

3-1986

The Texas Press and William Walker in Nicaragua

Jeffrey A. Zemler

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

[Tell us](#) how this article helped you.

Recommended Citation

Zemler, Jeffrey A. (1986) "The Texas Press and William Walker in Nicaragua," *East Texas Historical Journal*: Vol. 24 : Iss. 1 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol24/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in East Texas Historical Journal by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu.

THE TEXAS PRESS AND WILLIAM WALKER IN NICARAGUA

by Jeffrey A. Zemler

Nicaragua in 1855 was a country torn apart by constant civil strife. The country was ripe for a filibustering expedition. William Walker's arrival in Nicaragua was not a hastily conceived idea, but a well negotiated plan designed to take advantage of the political turmoil. After receiving a colonization grant from the Francisco Castellon government, Walker arrived in the Central American country and quickly began to establish himself in that war-torn area.¹

Walker's first military engagement occurred on June 29, 1855. The attack centered on the town of Rivas. 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, commandeered a schooner and sailed to Realejo. Walker's first military action in Nicaragua had ended in failure.²

Few newspapers in Texas noticed Walker's early exploits. Instead, the James Callahan expedition and 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 Castellon (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.³

The *Galveston Weekly News* was less cautious in describing the Walker expedition. Walker's arrival was to be the signal for the eruption 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 loss on the Nicaraguans, not on Walker. The Americans were

Jeffrey A. Zemler lives in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

"betrayed," the weekly reported, when the Nicaraguans "fled, leaving Walker and his men to fight it out as best they could."⁴

One reason for the cautious attitude of the *Standard* and other Texas newspapers was the sailing of the Henry L. Kinney expedition to Nicaragua. For years Kinney had been a land developer in Texas. He became interested in Nicaragua when he acquired a questionable land grant to over 22 million acres in the Mosquito territory. Kinney organized the Central American Land and Mining Company to colonize his acreage. 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 April 29, 1855.⁵

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.⁶

Walker continued his drive to subdue Nicaragua despite his defeat at Rivas. After a victory at Virgin Bay, Walker returned to San Juan del Sur, where he learned from Legitimist deserters that General Poncian Corral had left Granada to reorganize the Legitimist forces in Rivas. Realizing the vulnerable position of the capital, Walker decided to attack Granada. On October 11, 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 October 13, 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 October 14, 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.⁷

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 November 27, 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 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 savior 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.⁸

On December 4, 1855 the *Galveston Weekly News* claimed 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 December 8, 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.⁹

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 1000 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 conforms 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.¹⁰

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.¹¹

In March, the attention of the Texas press and citizens turned towards Nicaragua with increasing interest. On March 4, Costa Rica instigated military operations against Nicaragua. The war lasted two months, then Costa Rica withdrew from Nicaragua and saved 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 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 *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."¹²

The withdrawal of the Costa Rican forces from Rivas on April 26,

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*, witnessing the end of hostilities in Nicaragua, noted that the South was "deeply concerned in the stability and prosperity of Walker's government in Nicaragua."¹³

The form of Walker's government drastically changed on June 29, 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 June 29. Before the elections could be held Rivas fled into the interior and organized clandestine operations against Walker. Walker, nevertheless, proceeded with the election. On June 29, 1856, the people of Nicaragua elected Walker president of Nicaragua despite increasing native resistance.¹⁴

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."¹⁵

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, 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 filibusters [sic]. They have other and nobler aspirations. Good government, wise and salutary laws, a protection of life and property, follow their movements.

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 press envisioned manifest destiny as being stronger than the neutrality laws.¹⁶

While the newspapers in Texas discussed the merits of filibustering, Walker became embroiled in a second war that would eventually force him to flee Nicaragua. On July 18, 1856 the nations bordering Nicaragua entered into an alliance against Walker. Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, 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.¹⁷

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 9000 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:

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.¹⁸

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 in the North to operate to the prejudice of General 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."¹⁹

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:

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."²⁰

A few papers began to heed the ominous signs emanating 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.²¹

The word of Walker's surrender evoked a sense of loss in the Texas press. The *Austin State Gazette* reported the news of the capitulation by saying that "the course of Nicaragua is for the time defeated. Her sun has gone down. General 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 General 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.²²

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" ²³

The question of slavery in Nicaragua became the critical issue for some Texas newspapers. 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 August 8: "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 November 14, clarified itself:

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 General Walker make any move that would be in violation of our neutrality laws.²⁴

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 5700 Americans had lost their lives in Walker's campaign.²⁵

On November 14, 1857 Walker embarked upon his second expedition to conquer Nicaragua. 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.²⁶

The actions of Commodore Hiram 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."²⁷

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 General 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.²⁸

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 conscientious [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.²⁹

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. Finally in February of 1858 it discarded its timidity and publicly proclaimed its opposition to filibustering.

