Warren, Harris Gaylord. "The Origin of General Mina's Invasion of Mexico." Southwestern Historical Quarterly 42(1938):1-20.

Wyllys, Rufus Kay. "The Filibusters of Amelia Island." Georgia Historical Quarterly 12(1928):297-325.

_____. "The French of California and Sonora." Pacific Historical Review 1(1932):337-59.

_____. "Henry A. Crabb--A Tragedy of the Sonora Frontier." Pacific Historical Review 9(1940):183-94.