

10-1994

A Common Bond: Masonic Intrigues in East Texas

Robert W. Kesting

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



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

Tell us how this article helped you.

Recommended Citation

Kesting, Robert W. (1994) "A Common Bond: Masonic Intrigues in East Texas," *East Texas Historical Journal*: Vol. 32: Iss. 2, Article 7.
Available at: <http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol32/iss2/7>

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 administrator of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu.

A COMMON BOND: MASONIC INTRIGUES IN EAST TEXAS

by Robert W. Kesting

The impact of Freemasonry upon East Texas History usually begins with the arrival of Stephen F. Austin and the founding of his colony. But deliberate Masonic penetration of the disputed East Texas border occurred much earlier. Nevertheless, there are some available sources which suggest Freemasonry was not only a benevolent, teaching, and social organization on the western frontier, but an ardent and active political institution which secretly assisted in the demise of European domination of the Western Hemisphere. In 1836, Masonic philosophy would also serve as the intellectual stimuli for the rebellion against Mexico, and the eventual establishment of the Republic of Texas.

Unlike other medieval institutions in Europe, the Masonic transition was easily made to modern times because it adopted tenets which were important to contemporary societies. By 1717, European Freemasons adopted the Grand Lodge System, and had attracted political philosophers and other intellectuals into the institution. These important, but subtle changes, also were incorporated within their colonial lodges.

During the eighteenth century in Anglo-America, European conflicts placed more demands upon Anglo-American Masons for manpower, money, and material to support the wars. These demands combined with oppressive restrictions against European Freemasonry, which was incompatible with the theory of the divine right of kings, were perceived as harmful to all mankind. Freemasons believed that all men had inalienable rights, governments should be subservient to the will of the people, governments must function independent from religious institutions, and governments should be empowered to protect human rights (individualism, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness). Therefore, Anglo-Americans continued to turn to Freemasonry as a philosophic weapon against authoritarianism. It would be incorrect to conclude that Freemasonry solely was responsible for the American Revolution, but it would be an even greater mistake to conclude that it had no part in bringing it about.

From 1776 to 1783, Freemasons represented approximately two-tenths of one percent of the Anglo-American population. From this minority, some representatives of the wealthy, educated, and unfortunates of Anglo-American society conspired to separate themselves from the "Modern" Grand Lodge of England. These Masons also appeared as active participants in revolutionary activities. They secretly planned rebellion, encouraged military recruits to join several military lodges formed during the war, ensured secrecy in the plans of military campaigns and the fidelity of their executions, were selected as members of political committees of correspon-

dence, led propaganda campaigns which nurtured widespread anarchy, and formed a Continental Congress in which thirty-one of fifty-six (55%) of its members were Freemasons. Some well-known Masons were Samuel Adams, Paul Revere, John Hancock, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Peyton Randolph, Killiaen Van Rensselaer, Patrick Henry, Aaron Burr, Nathaniel Greene, Thomas Payne, Robert Morris, Anthony Wayne, James Otis, Alexander Hamilton, George Clinton, John Locke, Henry Knox, Richard Henry Lee, Henry Dearborn, James Madison, George Clinton, James Monroe, and James A. Wilkinson. Most became well-known leaders during the Early National Period.

Meanwhile, some Masons orchestrated a political agenda which was synonymous with Masonic political philosophy. Moreover, Masonry in the United States was unified and strictly loyal to American democratic ideals. Probably, the war only hastened the growth and evolution of American Freemasonry, which became antagonistic toward aristocracies. Furthermore, the American frontier made it possible for Anglo-American Freemasons to solidly establish themselves on the principles of equality, toleration, and fraternal brotherhood free from the restrictions of class distinctions and privileges which prevailed in Europe. Washington allegedly stated, "Masonry and its lessons were helpful [to him] throughout the Revolution, both upon the battlefield and in the Legislative Assembly."

