

**AP United States History**  
**Unit 4- The New Republic**  
**Topic: The Causes of the Civil War**

**Sam Houston and Texas Independence– from the Bill of Rights Institute**

In December 1832, Sam Houston went to Texas. On the way, he met the hulking frontiersman and land speculator Jim Bowie, and the pair traveled together to San Antonio, admiring the stark beauty of the open landscape as they traveled to the settlement. Houston had been a soldier during the War of 1812 and was twice wounded while fighting the Red Sticks Indians in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend under the command of Andrew Jackson. Later, Houston passed the bar and became a Jacksonian Democrat, serving two terms in the House of Representatives before being elected governor of Tennessee. He went to live among the Cherokee after a scandal caused him to resign, and then he caned a congressman on Pennsylvania Avenue while serving as an agent for the Cherokee. Broken by his failures, he sought a better fate in Texas.

Thousands of Americans had already moved to Texas in search of land and opportunity during the 1820s. The newly independent Mexican republic had welcomed them to establish prosperous settlements in its Texas territory under the leadership of individuals such as Stephen Austin. These settlers were required to become Mexican citizens, convert to Catholicism, and grant their enslaved persons freedom. Although Austin and his followers built a successful colony and pledged their loyalty to Mexico, Mexican authorities suspected they maintained their American ideals and loyalties. Wanting to keep Texas Mexican, Mexico passed laws in 1830 banning further American immigration, repealing an exemption from customs duties, and cracking down on the importing of slaves. In April 1833, Houston attended the San Felipe convention of Texan leaders, who petitioned the Mexican government to restore their former rights and grant them self-rule. Stephen Austin traveled to Mexico City to present the petition, whereupon he was arrested and imprisoned indefinitely without the right of habeas corpus. Meanwhile, the new Mexican president, Antonio López de Santa Anna, began to seize dictatorial powers and sent his trusted General Martín Perfecto de Cos to suppress Texan resistance to centralized Mexican authority. When Austin was finally released in August 1835, after languishing in Mexican prisons, he asserted, "We must and ought to become part of the United States."

Many other Texans were prepared to fight for independence, and violence erupted in October. When Mexican forces attempted to disarm Texans at Gonzales, volunteers rushed to the spot with cannons bearing the banner "Come and Take Them" and fired into the Mexican ranks. Texans described it as their Battle of Lexington, and with it, the war for Texas independence began. In the wake of the initial fighting, the Texans began to organize their militias. Houston was elected commander of the Nacogdoches militia, with an assertion that Texans were fighting to defend their rights and the revolutionary slogan "Liberty or Death!" He appealed to the Declaration of Independence and thought an independent Texas should join the American Union. While additional skirmishes broke out, Houston attended another political convention at San Felipe, which was divided over the question of independence, and he won appointment as commander in chief. His fledgling army was a ragtag group of volunteers who were ill-disciplined and democratic. The men elected their own officers and usually acted according to their own whims. Moreover, the convention established a provisional government that gave Houston no authority to appoint officers, recruit soldiers, or secure provisions or ammunition.

Houston's strategy was to avoid battle until he could raise an army to face the larger Mexican forces, but he could barely control his men. He opposed an attack on the San Antonio garrison and an expedition to the south

at Matamoros, but the army proceeded with these operations while dozens deserted, because they were dissatisfied with their commander's unwillingness to launch offensive operations.

The attack on San Antonio began on December 5, with Texans assaulting the town and the fortified mission at the Alamo. Texan sharpshooters and infantry closed the noose on General Cos's army and repulsed a charge from the town. Not even the arrival of five hundred reinforcements could save the Mexican army. Cos surrendered on the fourth day, and his army was permitted to march home with their weapons. In contrast, however, the Matamoros expedition ended disastrously in February 1836. Mexican forces at that garrison learned of the small advancing Texan force of forty men and sallied forth in driving rain to meet them in a surprise attack in the middle of the night. Half the Texans were killed and the other half taken prisoner. Santa Anna had reached San Antonio with his army and immediately ordered the execution of the survivors. No quarter was to be given in achieving the goal of driving the Americans from Texas.

Meanwhile, Santa Anna besieged the Alamo, then being held by some two hundred Texans under William Travis. The Texans deployed their cannons around the fort, took up positions, and begged the provisional government and Houston for more troops even as Travis pledged to fight to the last man. James Fannin launched an abortive relief expedition from Goliad, one hundred miles away, but had to turn back for lack of supplies. The men at the Alamo were on their own, except for one recently arrived American: Davy Crockett. Davy Crockett had written an autobiography and thrilled eastern audiences by speaking of his frontier experiences. He had also been an anti-Jackson member of Congress who told his nemesis, "You can go to hell, I will go to Texas." Crockett arrived in San Antonio in February and went to the Alamo. He bolstered the courage of the defenders by fighting for no other cause than liberty. He soon fought to the death for that ideal. Before dawn on March 6, the Mexican army advanced in four columns in a direct assault from different angles. The defenders were alerted and cut down the enemy with devastating cannon blasts in a slaughter. Still, they came on. The Mexicans scaled ladders, despite being picked off by sharpshooters, and established a foothold on the walls. They overwhelmingly outnumbered the defenders, and when they threw open the gates, the Texans and Crockett retreated into the chapel and made a last stand until the door was blasted down and nearly all were killed. A rumor later circulated that Crockett was among five prisoners taken alive and executed, but it is probably untrue. Santa Anna had lost six hundred troops but believed they were expendable in pursuit of his objective. Imprudently, however, he had also made martyrs and heroes of the men who sacrificed everything for Texan independence at the fort. "Remember the Alamo!" became a rallying cry of tremendous significance for unifying the Texans.