We are not advocate of [or] friend of filibustering [sic]; but if we were, we do not think General 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 7000 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.³⁰

Following his return to the United States, Walker organized two more expeditions. The first set sail from Mobile Bay on December 6, 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 December 16 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.³¹

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." His fourth and final 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.³²

By July 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 fortuity of silence.

NOTES

¹William O. Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers: The Story of William Walker and His Associates* (New York, 1916), pp. 82, 84-86, 92; Charles H. Brown, *Agents of Manifest Destiny: The Lives and Times of the Filibusters* (Chapel Hill, 1980), pp. 261.

¹Brown, *Agents of Manifest Destiny*, pp. 277-82; Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, pp. 109-10.

²*Clarksville Standard*, 30 June 1855, 14 July 1855, and 18 August 1855.

⁴*Galveston Weekly News*, 5 June 1855, 10 July 1855, and 17 July 1855.

⁵Brown, *Agents of Manifest Destiny*, pp. 155, 257-59, 270-72.

⁶*Clarksville Standard*, 25 August 1855, 14 July 1855; *Austin Texas State Gazette*, 17 March 1855; *Galveston Weekly News*, 12 June 1855, 19 June 1855.

⁷Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, pp. 111-13; Brown, *Agents of Manifest Destiny*, pp. 291-93, 295-99; *Galveston Weekly News*, 9 October 1855.

⁸*Galveston Weekly News*, 13 November 1855, 25 November 1855; *Clarksville Standard*, 22 December 1855.

⁹*Galveston Weekly News*, 4 December, 18 December 1855, and 25 December 1855; *Clarksville Standard*, 19 January 1856.

¹⁰*Clarksville Standard*, 8 March 1856; *Galveston Weekly News*, 1 January 1856, 15 January 1856.

¹¹*Austin State Gazette*, 23 February 1856, 1 March 1856.

¹²*Marshall Texas Republican*, 3 May 1856; *Clarksville Standard*, 3 May 1856.

¹³Brown, *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.

¹⁴Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, pp. 197-201.

¹⁵*Austin State Gazette*, 26 July 1856; *Galveston Weekly News*, 22 July 1856.

¹⁶*Galveston Weekly News*, 27 May 1856; *Marshall Texas Republican*, 10 May 1856; *Austin State Gazette*, 17 May 1856, 7 June 1856.

¹⁷Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, p. 250.

¹⁸*Marshall Texas Republican*, 19 July 1856; *Galveston Weekly News*, 5 August 1856, 30 September 1856.

¹⁹*Galveston Weekly News*, 30 December 1856; *Marshall Texas Republican*, 7 February 1857.

²⁰*Austin State Gazette*, 21 February 1857; *Galveston Weekly News*, 3 February 1857.

²¹*Clarksville Standard*, 10 January 1857, 21 February 1857.

²²*Austin State Gazette*, 6 June 1857, 13 June 1857; *Galveston Weekly News*, 2 June 1857, 9 June 1857; *Marshall Texas Republican*, 6 June 1857.

²³*Galveston Weekly News*, 26 September 1857, 11 August 1857.

²⁴*Austin State Gazette*, 8 August 1857, 19 September 1857, and 14 November 1857.

²⁵*Corpus Christi Nueces Valley*, 10 October 1857; *Marshall Texas Republican*, 3 October 1857.

²⁶*Corpus Christi Nueces Valley*, 19 December 1857; *Galveston Weekly News*, 24 November 1857.

²⁷*Clarksville Standard*, 9 January 1857, 23 January 1857.

²⁸*Galveston Weekly News*, 5 January 1858, 16 February 1858.

²⁹*Austin State Gazette*, 16 January 1858, 27 March 1858.

³⁰*Marshall Texas Republican*, 20 February 1858, 6 February 1858; *Corpus Christi Nueces Valley*, 23 January 1858.

³¹Brown, *Agents of Manifest Destiny*, pp. 430-32.

³²*Marshall Texas Republican*, 28 April 1860; *Austin State Gazette*, 13 October 1860.