After the war, some of the aforementioned Masons drafted the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. They implemented our Federal system based on a limited democracy. They also were elected or appointed to high-level civilian or military positions.¹ Some even masterminded and selected other Masons, such as Meriwether Lewis, William Clark, John Hamilton Robinson, Zebulon Montgomery Pike, William Dunbar, George Hunter, Edward Turner, Richard Sparks, Walter Burling, and Daniel Hughes to lead secret quasi-military and military expeditions into disputed East Texas and other lands claimed by New Spain.² Other western Masons, such as Rufus Easton, Henry Clay, Joseph H. Daviess, Edward Livingston, Thomas Cushing, Charles Cole Claiborne, Isaac Shelby, Andrew Jackson, Stephen F. Austin, David G. Burnet, and Sam Houston brought with them valuable lessons learned from postwar frontier experiences.³

Yet, Frontier-Masons and non-Masons, who settled in the trans-Appalachian territories during the 1780s and 1790s, were subjected to European intrigues, lack of security from Indian attacks, political depravity, and seemingly economic ruin. European governments made some unsuccessful attempts to reclaim western lands by recruiting loyalists, and even filibuster (adventurer)-Masons such as George Rogers Clarke. Some trans-Appalachian Freemasons probably perceived that the brotherhood back East had abandoned them to the Indians, land speculators, the whims of European monarchs, and eventually a dictator. Some declared openly for separation. Particularly, they felt oppressed by the Spanish Crown, which

controlled the navigation of the Mississippi River.⁴ But more importantly, American Freemasons probably began to formulate strategies in order to limit European domination of the Western Hemisphere.

Frontier Masons as well as non-Masons differed on methods to solve the Spanish dilemma. Some agreed that Spain should be aggressively removed from the Mississippi River, the port of New Orleans, and the Floridas. Others believed in diplomatic and cautious approaches to eliminate the Spanish presence. The Treaty of San Lorenzo in 1795 (also known as Pinckney's Treaty) temporarily halted plots to extricate Spain from the Louisiana Territory.⁵

Ideally, the political program of American Freemasonry possibly called for the infusion of democracy, and the establishment of constitutional forms of government in the Western Hemisphere based on the American model. Jefferson summed up their political goal when he said that "[Cuba's and New Spain's] interests and ours [are] the same, and that the object of both must be to exclude all European influence from this [Western] Hemisphere."⁶ This, combined with their insatiable appetite for more lands and the perceived riches contained therein, caused some Masons to mix Pan-Americanism and nationalism with self-aggrandizement. This infectious desire also spread to non-Masons. Some Masons masterminded covert filibuster, quasi-military, military expeditions, and diplomatic operations with the object of inciting rebellion within New Spain, or the forceful removal of an increasingly and seemingly weak Spanish Government which was steadfastly supported by the Roman Catholic Church. Initially, the Louisiana Territory, the Floridas, and the eastern Internal Provinces (*Provincias Internas*), which included East Texas, were targeted.⁷

Perhaps the first glimpse of Freemason activity in the Louisiana Territory was from Don Luis Penalver, Bishop of Louisiana. In a letter from Minister Caballero to Minister Coruel dated in 1799, Penalver reported:

... emigration from the western part of America, and the tolerance of sectarians have brought a mob of adventurers to the colony who know not God or religion ... In one of the suburbs of the city a [Freemason] lodge has been formed in which are enrolled [Spanish] officers of the garrison, officers of the royal treasury, merchants, [and] countrymen both natives and foreigners ...

... those same adventurers have spread through the districts of Atacapas, Opelusas, Ouachita, and Natchitoches ... they are furnishing their hunters and Indians with arms; they hold conversations and impress mischievous thoughts on their hearers [listeners] ... They have a custom of patting their children on the shoulder when the latter are very robust and saying to them "You will go to New Spain"...

...the same thing is taking place on the upper Mississippi, in the Illinois district and its vicinity, where there has been a remarkable introduction of those adventurers who are penetrating into the interior toward New Spain ...

... the governor be advised to destroy the lodge ...⁸

Perhaps the bishop's report was somewhat of an exaggeration to inspire Spanish bureaucrats to action, but the Masonic movement on the frontier

was not totally confined to land-starved Anglo-Americans. Obviously, the establishment of chartered or clandestine lodges were necessary in order to conduct successful operations within Spanish territory.⁹ Moreover, Freemasonry was a threat to the Catholic Church, which was the antithesis of the individualistic philosophy of Freemasonry. The Catholic Church orchestrated some anti-Masonic actions and laws in Europe during the eighteenth century.¹⁰ Probably, these oppressive actions were conveyed to American Masons. Furthermore, it is curious that some Spanish officials equated adventurers (filibusters) with Freemasons.