At Gonzales only a few days before, on March 2, the territory's provisional government had met in convention and declared Texas an independent republic in a statement modeled on the Declaration of Independence. The delegates appealed to the United States for diplomatic recognition and aid in the war. The convention soon approved a constitution. Later that month, Sam Houston ordered James Fannin to abandon Goliad, but Fannin's garrison of about four hundred men did not get away fast enough and was discovered by the Mexican army. The Texans courageously repelled several cavalry attacks and fought through the night until they ran low on water and ammunition and were forced to surrender the next day. They were marched back to the smoldering ruins of Goliad where the unarmed prisoners were executed by four volleys and the sword. "Remember Goliad!" became another war cry. With only four hundred remaining troops, Houston refused to give battle, to the great consternation of his men. Santa Anna chased the Texan government from Gonzales and terrorized civilians throughout the area with impunity. Men flocked to Houston's camp, and he learned that Santa Anna's force had only 750 men. He eventually felt confident enough to give battle and moved to the confluence of the Buffalo Bayou and San Jacinto River, where he deployed his force in the woods. Santa Anna took the bait, and on April 20, the two armies squared off, firing their cannons, Texas's nicknamed the "Twin Sisters," in a long-distance artillery duel. Then a group of sixty Texan cavalry sallied forth with strict orders from Houston to reconnoiter enemy positions only, a command they ignored. The men exchanged fire with the

Mexicans and were nearly routed but narrowly escaped back to their lines. Both sides retired and prepared for battle the next day.

On the morning of April 21, General Cos arrived to double the size of Santa Anna's army, but his men were exhausted from their march and proceeded to take an afternoon nap with their generals. Houston seized the moment and formed his army. The troops covered the open ground in relative silence and then awoke the sleeping enemy, yelling "Remember the Alamo! Remember Goliad!" The shocked Mexican army roused itself and quickly organized. The Texans' "Twin Sisters" cannons blasted away, and the infantry routed the Mexican troops, who were driven back into the bayou while the Texans' cavalry flanked and surrounded them. Houston tried to stop his men from slaughtering the Mexicans in revenge for the previous atrocities. In a little over twenty minutes, however, 630 were killed and more than 700 captured. Santa Anna was taken prisoner and capitulated to Texan independence (for the time being). The new republic selected Houston as its president and approved annexation by the United States.

Americans were deeply divided over the question of annexation, however, because it meant opening hostilities with Mexico. Moreover, many northern politicians, such as John Quincy Adams and abolitionists, warned that annexation would strengthen southern "slave power" because Texas would come into the Union as a massive slave state or as several smaller ones. Eight years later, in 1844, President John Tyler supported a resolution for annexation after the Senate had defeated an annexation treaty. Both houses of Congress approved the resolution after a heated debate, and Tyler signed the bill in his last few days in office in early March 1845. As some had feared, annexation led to war with Mexico. Throughout the annexation debate and contention over the Mexican War, sectional tensions raised by the westward expansion of slavery tore at the fabric of the Union. Even the Compromise of 1850, over the fate of liberty in the southwestern territories acquired from Mexico in the 1848 treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, could not save the country from being rent by civil war.

### **Primary Source One: Letter From Henry Clay to the Editors of the National Intelligencer Opposing the Annexation of Texas (April 17, 1844)**

But would Texas ultimately really add strength to that which is now considered the weakest part of the confederacy? If my information be correct, it would not. According to that, the territory of Texas is susceptible of division into five states, of convenient size and form. Of these, two only would be adapted to those peculiar institutions to which I have referred; and the other three, lying west and north of San Antonio, being only adapted to farming and grazing purposes, from the nature of the soil, climate, and productions, would not admit of those institutions. In the end, therefore, there would be two slave and three free states added to the Union. If this view of the soil and geography of Texas be correct, it might serve to diminish the zeal both of those who oppose and those who are urging annexation.

Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may. What it is, I do not know certainly; but the least I have seen it stated at, is thirteen millions of dollars. And this responsibility will exist whether there be a stipulation in the treaty or not, expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas. For I suppose it to be undeniable, if one nation becomes incorporated in another, all the debts, obligations, incumbrances, and wars of the incorporated nation become the debts, obligations, incumbrances, and wars of the common nation created by the incorporation.

I consider the annexation of Texas, at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure compromising the national character, involving us certainly in a war with Mexico, probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and not called for by any general expression of public opinion.

**Primary Source Two: Letter from John C. Calhoun to Richard Pakenham (April 18, 1844):  
Acquisition of Texas**

It is well known that Texas has long desired to be annexed to this Union; that her people, at the time of the adoption of her constitution, expressed, by an almost unanimous vote, her desire to that effect; and that she has never ceased to desire it, as the most certain means of promoting her safety and prosperity. The United States have heretofore declined to meet her wishes; but the time has now arrived when they can no longer refuse, consistently with their own security and peace, and the sacred obligation imposed by their constitutional compact for mutual defense and protection. Nor are they any way responsible for the circumstances which have imposed this obligation on them. They had no agency in bringing about the state of things which has terminated in the separation of Texas from Mexico. It was the Spanish government and Mexico herself which invited and offered high inducements to our citizens to colonize Texas. That, from the diversity of character, habits, religion, and political opinions, necessarily led to the separation, without the interference of the United States in any manner whatever. It is true the United States at an early period, recognized the independence of Texas; but, in doing so, it is well known they but acted in conformity with an established principle to recognize the government de facto.<sup>[3]</sup> They had previously acted on the same principle in reference to Mexico herself, and the other governments which have risen on the former dominions of Spain on this continent.