Philip Nolan, a native of Belfast Ireland, was well-known for his knowledge of the Indians, horse-trading, and his ability to be hired by anyone who had money to pay him. He helped James A. Wilkinson, Spanish agent and commander of the U.S. Army in the West, liquidate some of his Kentucky real estate to pay creditors. Nolan also was aware of Wilkinson's Achilles heel, which was to live beyond his means. From 1792 to 1801, Nolan also made several trips into the Spanish Borderland of Texas. His purpose was to trade in contraband. With the aid of his Spanish passport, which was received from the Spanish governor at New Orleans for doing jobs for the Crown such as transporting Spain's pension money to Wilkinson, he traveled back and forth unimpeded. Despite Spanish trade restrictions, Nolan continued his operations and lived with his mistress in Nacogdoches. He also lived in San Antonio until he came under suspicion for being a spy. Nolan observed that Texas contained an abundance of wild horses and mules. In New Orleans, these mustangs were very profitable for each head delivered.¹¹ Nolan probably offered Wilkinson an opportunity to become a silent partner. Wilkinson, perhaps desired more.

Wilkinson and Nolan presumably devised a plan for an armed invasion of Texas utilizing friendly Indians.¹² A possible alternative was for Nolan's party to infiltrate Texas legitimately disguised as horse traders when in fact their mission was to spy. Also, their capture might have been perceived as possibly causing a border conflict which would force United States military intervention. Nolan and other filibusters probably were frustrated with the Spanish monopoly system which imposed rigid trade restrictions, and also the Spanish generally discriminated against foreign nationals who wanted to trade in Spanish Territory. Yet, Spanish government restrictions to Americans, especially western Freemasons, probably infringed upon their fundamental democratic rights and principles, particularly that of free trade.

In 1800, Nolan visited President Thomas Jefferson, carrying a letter of introduction written and endorsed by Wilkinson, which tried to entice the president into supporting the proposed armed invasion into East Texas. Jefferson's policy of neutrality was immediately made clear to the filibuster. A disappointed Nolan decided to submit the plan to the English, who also rejected it.¹³ Without proper support Wilkinson probably perceived his continued participation was unwise, and decided to disassociate himself from Nolan.

Nolan, accompanied by some former soldiers in Wilkinson's command, invaded Spanish Territory and established their encampment near Nacogdoches. In 1801, a combined Spanish force of regulars, militia, and allied Indians were dispatched to Nolan's camp. After a brief skirmish, Nolan was killed and the remainder of his party became captives of the Spanish Crown.¹⁴ The only known Mason to participate directly in this expedition was David Fero, who was second-in-command to Nolan.¹⁵

After the sale of the Louisiana Territory to the United States, some former Spanish and French subjects residing in the newly purchased American Territory perceived that they were betrayed by the French for the retrocession, and were angered by the immediate sale of the territory to the Americans. Some envisioned economic ruin and diminished status in the new order. Therefore, some plotted to overthrow the American government. Additionally, most Spanish subjects were concerned that American expansionism would not end at the disputed borders. Both countries claimed the same lands. Americans, however, attempted to capitalize by claiming all lands and confluences extending to the Rio Grande and west of the Mississippi Rivers. Also, illegal American emigrants (squatters, criminals, and slaves) continued to cross Spanish borders in ever increasing numbers, which fomented additional animosity between the governments.¹⁶ On November 20, 1803, Wilkinson dispatched a man named Cushing up the Red River to occupy that area. Cushing was the first American Mason to legally step foot on East Texas soil.¹⁷

Nemesio Salcedo, Commandant-General of the Internal Provinces of New Spain, both feared and distrusted American intentions because he was aware of their strategy for conquest. He wrote to Joaquin Del Real Alencaster, governor of New Mexico:

... it [the United States] assigns its defense and security to the Yndian [Indian] tribes which inhabi [inhabit] the Frontiers ... from which follows a division of said tribes ... toward one another ... and [by] sending them firearms and ammunition ... [so] they will declare themselves our enemies ... the same thing that the said Government did on its former frontiers with respect to the Prov. of Luisiana [Louisiana] ...
... [when] the expedition of Captain Merri [Merriwether Lewis] returns ... they [the Pawnee Indians] would intercept it ...¹⁸

Salcedo's suspicions continued to mount, when Casa Calvo, Spanish minister in New Orleans, gave his approval for the William Dunbar expedition, which supposedly was for scientific and geographic exploration of the headwaters of the Colorado [Red] and Arkansas Rivers. Salcedo's reply to Casa Calvo establishes the reason for Zebulon Montgomery Pike's subsequent capture in 1806:

... that an expedition [ordered by the President of the United States] in charge by Guillermo Dumber [William Dunbar] should go to reconnoiter to their sources the Rivers Colorado [Red] and San Francisco [Arkansas] ... its object is purely geographical and scientific ... but I, considering

[the operation] both unnecessary and very dangerous to the Interests of our Government, not only do not give my permission for you to aid the operation, but I must protest against your doing so ...
 ... the expedition of Mr. Merri [Merriwether Lewis] along the River Misuri [Missouri] besides reconnoitering that River to its source ... had the concealed end of capturing the good will of the heathen nations ..."¹⁹

Meanwhile, Henry Dearborn, Secretary of War, authorized Wilkinson to use spies after an attempted Spanish military coup in the Louisiana Territory had failed. He was particularly concerned about Spanish mobilization within East Texas:

In consequence of the information ... to certain movements completed by the officers of the Spanish Government in Louisiana and its vicinity, it is deemed proper to take suitable measures for ascertaining the existing state of things relative to any contemplated military operation ... [this] will result in satisfactory intelligence ... within the boundaries of Louisiana, between the Rio Bravo [Rio Grande] and our advanced posts to the westward of the Mississippi; from the Red River to the borders of the Bay [Gulf] of Mexico, especially at Nacagdoches [Nacogdoches] and the Bay of St. Bernard [Matagorda]. It will be particularly desirable to know what is doing at St. [San] Antonio.

Dearborn further suggested that "individuals in the character of hunters or traders, may probably be employed with secrecy and success."²⁰ Dearborn was reacting to alarming reports submitted by Wilkinson, who also was sending similar communications to Spanish officials in order to ignite a border war. Probably, this was part of a grand strategy planned by Aaron Burr, former vice-president of the United States, and Wilkinson to separate some western states in order to establish a republic under their leadership. They also conspired to invade the Spanish stronghold of Vera Cruz.²¹

From June 27 to September 7, 1805, Wilkinson reported to Dearborn that Captain James Stille had completed one secret mission into Spanish Territory and was about to embark on another along the Texas Coast with the object of reconnoitering Matagorda, Texas. He also reported that Captain Edward Turner was ordered to spy on Spanish activities in Nacogdoches and San Antonio.²²

Meanwhile, Jefferson had also sanctioned the William Dunbar-George Hunter expedition to clarify the disputed geography of the newly acquired territories around the Red and Arkansas rivers, record regional scientific discoveries in flora and fauna, possibly influence western Indians to join an alliance, and probably probe for intelligence relative to a perceived Spanish plan to reclaim the lands. However, the expedition was thwarted when Hunter became ill.²³

Jefferson realized his fledgling republic was not prepared for another military confrontation with a European power because of his own austere military reductions. Therefore, diplomacy and subterfuge, not gunpowder, were used in attempts to coerce Spanish officials into relinquishing lands without bloodshed. ²⁴ In 1805, James Monroe, in Paris, France, urged

Jefferson to seize East Texas to hasten the diplomatic process.²⁵ Burr, Wilkinson, and other Masons, however, did not agree with the Jeffersonian approach, but secretly prepared for an armed invasion. Wilkinson said that "if Burr been president, we would have had all this country [Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas] before now."²⁶

By 1806, the border dispute between Spain and the United States was unresolved, Spanish fears continued to intensify as more American expeditions, mostly from the Upper Mississippi Territory, penetrated their lands. Spanish officials decided to dispatch patrols to key locations along the disputed and vague borders.²⁷ Meanwhile, Hamilton and other eastern Masons, as well as Livingston and other southwestern Masons who were members of the Mexican Association based in New Orleans, financially and logistically supported the failed Francisco de Miranda expedition to Venezuela.²⁸