**AP United States History**  
**Unit 4- The New Republic**  
**Topic: The Causes of the Civil War**

**Migration West by A. James Fuller, University of Indianapolis**

In 1846, the Donner Party, a group of emigrants from Illinois, joined a wagon train and made their way westward, heading to California. There they hoped to build farms on rich, undeveloped land in a mild climate. Delayed in starting, they decided to take a shortcut that would allow them to save time and many miles by leaving the Oregon Trail at a certain point. The Hastings Cutoff they followed had been described by a writer named Lansford W. Hastings, who had never traveled it himself but wanted to encourage American settlers to move to California, a land he promoted as an idyllic paradise. Hastings hoped California would break free of Mexico and become independent before joining the United States. The cutoff was, indeed, the most direct path to California, but crossing Utah and Nevada proved much more difficult than imagined. Steep slopes and high mountains were followed by long stretches of desert. The Donner Party had made a fateful decision to take this route.

By the time the group reached the Truckee River in northwestern Nevada, they were running low on food and the men were arguing among themselves. Tensions reached a breaking point when one man stabbed another and killed him. Other members of the party died of disease or accidents. American Indians stole or shot some of their livestock. The expedition began to break up as smaller groups and families left the main party to try to make it on their own. It was now October, but George Donner and the other men decided to try to cross the towering Sierra Nevada. As they pushed high into the mountains, the snow began to fall. Forced to stop by snow drifts that reached 10 feet high or more, the group made a winter camp of several rough cabins and tents. Despite efforts to walk out and bring back help, and despite some rescue attempts, only 48 of the 87 remaining members survived the winter. Some became so desperate for food that they resorted to cannibalism, eating the bodies of those who had died. The infamous disaster underscored the dangers faced in the decision to migrate to the West.

Westward migration was not new in the nineteenth century. Instead, it continued patterns of movement and settlement that stretched back to at least the early 1600s, when English expeditions founded Virginia and Massachusetts on the Eastern seaboard. In some ways, such migration connected to the experience of other European empires, including the Spanish and French. As settlers pushed out from the coast into the interior, westward expansion had simply become part of the colonial experience. After the American Revolution, it accelerated across the Appalachian Mountains to the Mississippi River and beyond.

What brought people to the decision to go West? There were many factors, but for most men and women, the West represented opportunity. Many simply sought a better life, tantalized by the availability of cheap land. Most Americans lived an agrarian lifestyle that required land for farming or raising livestock. Hunting and trapping presented economic opportunities for some and timber for others, because lumber was in demand and logging companies needed lumberjacks. Of course, the possibility of mineral wealth also presented an economic motivation, and during the Gold Rush years (1848–1855) many headed westward in search of gold or silver. Economic uncertainty and the lack of economic opportunities in the East also were motives to seek a better situation in the West. Some went hoping to make a quick profit to pay off debts or to expand their farm or business back home. And many workers—mostly young single men—went West to find jobs as miners, railroad workers, or cowboys on ranches.

Another inspiration was cultural, such as the desire of migrants who went west to spread their religion. Whether working as missionaries to American Indians or hoping to convert other settlers, Christians from many different churches moved westward. Other religious groups moved west to escape persecution; among these were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, or Mormons, who moved to Utah and established a new homeland there. The promise of social mobility led still others westward. This was especially true for European immigrants who came to the United States from highly stratified and rigid class societies and then moved west to seek opportunity and build new communities. For African Americans living the South after the Civil War, moving westward offered the possibility of escaping white supremacy and finding a less racist society. Another motive was related to new means of transportation. By the late nineteenth century, railroads had made travel easier and less expensive. Constructing those railroads also meant jobs for workers, and once the work was done, the railroad companies promoted the buying of land and encouraged people to build farms and towns along their new routes. Other migrants, especially men, went west because they sought a life of adventure, whether that meant exploring unknown lands or searching for gold or carving a home out of the wilderness. One sought-after adventure was life on the open range. After the Civil War, the life of the cowboy was romanticized and promoted, especially through dime novels. The high demand for beef made ranching a viable business investment, and such enterprises needed workers to raise livestock. Some young men headed west to live the life of the cowboy, although the realities of the job turned out to be far less romantic than the books had portrayed. Cowboys worked hard in dangerous and dirty conditions and for low pay. Still, the job attracted many young men, about a third of whom were Latinos; nearly as many were African Americans. Such diversity was not as common among the ranch owners who employed them, but some ranches were owned by European immigrants or by European companies that operated them from afar.

Moving west was a risky decision. The journey could be long and hard, with the dangers of the wilderness threatening life and limb. Snowstorms, tornadoes, thunderstorms, droughts, dust storms, flash floods, heat, and cold could all kill travelers or their animals. Mountains, rivers, and deserts were potentially deadly barriers to travel. The lack of water in arid regions was a real threat, and wild animals also might prove deadly. Outlaws operated along the western trails and stole from pioneers. Despite their frequent depiction in later books and films, attacks by American Indians were rare, and very few travelers were ever killed by them. In fact, the tribes of the West usually saw migrants as trading partners and often offered help when it was needed. Still, the fear of attack caused anxiety for pioneers, and American Indians might steal food or livestock. Another concern for women was childbirth without the assistance of their female support networks. Despite these perceived dangers, many migrants believed the opportunities outweighed the risks. As they considered whether to migrate, this was the key question informing their decision.

Westward expansion and the various motivations for choosing it became a part of the national identity of the United States. Long after the frontier had closed and migration to the West had become a part of history, Americans have held fast to the national memory of the experience. For example, the cowboy image continues to appeal to many Americans, representing the free spirit and rugged individualism so prized in the broader culture. Americans continue to move within their own country to find a better life, to realize the American dream of home ownership, and to seek new opportunities. They might move north or south or east instead of west and travel by train or truck or airplane instead of wagon train. They are of different races and ethnicities and from diverse backgrounds, and they still keep alive the same restless spirit that had marked western expansion for so long.