In April 1806, Jefferson ordered Thomas Freeman to form part of a dual operation to explore the Red River. The expedition was commanded by Captain Richard Sparks, and accompanied by Dr. Peter Custis, a botanist. They departed Fort Adams, Arkansas, and traveled several hundred miles up the river before they were intercepted and turned back by a sizeable Spanish force commanded by Francisco Viana, acting commander in charge of the garrison at Nacogdoches. The expedition's mission had certain objectives which included surveying the mouth of the river and beyond, recording the flora and fauna, and probably reconnoitering for signs of Spanish military activities to reconquer lands claimed by the United States.²⁹ Even though this mission was a failure, perhaps it was also used as a diversion in order to distract Spanish forces away from Pike's expedition to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Meanwhile, Sergeant Joseph Ballinger, a past associate of Wilkinson and an alleged associate of Burr, and whose recruitment for Pike's Santa Fe expedition was highly suspect, returned to New Orleans with Lieutenant James Wilkinson, who was son of the general, Pike's second-in-command to Santa Fe, and officer-in-charge of exploring the Arkansas River. Ballinger allegedly returned to the disputed territory, perhaps in Texas, where he induced some unidentified Indians into joining an alliance with the ill-fated Burr expedition. It was also alleged that he became extremely angry when he returned to the United States and discovered that General Wilkinson had denounced and detained the chief perpetrators of the Burr Conspiracy.³⁰

A glimpse of the main objective of Pike's mission was revealed around 1811 in an extract of George G. Sibley's journal. Sibley, an Indian agent, had completed a conversation with Cheratareesh, a Pawnee Indian Chief, who had rather aggressively confronted Pike's expedition at the request of the Spanish. Pike admitted to him that his goal was to reach the "Spanish Settlements of New Mexico...[and] nothing but death can stop us [them]." Sibley, who later met Pike in 1807, was assured that the "old chief's story was true."³¹

Therefore, the main objective of Pike's mission to Santa Fe probably was to infiltrate enemy territory with the purpose of reporting on political attitudes and military and economic activities within the International Provinces, and to provide the necessary excuse for Burr and Wilkinson to invade Spanish Territory with the assistance of friendly Comanches who occasionally resided in Texas and were possibly recruited as a result of Ballinger's efforts. Robinson, the official spy, perhaps was sent along as insurance, or perhaps he was to incite rebellion among the population perceived as disgruntled. Yet, Pike's report on his return trip via East Texas was invaluable to any future filibustering or military expedition to East Texas.

In 1806, Major Walter Burling was sent by Wilkinson to Mexico. He was instructed to use the mule-trader disguise, and was allegedly ordered:

... to avail yourself of the present alarm, produced by Col. Burr's project, to effect a visit to the City of Mexico by the interior and return by water [Texas Coast], in order to examine both routes, relative to their practicability and the means of defense the Spanish possess.

Burling also was ordered to obtain money from the Spanish on Wilkinson's behalf for the general's alleged exposure of the Burr Conspiracy, and to contact and incite revolutionaries in Mexico. Pike, on his return trip through East Texas, met an unidentified Frenchman who had gone to Mexico with Burling as an interpreter. The man later went to Wilkinson, who apparently bought his silence.³²

Meanwhile, Wilkinson requested that Dearborn authorize a qualified officer to bring out the remainder of Pike's party. Lieutenant Daniel Hughes was selected as the best candidate. In 1808, Hughes, disguised as a horse trader, was successful in obtaining the release of most of Pike's men. However, there were other mission objectives. Seemingly, Wilkinson ordered him to carry into East Texas a message marked "personal" to Simon Herrera, the Spanish officer who opposed Wilkinson at the Sabine River in 1806. Wilkinson, who was experiencing pre-court-martial jitters, requested that Herrera provide a written denial that both were not involved in an intrigue when they agreed on the solution of the "Neutral Ground." Hughes also returned to the United States with a significant number of horses he had bought in East Texas with army funds.³³

From 1811 to 1826, the "Neutral Ground" proved to be a gathering place for Masons and non-Masons who could be recruited for almost any scheme that promised an even chance for success.³⁸ It was also used as a base for clandestine American diplomatic operations employed to encourage and aid the efforts of the rebels within New Spain.³⁴ Some of the known Masons to take direct or indirect part in these events were Madison, Monroe, Robinson, Livingston, Wilkinson, Augustus W. Magee, Don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, Jose Manuel de Herrera, James Gaines, Warren D.C. Hall, General E.W. Ripley, Walter Shalen, Benjamin Milam, John Knight, and Hayden Edwards.³⁵