**Primary Source Three: John L. O'Sullivan (He coined the term, "Manifest Destiny."), 1845**

Texas is now ours... Her star and her stripe may already be said to have taken their place in the glorious blazon of our common nationality; and the sweep of our eagle's wing already includes within its circuit the wide extent of her fair and fertile land. She is no longer to us a mere geographical space—a certain combination of coast,

plain, mountain, valley, forest and stream. She is no longer to us a mere country on the map. She comes within the dear and sacred designation of Our Country... other nations have undertaken to intrude themselves ... in a spirit of hostile interference against us, for the avowed object of thwarting our policy and hampering our power, limiting our greatness and checking the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions. This we have seen done by England, our old rival and enemy; and by France, strangely coupled with her against us....

The independence of Texas was complete and absolute. It was an independence, not only in fact, but of right. No obligation of duty towards Mexico tended in the least degree to restrain our right to effect the desired recovery of the fair province once our own—whatever motives of policy might have prompted a more deferential consideration of her feelings and her pride, as involved in the question. If Texas became peopled with an American population; it was by no contrivance of our government, but on the express invitation of that of Mexico herself...

California will, probably, next fall away from the loose adhesion which, in such a country as Mexico, holds a remote province in a slight equivocal kind of dependence on the metropolis. Imbecile and distracted, Mexico never can exert any real governmental authority over such a country. The impotence of the one and the distance of the other, must make the relation one of virtual independence; unless, by stunting the province of all natural growth, and forbidding that immigration which can alone develop its capabilities and fulfil the purposes of its creation, tyranny may retain a military dominion, which is no government in the, legitimate sense of the term. In the case of California this is now impossible. The Anglo-Saxon foot is already on its borders. Already the advance guard of the irresistible army of Anglo-Saxon emigration has begun to pour down upon it, armed with the plough and the rifle, and marking its trail with schools and colleges, courts and representative halls, mills and meeting-houses. A population will soon be in actual occupation of California, over which it will be idle for Mexico to dream of dominion.

**Primary Source Four: Abraham Lincoln, Speech (He sarcastically speaks of the Young America Movement), February 11, 1859**

He (the Young American) owns a large part of the world, by right of possessing it; and all the rest by right of wanting it, and intending to have it. . . . Young America had “a pleasing hope—a fond desire—a longing after” territory. He has a great passion—a perfect rage—for the “new”; particularly new men for office, and the new earth mentioned in the revelations, in which, being no more sea, there must be about three times as much land as in the present. He is a great friend of humanity; and his desire for land is not selfish, but merely an impulse to extend the area of freedom. He is very anxious to fight for the liberation of enslaved nations and colonies, provided, always, they have land. . . . As to those who have no land, and would be glad of help from any quarter, he considers they can afford to wait a few hundred years longer. In knowledge he is particularly rich. He knows all that can possibly be known; inclines to believe in spiritual trappings, and is the unquestioned inventor of “Manifest Destiny.”<sup>5</sup>

**AP United States History**  
**Unit 4- The New Republic**  
**Topic: The Causes of the Civil War**

**The American Southwest: Tucson in Transition by Andrew Fisher of the College of William and Mary**

Tucson, Arizona, is nicknamed the Old Pueblo because of a rich Hispanic history that stretches back more than 150 years, before it became a U.S. city. Like other Spanish settlements in the Southwest – including Los Angeles, Santa Fe, and San Antonio – it grew from the chain of missions and presidio (forts) planted along the northern frontier of New Spain. By the nineteenth century, Spanish colonists had developed distinctive societies characterized by extensive trade and cultural mixing with their American Indian neighbors, but also marked by prejudice, exploitation, and violence. The Mexican War of Independence, followed closely by the arrival of North American emigrants, destabilized this fragile middle ground and brought dramatic changes for *Los Tucsonenses*, as Hispanic residents called themselves. Rising tension between the United States and Mexico soon led to war and the cession of northern Sonora, a Mexican state, to the United States. *El Norte*, “the North,” suddenly became the Southwest. For the people of Tucson and other Mexicans who had never crossed the border but now found themselves on the other side of it, the later nineteenth century would pose difficult choices and challenges in adopting to a predominately white American society in which they were treated as second-class citizens. Tucson was a Native American place before it became a Spanish *colonia*. Its name comes from the Tohono O’odham word *Cuk son*, or “Black Base,” which was the site of a village on the banks of the Santa Cruz River. When Spanish missionaries first entered the region in the 1680s, the Native Americans lived by raising crops in irrigated fields, harvesting wild plants, and hunting small game in the surrounding desert. They had already been exposed to European goods and diseases that made their way north from Mexico, and many O’odham remained wary of the newcomers despite the material benefits their presence offered.

After Native American revolts in 1695 and 1751 failed to drive out the Spaniards, the O’odham turned to them as allies against a more pressing mutual enemy – the Apaches, whose raids struck Spanish missions and O’odham villages with increasing frequency. In 1775, Spanish soldiers established a new presidio at Tucson to defend against Apache attacks and discourage intrusion by other European powers. For the next thirty years, their alliance with the O’odham and the distribution of rations to “pacified” Apaches enabled the small outpost to survive and even thrive. By 1804, Tucson had approximately 1,000 residents, with 3,500 cattle, 2,500 sheep, and 1,200 horses. The outbreak of the Mexican War of Independence in 1810 ended this period of relative peace and prosperity. Although Tucson had no involvement in the conflict other than sending its soldiers south to fight, the war caused political reverberations that undermined the presidio’s stability. In the chaos that followed, missions collapsed and frontier forts ran short of the goods necessary to appease the Apaches. By 1831, escalating attacks had reduced Tucson’s population to just 430. Meanwhile, North American trappers and traders pushed into El Norte seeking new markets and more furs. Arizona attracted fewer settlers than did California and Texas. Some of them sold guns and ammunition to the Apaches in exchange for livestock and goods taken from Mexican pueblos. The Mexican government could no longer afford to provision the Apaches who settled near the missions and presidios, so some of them used the weapons to launch additional raids on Mexican settlements.

The growing unrest in the Southwest emboldened expansionist politicians in the United States, who argued that Mexico’s inability to defend its northern frontier against marauding Indians justified placing the region under U.S. control. When the United States declared war on Mexico in 1846, many northern Mexicans greeted the news with mixed emotions. Although they resented American aggression, they also criticized the Mexican



government's failure to protect them from the Apaches. But they offered no resistance to the U.S. military forces that passed through Tucson on their way to California, where they participated in the conquest of that territory. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War in February 1848, initially changed little for the residents of Tucson. The international boundary moved south to the Gila River, but the town remained part of Mexico, and much of the territory surrendered to the United States had already been abandoned because of Apache raids. For Mexicans elsewhere in the Southwest, Section IX of the treaty presented three options: within a year of its effective date, they could move south of the new border; they could retain Mexican citizenship and receive the status of permanent resident aliens in the United States; or they could automatically become American citizens with "all the rights of citizens of the United States," while being "maintained and protected in the enjoyment of their liberty, their property, and the civil rights now vested in them according to the Mexican laws." Politically, they were promised "an equality" with the inhabitants of other U.S. territories, but the wording of the treaty left the timing and conditions of full citizenship up to Congress. Because most "Anglos" (as *Tucsonenses* called white Americans) held Mexicans in low esteem – considering them to be dirty, lazy, immoral, and violent – the difference between what the treaty implied and what Mexican Americans experienced was often quite dramatic. Especially in California and Texas, where Americans soon greatly outnumbered Mexicans, racial antagonism produced rampant discrimination, land loss, and ethnic violence.

The transition in Tucson occurred later and more gradually. In 1853, the Mexican government agreed to sell an additional 30,000 acres south of the Gila River to the United States. President Santa Anna needed the money to prop up his failing regime, and the United States wanted the land to build a southern transcontinental railroad line. Known as the Gadsden Purchase, or the Treaty of La Mesilla, this agreement turned Tucson into U.S. property and gave its 600 residents the same choices that Mexican citizens had under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. As historian Karl Jacoby notes, the question came down to "a decision between home and homeland. Did they feel a greater allegiance to the place where they and in many cases their parents and grandparents had spent much of their lives – the *patria chica* (small fatherland) of their home community? Or did they see themselves first and foremost as citizens of Mexico," in which case they would have to move? To answer this question, residents of Tucson also had to weigh their mistrust of the Americans against their resentment of the Mexican government. Which would best serve their interests and protect them from the Apache menace? Ultimately, most *Tucsonenses* decided to stay behind when Mexican troops rode out of the presidio for the last time in 1856. People of Mexican ancestry remained the majority in Tucson until the early twentieth century, and for many years after 1853 the town resembled a Mexican pueblo more than a U.S. town. In the plazas of the old presidio, Catholic fiestas filled the social calendar and Spanish served as the common tongue for Hispanics, Indians, and whites alike. Most working-class residents still lived by farming and ranching, and regional trade continued to flow on a north-south axis that kept Tucson closely tied to Mexico.

In marked contrast to the situation in other parts of the Southwest, the town's Mexican elite initially fared well under American rule, if only because so few white Americans lived there. Mexicans not only held onto their land but expanded their businesses and maintained their social standing within the community. Don Estevan Ochoa, a leading merchant, hosted lavish parties for American military and political visitors at his home. Leopoldo Carrillo became one of the wealthiest men in Tucson from the profits of his freight business and real estate holdings. White men eagerly married into elite Mexican families, seeking to forge both commercial and domestic partnerships, but interethnic unions extended all the way down the social ladder due to the scarcity of white women. Consequently, argues historian Thomas Sheridan, Tucson had "a bicultural vitality unique in the nineteenth-century Southwest."

This bicultural accord started to crumble with the arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad and other American corporations during the 1880s. By that time, Anglo-Americans had already displaced Mexicans from the old presidio, but the pace of residential segregation quickened as the white population grew. Hispanic families moved south of downtown, where Tucson's major Mexican-American barrios are located today, and their social

status declined as well. The rise of the mining industry, cattle companies, and agribusiness concerns created more jobs for semiskilled and unskilled workers. Many of these positions went to recent Mexican immigrants, whom Anglo workers regarded as a threat because they would accept lower wages for the same labor. Whether native or naturalized, Mexican Americans found themselves subjected to racial stereotyping and treated as unwelcome “aliens” with limited rights. They could rarely serve on juries, faced criminal prosecution and imprisonment at higher rates than Anglo Americans, and attended substandard schools in neighborhoods with poorer quality housing and services. In sum, by the turn of the twentieth century, Tucson’s nominally pluralistic society was hierarchical, and the lives of its Anglo and Mexican inhabitants were unequal and separate. The fight for full citizenship and cultural respect continues to this day amid heated debates over continued border security and immigration from Latin America.

**Secondary Source One: Kristina M. Campbell, Rising Arizona: The Legacy of the Jim Crow Southwest on Immigration Law and Policy After 100 Years of Statehood**

“Slavery, primarily of American Indians, was in existence in the New Mexico Territory long before the official enactment of a Slave Code in the Territory. As such, much of the economic growth of the Territory in the 1850s relied on slave labor. Thus, in 1859, the Territorial Legislature enacted the New Mexico Territory Slave Code, which restricted slave travel, prohibited slaves from testifying in court, and limited an owners’ right to arm slaves. Because American Indians constituted the majority of slaves in the New Mexico Territory, one of the major goals of the Slave Code was to keep persons of African descent out of the Territory, American Indians thus remained the predominant group of enslaved persons in the New Mexico Territory.”