With the execution of Don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla in 1811, the leader of the Spanish Republicans in New Spain, Bernardo Gutierrez de Lara, a colonel in the rebel forces, fled to East Texas. August W. Magee, who was a subordinate of Wilkinson in Louisiana, was second-in-command. James Gaines and Warren D. C. Hall were rebel participants. This rebel force managed to capture San Antonio. De Lara was eventually removed because he was accused of the brutal slaughter of royalists prisoners. Jose Alvarez de Toledo assumed command of the republicans, but was defeated at the Medina River.³⁶ Meanwhile, Livingston and his Mexican Association in New Orleans provided financial and logistical support along with some desperately needed manpower.³⁷ Republican leaders also reported to Walter Shalen, a special agent, who was assigned to the office of secretary of state under Monroe during James Madison's Administration. Robinson, who was recommended by Pike to Monroe, was selected as a spy. He first contacted de Lara and Magee in East Texas before he met with Saucedo in New Spain.³⁷ Therefore, Masonic participation probably was not coincidental. To inspire rebellion with the intent to overthrow Spanish domination probably was the Mason's secret goal in East Texas. Even though the contradictory but official position of the United States government called for Americans not to be involved in hostile acts against Spain, unofficially some American Masons and non-Masons continued to aid Spanish republicans. Consequently, the republicans established their own government on the Gulf Coast of Texas in 1816 under Jose Manuel de Herrera.³⁹

In 1819, news of the Adams-Onis Treaty, which relinquished the United States claims to Texas in exchange for Florida, was received in the West with discontent. In Mississippi, another filibustering expedition was planned with the backing of some well-known Masons. James Long, the husband of James Wilkinson's niece, was selected as its commander. Wilkinson, General E. W. Ripley, and Livingston's Mexican Association provided meager financial and logistical support. Gaines and Hall once again participated in the expedition.

After a bitter disappointment, Long again tried to launch a second expedition with the help of some New Orleans Masons, while Benjamin Milam and James Knight physically participated. This was the last known Masonic failure to establish a free and independent republic in East Texas prior to 1836.⁴⁰ Ironically, some East Texas colonists, who were Masons, fought against American Masons during this period.

In 1820, the Riego Revolt in Spain put Spanish liberals in power. In order to secure Texas for Spain, Spanish officials empowered authorities in New Spain to encourage American emigration to Texas. However, they did not reenact the earlier stipulations required of American colonists in West Florida and Upper Louisiana that they become Spanish citizens and Catholics.⁴¹

After Mexico declared its independence from Spain in 1821, a constitution was drafted which also attracted American emigration. Austin and oth-

ers participated in its drafting, which contain striking similarities to the American Constitution.⁵⁰ After 1824, however, former American and Mexican Masons residing in East Texas began to push aside their cultural differences. The stimuli were a series of oppressive measures instituted by the Mexican government based on perceived aggression by Americans living outside the East Texas colonies as well as some Americans living within the colonies. East Texas Masons also perceived that Mexico had failed to provide certain inalienable rights under the Constitution of 1824. This distrust continued to escalate, and eventually led to revolution.⁴²

Meanwhile, a second group of Freemasons, who directly or indirectly influenced East Texas history, ironically came from New Spain. In 1789, French Masons also prepared and achieved a successful revolution. In 1805, Napoleon Bonaparte authorized his brother Joseph to become Grand Master of French Masons. When the dictator absorbed Spain, Joseph and the French army reestablished Freemasonry in Spain. Additionally, four English lodges also were established in Spain during the Peninsular Campaigns. Freemasonry in Spain, however, closely aligned itself with political parties and leaders. Consequently, Spanish masons who returned to New Spain reflected the methods used on the Continent. Some well-known Spanish Masons who directly or indirectly influenced events in East Texas were Miguel Ramos Arizpe, and William S. Parrott. During the 1820s, some of these individuals assisted Stephen Austin in his quest for an empresario contract in East Texas and in the gradual movement toward a constitutional government. Despite the promotion of democratic ideals by Mexican Masons and some American Masons such as Wilkinson, Joel Poinsett, and Austin, the history of Freemasonry in Mexico, in which Texas was a province, failed to secure enough support to ensure the permanent overthrow of the privileged oligarchy by 1835.⁴³

While it is extremely difficult to determine and prove specifically what the influence of Freemasonry had on early American history, particularly relating to American expansionism into East Texas, proof has been given which suggests that Freemasonry created in a limited but influential group of people a common bond, even though some differed on a common direction, without which American and Texas independence and liberty could not have developed. If it is accepted that Masonic philosophy was the intellectual basis for the aforementioned events, then Freemasons were far more involved in political and economic decisions than we have previously chronicled. Scholars must continue to examine the record beyond current evidence of Masonic benevolence and cronyism to arrive at the entire truth.

NOTES

¹James David Carter, *Masonry in Texas* (Waco, Texas, 1955), pp. 14-15, 37, 107-108, 115-116, 141-142, 149, 165, 177, 211-212. Hereafter cited as JC. Roscoe Pound, *Masonic Address and Writings* (Richmond, Virginia, 1960), pp. xi-xii, 73, 81, 156, 159-160, and 163-164. L.B. Blakemore, *Masonic Lodge Methods* (Richmond, Virginia, 1953), pp. 12-13.

²George Eldridge Kidd, *Early Freemasonry in Williamsburg, Virginia* (Richmond, Virginia,

1957), p. 89-90. William R. Denslow, *10,000 Famous Freemasons*, vols. 2 and 4 (4 vols., Trenton, Missouri, 1950), pp. 119-121 and 334. Letters verifying memberships from the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of Ancient, Free, and Accepted Masons of the Commonwealth of Virginia, January 17, 1992; Masonic Library and Museum of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, February 20, 1992; Library of the Grand Lodge of New York, January 10, 1992; and the Grand Lodge of Mississippi of Free and Accepted Masons, March 31, 1992 to the author. JC., pp. 159-160, 165, 169, 211-213.

¹*Texas Grand Lodge Magazine*, VI (August, 1936), pp. 14-16. JC., pp. 168-169, 171, 211, 214-218.

²Letters of Caleb Webb to James Madison, July 7 and September 25, 1785, microfilm, 2 reels, General James Wilkinson Letters, 1779-1809, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois. James Ripley Jacobs, *Tarnished Warrior* (New York, New York, 1938), pp. 70-109. Hereafter cited as TW. "General James Wilkinson and Kentucky Separatism," 1784-1798 (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1935), pp. 10-162. Hereafter cited as KS. JC., pp. 159-160.

³J. Villasana Haggard, "The Neutral Ground Between Louisiana and Texas," *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, 28 (October 1945), pp. 1001-1004 and 1008-1028. Hereafter cited NG. Isaac Joslin Cox, "The Louisiana-Texas Frontier During the Burr Conspiracy," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 10 (1923-1924), pp. 274-284. Hereafter cited as LT. KS., pp. 4-83. TW., p. 194.

⁴Isaac Joslin Cox, "The Pan-American Policy of Jefferson and Wilkinson," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 1 (September 1914), p. 214. Hereafter cited as PAN.

⁵*Pike's Journal of His Western Expedition, Part I with Editorial Footnote on Thomas Freeman Expedition*, in Donald Jackson, ed., *The Journals of Zebulon Montgomery Pike*, 1 (2 vols., Norman, Oklahoma, 1966), pp. 288-379. Hereafter cited as Pike. Harold A. Bierck, Jr., "Dr. John Hamilton Robinson," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, 25 (1942), pp. 644-669. Hereafter cited as JR. Isaac Joslin Cox, "Opening of the Santa Fe Trail," *Missouri Historical Review*, XXV (October 1930), pp. 30-34. John Francis McDermott, *The Western Journals of Dr. George Hunter, 1790-1805* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1963), p. 9. Hereafter cited as GH. W.F. McCaleb, *The Aaron Burr Conspiracy* (New York, New York, 1903), pp. 22-97. Hereafter cited as MC. It is ironic that Spanish citizens were upset over the fact that Anglo-Americans were competing for the same Indian allies, because this was a similar tactic used by the Spanish to conquer hostile Indian nations in New Spain.

⁶Letter from Joseph Antonio Caballero to Don Antonio Coruel, November 13, 1799, with editorial footnote, in James Alexander Robertson, ed., *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States*, 1 (2 vols., Freeport, New York, 1969), pp. 355-357. Hereafter cited as Spain.

⁷Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803*, (New York, 1934), p. 162. Spain, pp. 355-357. Some of the first Freemason Lodges recorded in Spanish Territory were in New Orleans in 1794, and in Cuba in 1805. Others were established in Spain's Upper Mississippi River Territory, because American and French merchants of St. Louis and St. Genevieve, Missouri were initiated in the old French Lodge #73 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Yet, others probably were established, but they remained unchartered [clandestine].

⁸JC., pp. 116 and 184.