**Secondary Source Two: A Map of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase.**



**AP United States History**  
**Unit 4- The New Republic**  
**Topic: The Causes of the Civil War**

**To Go to War with Mexico– by A. James Fuller of the University of Indianapolis**

On May 11, 1846, President James K. Polk sent a special message to Congress asking for a declaration of war against Mexico. In his message, the president outlined a series of grievances, including the complaint that the government of Mexico had refused to receive an envoy from the United States whom he had sent to try to negotiate a peaceful solution to the problems between the two countries. Worse, he said, the Mexicans, “after a long series of menaces, have at last invaded our territories and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on our own soil.” Polk pointed to an alleged attack made on American soldiers in southern Texas and argued that the Mexicans had started a war. Now the United States had no choice but to defend itself. Congress responded by declaring war two days later, but the debate over whether to fight Mexico had been going on for some time, and the conflict was not simply an American response to an unprovoked Mexican attack.

The question whether to go to war with Mexico was rooted in the American idea of Manifest Destiny. This concept had deep roots but flourished within the dynamic society and culture of the early American republic. It held that the United States was fated to spread across the continent of North America and extend the ideals of liberty, equality, and democracy into new territories. Different people pointed to different origins for this national purpose. Some believed it was God’s plan for the country, whereas others preferred to see it as part of a natural design, and still others thought of it as continuing the historical march of progress. Manifest Destiny also stemmed from economic considerations. The United States had experienced rapid population growth in the decades after the American Revolution, and Americans had an insatiable desire for more land for agriculture. Thus, it seemed to many both necessary and right that a bigger population needed more territory.

Many American Indians and Mexicans disagreed that the destiny of the United States was so manifest, and some Americans saw U.S. expansion as conquest. This was certainly the view among the leaders of the Mexican republic in regard to Texas, California, and other regions in northern Mexico. In the 1820s, thousands of Americans had moved south to Texas, welcomed by the Mexicans who wanted them to help develop the area and serve as a buffer against attacks by American Indian tribes like the Comanche. But the Texans rose up against the Mexican government and won their independence in 1836. Soon there were calls for the new Texas republic to be annexed to the United States. Several attempts to do so failed, but President John Tyler led a successful annexation effort, and Texas joined the Union in 1845.

There was disagreement over the location of the southern border of the new state. The Mexicans argued that it was the Nueces River, and the American settlers insisted it was farther south at the Rio Grande. When Democrat James K. Polk took office as president in 1845, he promised to acquire more land from Mexico and also hoped to settle the boundary issue in favor of the United States. Meanwhile, more American settlers were making their way into Mexican territories, including California, where there was talk of a revolution to establish an independent Bear Flag Republic. Settlers were also increasingly interested in New Mexico, and many Mormons had moved to Utah. Certainly, the Mexicans had reason to be wary of their northern neighbor.

Although most Americans favored westward expansion, many were not convinced it was a good thing. Some northerners, in particular, worried that territorial expansion was the goal of southerners who actually wanted to preserve their interest in expanding and protecting slavery. Southern planters did require more land for their ever-expanding cotton kingdom. Cotton was the foundation of the American economy: it accounted for some

two-thirds of the nation's exports, and northern industrialists relied on the crop for their textile mills. To grow cotton in the early 1800s required land and labor. Slavery provided the labor and territorial expansion provided the land. Although many northerners happily supported expansion into new territories like Oregon, they feared movement into Mexican lands to the south meant the expansion of slavery, especially when Texas joined the union as a slave state.

White southerners enthusiastically supported taking more land from Mexico, and some of them also wanted to expand into the Caribbean and Central America. Adding new territory south of 36°30' latitude, which had marked the boundary between free and slave states since the Missouri Compromise in 1820, indeed, would allow for the expansion of the South's plantation economy and slavery. It would also give southerners more political power. New slave states would have at least one seat in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate, which would allow the South to protect slavery against the growing criticism in the North. No wonder, then, that so many antislavery northerners feared a war with Mexico would be fought to build an empire for slavery.

With tensions mounting, President Polk sent troops to the Rio Grande under General Zachary Taylor to protect the border. The Mexicans saw this as an invasion, and so did some Americans. Ulysses S. Grant, an officer under Taylor's command, saw the coming conflict as an unjust war being fought to expand slavery. Although he did his duty, he later said, "We were sent to provoke a fight, but it was essential that Mexico should commence it. It was very doubtful whether Congress would declare war; but if Mexico should attack our troops," then the president could say that the war had already begun and Congress would support the conflict. In other words, Polk wanted political cover for his actions, and he sent Taylor into the disputed territory in hope the Mexicans would attack and he could blame them for starting the war. And that was exactly what happened.

At first, the Mexicans did not respond to the American troops moving into the disputed territory south of the Nueces River, although the Mexican government declared it would fight a defensive war against the United States. General Taylor had his men build a fort on the banks of the Rio Grande across from the Mexican town of Matamoros. On April 25, 1846, a large force of Mexican soldiers attacked a U.S. Army patrol and killed 11 Americans. A few days later, Mexican artillery began to bombard the U.S. fort on the Rio Grande. Taylor retaliated, and hostilities commenced. When news of the fighting reached Washington, DC, President Polk had what he wanted. He asked the members of Congress to declare war, and they did.