⁹Letters from Wilkinson to Nolan, ca. 1789-1801, in Philip Nolan Papers acquired by Henry I. Wagner [Western Americana Manuscripts, S-344] (New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Library). John Francis Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier 1513-1821* (Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1963, 1974, and 1979), p. 209. Hereafter cited as SB. TW., p. 194. Editor's footnote on Philip Nolan, in Louis Houck, *The Spanish Regime in Missouri*, 2 (2 vols., New York, New York, 1971), pp. 288-289. Houck suggests Wilkinson knew Nolan before their meeting in the West, because Nolan appears on the 1790 census for Maryland.

¹⁰SB., p. 209. TW., p. 194.

¹¹TW., p. 194.

¹²SB., p. 209. TW., p. 194.

¹⁵Verification of membership from Grand Lodge of New York to the author, dated January 10, 1992.

¹⁶NG., pp. 1001-1004 and 1008-1028. LT., 274-284.

¹⁷JC., p. 211.

¹⁸Letter from Salcedo to Alencaster, September 9, 1805, Pike, 2, pp. 104-108.

¹⁹Letter from Salcedo to Maques de Casa Calvo, October 8, 1805, Pike, 2, pp. 111-112.

²⁰Letter from Dearborn to Wilkinson, February 26, 1805, Pike, 2, p. 99.

²¹Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *The Burr Conspiracy* (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1954), pp. vii and 3-117. MC., pp. 22-97.

²²Letter from Wilkinson to Dearborn with editor's footnote, September 7, 1805, Pike, 2, p. 100.

²³GH., p. 9. TW., p. 220.

²⁴PAN., pp. 221-236. NG., pp. 1001-1028. LT., pp. 274-284.

²⁵LT., p. 279.

²⁶Notes of a Meeting, in Herbert Eugene Bolton, "Papers of Zebulon M. Pike," *American Historical Review*, 13 (1907-1908), p. 802.

²⁷Editor's footnote on the Thomas Freeman Expedition, Pike, 1, pp. 324-325. Pike Journal of His Western Expedition Part I from St. Louis to the Conejos [Chama River], 1806-1807, Pike, 1 pp. 288-379. Extract of George G. Sibley's Journal, [June 1811], Pike, 2, pp. 370-377.

²⁸Letter from Wilkinson to Pike, July 19, 1806, Pike, 2, p. 120.

²⁹Editor's footnote on the Thomas Freeman Expedition, pp. 324-325.

³⁰Daniel Clark, *Proof of the Corruption of General James Wilkinson [Notes not included]* (Freeport, New York, 1970), pp. 193-199. Extract from Congressional Debate, Pike to "national Intelligence," letter from Pike to Dearborn [February 22, 1808], and editor's footnotes, Pike, 2, pp. 155 and 297-299. Ballinger's reaction to Wilkinson's betrayal was discovered by Congressman John Rowan of Kentucky. John and Joseph Ballinger's association with Wilkinson initially began in 1789. Both served as middle-men between Wilkinson and the Spanish Government. The Spanish gave them silver for Wilkinson's services. John Ballinger also was an active participant in the West Florida separation controversy.

³¹Extract of George G. Sibley's Journal, pp. 370-377.

³²Journal of the Western Expedition with Editor's Footnotes, Pike, 1, pp. 417-418 and 445. Editor's Footnote. Pike, 2, p. 326.

³³Letter from Dearborn to Wilkinson with Editor's Footnote, [September 8, 1808], Order from Wilkinson to Thomas H. Cushing, October 12, 1808; and an Order from Wilkinson to Hughes, October 13, 18[08], Pike, 2, pp. 324-330. NG., 1001-1004.

³⁴*Journal of the Western Expedition*, Pike, 1, pp. 324-325, 328, and 332. Letter from Pike to James Monroe, June 19, 1812, Pike, 2, pp. 379-380. JC., pp. 213-216. JR., with author's footnote p. 650-651.

³⁵Letter from Grand Lodge of Mississippi to author verifying membership of Augustus Magee, August 19, 1992. Walter Shalen verified in the *The Master Mason*, IV, 477-478. JC., pp. 212-230.

³⁶SB., pp. 211-212. JC., pp. 168 and 212-218.

³⁷JC., p. 168.

³⁸JR., with author's footnote pp. 650-651 and 663.

³⁹SB., p. 212. JC., pp. 193, 200, and 212-219.

⁴⁰JC., 215-216.

⁴¹SB., p. 214.

⁴²SB., p. 213. JC., 218-260.

⁴³JC., pp. 182-207.