Although the war had now begun, not everyone went along with the decision. Poet and philosopher Henry David Thoreau went to jail for refusing to pay taxes that would help fund the war and wrote his famous essay, later known as "Civil Disobedience," to assert the freedom of the individual to resist government policy. Some tried to stop the war from expanding slavery. In 1846, David Wilmot, a Democratic representative from Pennsylvania, tried to prohibit slavery in any territory taken from Mexico, with a rider attached to a bill funding part of the war. The Wilmot Proviso passed the House of Representatives, but it failed in the Senate. Another antiwar representative was Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, who entered Congress after the combat was essentially over but who still delivered a scathing attack on the president in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on January 12, 1848. Lincoln denounced the plan to take the northern half of Mexico, saying he hoped that Polk realized that "the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to Heaven against him". But the United States had clearly won the war and gained a huge swath of territory in the final treaty negotiations, taking in California, New Mexico (which included what is now Arizona), and Utah (which included what later became Nevada).

As the war was ending, gold was discovered in California. Many Americans saw the ensuing Gold Rush as evidence of the validity of Manifest Destiny, because the wealth of California had not been fully discovered until it became part of the United States. It seemed that the war was truly a triumph. But things did not turn out as

expected. As the poet and essayist Ralph Waldo Emerson predicted, "The United States will swallow Mexico, but it will be as the man who swallows arsenic, which brings him down in turn. Mexico will poison us." California's population soon grew large enough for the territory to become a state. Its application to enter the union as a free state set off a political firestorm between the North and the South, however, because part of it lay south of the 36°30' line. Although the Compromise of 1850 had temporarily eased political tensions over the territorial expansion of slavery, the issue remained unresolved. Ironically, although it started in the name of the nation's collective destiny, the Mexican-American War helped set the stage for the Civil War that ripped the country apart.

**Primary Source Five: President James K. Polk, Address to Congress, 1846**

"Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory and shed American blood upon the American soil. She has proclaimed that hostilities have commenced, and that the two nations are now at war. As war exists, and, notwithstanding all our efforts to avoid it, exists by the act of Mexico herself, we are called upon by every consideration of duty and patriotism to vindicate with decision the honor, the rights, and the interests of our country."

**Primary Source Six: Henry David Thoreau, "On Civil Disobedience," 1849**

"The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it. Witness the present Mexican war, the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset, the people would not have consented to this measure. . . .

. . . Practically speaking, the opponents to a reform in Massachusetts are not a hundred thousand politicians at the South, but a hundred thousand merchants and farmers here, who are more interested in commerce and agriculture than they are in humanity, and are not prepared to do justice to the slave and to Mexico, cost what it may. I quarrel not with far-off foes, but with those who, near at home, co-operate with, and do the bidding of those far away, and without whom the latter would be harmless. We are accustomed to say, that the mass of men are unprepared; but improvement is slow, because the few are not materially wiser or better than the many. It is not so important that many should be as good as you, as that there be some absolute goodness somewhere; for that will leaven the whole lump. There are thousands who are in opinion opposed to slavery and to the war, who yet in effect do nothing to put an end to them; who, esteeming themselves children of Washington and Franklin, sit down with their hands in their pockets, and say that they know not what to do, and do nothing; who even postpone the question of freedom to the question of free-trade, and quietly read the prices-current along with the latest advices from Mexico, after dinner, and, it may be, fall asleep over them both. . . .

Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once?"

**AP United States History**  
**Unit 4- The New Republic**  
**Topic: The Causes of the Civil War**

**The Compromise of 1850 by Martin H. Quitt of the University of Massachusetts, Boston**

When the first session of the 31st Congress opened on December 3, 1849, 30 states were represented: 15 had slaves and 15 prohibited slavery. In the House of Representatives, members from free states outnumbered those from the South 140 to 91. The basis of representation in this Congress was the census of 1840. The enormous flow of European immigrants into the United States in the mid to late 1840s, especially into the North, meant that the next census, in 1850, would widen the already lopsided ratio of free- to slave-state representatives. This growing imbalance in the House heightened the importance to the South of parity in the Senate. That parity was immediately put at risk when President Zachary Taylor called for Congress to act favorably on the imminent application of California for statehood, and his notice that New Mexico would soon follow with its application. Both territories were certain to seek admission as free states. The South feared for its future with slavery if representation in the Senate became imbalanced. In 1849, sectional division between the South and North was somewhat muted by the presence in each section of two national parties, the Democrats and the Whigs. The Whig President, Zachary Taylor, faced Democratic majorities in each chamber. Each party, however, had representatives and senators from both sections, providing a framework in which a compromise could be forged. But it was not to be easy. Leadership was important, and the 31st Senate had “the Great Triumvirate” of Henry Clay (a Whig representing Kentucky), John C. Calhoun (a Democrat representing South Carolina), and Daniel Webster (a Whig representing Massachusetts). All gave famous speeches at what proved to be the end of their senatorial careers (Calhoun died a few weeks after his speech was read for him; Clay and Webster died in 1852). The debates of 1850 also became a springboard for the national careers of two other Senate giants, William H. Seward of New York, a Whig; and Stephen A. Douglas, Democratic Senator of Illinois. Considering the issues of 1849–1850 from the perspectives of these five men reveals the complexity of the decision-making the national government faced.

The treaty that concluded the Mexican-American War in March 1848 ceded to the United States all of present-day California, Nevada, and Utah, most of Arizona, half of New Mexico, and portions of Colorado and Wyoming. In 1846, the controversial Wilmot Proviso would have prohibited slavery in all this territory. The Proviso passed the House but was defeated in the Senate, where the South had a one-delegate advantage from 1846 to 1848 and parity from 1848 to 1850. If only free states were carved out of the Mexican Cession, southern interests would be overwhelmed in both houses, and their champions, most influentially Calhoun, warned the South would withdraw from a Union that did not protect its interests. If free states had growing majorities in both the House and Senate, they might move to abolish slavery in the South. On the other hand, the North viewed parity as an evil precisely because it provided protection to slavery and gave southern states with smaller populations a significant measure of political equality with vastly larger northern ones. California had been the big prize President James Polk craved from the Mexican-American War, though by 1848, only about 350 American settlers had traveled to the area. In his last annual message that December, however, Polk confirmed reports that gold had been discovered in California, and some 42,000 people rushed there in 1849, followed by more than 55,000 in 1850. This explosive migration was the reason President Taylor’s address in December 1849 called on Congress to approve California statehood.

After a month of intense debate, Senator Henry Clay offered eight resolutions: that (1) California be admitted without federal determination of the slavery question; (2) Congress not introduce slavery into New Mexico; (3) an imprecise boundary (that disadvantaged slave-owners) be established between New Mexico and Texas; (4) the federal government reimburse Texas for costs incurred in its war for independence and compensate it for territory relinquished to New Mexico; (5) it was inexpedient to abolish slavery in Washington, DC, while retaining it in Maryland unless the people there consented and the slaveholders were compensated; (6) it was expedient to ban the slave trade in the national capital; (7) more effective fugitive slave legislation be enacted; and (8) Congress had no power to abolish slavery in the states, which possessed exclusive authority over the question. Clay followed his resolutions a week later with a two-day speech explaining and defending his package as a comprehensive settlement of outstanding issues that should be voted on as a single bill, an omnibus. During the first two weeks of March, Senators Calhoun, Webster, Seward, and Douglas delivered four of the most memorable speeches in Senate history. On March 4, Calhoun, too weak from tuberculosis to speak, sat while a colleague read his speech rejecting Clay's compromise as sacrificing the sectional balance so essential to securing southern interests. "How can the Union be saved?" Calhoun asked in his speech. He called for a constitutional amendment that would preserve "the equilibrium" but did not specify how. On March 7, Webster began famously, "I wish to speak to-day, not as a Massachusetts man, not as a northern man, but as an American, and a member of the Senate of the United States . . . I speak today for the preservation of the Union. Hear me for my cause." He identified grievances of both sections but supported redressing the South's complaint about runaway slaves with a strong Fugitive Slave Act, thereby incurring lasting condemnation in his own state, the epicenter of abolitionism. On March 11, New York's Senator Seward rose to oppose compromise of any kind. In a memorably controversial line, he sought to undercut the Constitutional protection for slavery: "But there is a higher law than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes. The territory is a part—no inconsiderable part—of the common heritage of mankind, bestowed upon them by the Creator of the universe." On March 13 and 14, Stephen Douglas spoke as a moderate from the West. He applauded Clay's omnibus bill for setting "the ball in motion to restore peace and harmony." Responding both to Seward and Calhoun respectively, he insisted that the Constitution was the highest law in the land and emphasized that it took no notice of sections, only of states. Furthermore, he emphasized that state sovereignty, not congressional legislation, had worked to expand freedom and constrict slavery. States had always decided the issue, and it should be left to their determination in the future under a principle he later called "popular sovereignty."

The need to reach a decision was heightened by the Calhoun-inspired Nashville Convention, a meeting of delegates from nine southern states that had been called to strategize resistance, including possible secession, if Congress banned slavery from the new territories. It met from June 3 to 12 and took a "wait and see" position regarding the proceedings in Washington, where in June alone, 16 U.S. Senators proposed 28 amendments to the omnibus bill. In the House, 58 members delivered one-hour speeches from May 8 to June 11. Prospects for the omnibus worsened when President Taylor became sick after eating at a hot July 4 celebration and died of severe gastroenteritis five days later. Finally, on July 31, each major section of the omnibus bill was voted down. Clay left Washington in despair. Stephen Douglas now pushed to have each part of the bill considered separately. During the last two weeks of August, he managed bills through the Senate and then shifted his attention to the House, where he and a few colleagues worked the floor informally to gain support. Finally, on September 9, President Millard Fillmore signed this Compromise of 1850 into law. The compromise included California's admission as a free state, the organization of New Mexico Territory with a boundary adjustment that required paying Texas \$10 million, and the organization of the Utah Territory. New Mexico and Utah were organized into territories with no restrictions of slavery. On September 18 came the new Fugitive Slave Act, which allowed federal warrants to be used to arrest suspected fugitives, provided for federal marshals to capture fugitives, and punished anyone who obstructed the execution of the law. Two days later, another part of the compromise went into effect when Congress abolished the slave trade in Washington, DC. Many northerners thought the slave markets in the nation's capital compromised the country's principles and were an embarrassment to foreign visitors.

The Compromise of 1850 failed to settle the tensions that continued to divide the nation during the next decade and did not establish a principle that could be applied unequivocally to territories outside the Mexican Cession. Extremists in both sections were displeased with the Compromise. Over the next decade, the Fugitive Slave Act set off a firestorm of protest and mob violence in the north and caused significant sectional divisions. More sectional conflict resulted from the explosive Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, ironically also initiated by Douglas.

**Primary Source Seven: Senator William H. Seward, "Higher Law Speech," March 11, 1850.**

"And now the simple, bold, and even awful question which presents itself to us is this: Shall we, who are founding institutions, social and political, for countless millions; shall we, who know by experience the wise and the just, and are free to choose them, and to reject the erroneous and the unjust; shall we establish human bondage, or permit it by our sufferance to be established? Sir, our forefathers would not have hesitated an hour. They found slavery existing here, and they left it only because they could not remove it. There is not only no free state which would now establish it, but there is no slave state, which, if it had had the free alternative as we now have, would have founded slavery. Indeed, our revolutionary predecessors had precisely the same question before them in establishing an organic law under which the states of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, have since come into the Union, and they solemnly repudiated and excluded slavery from those states forever. I confess that the most alarming evidence of our degeneracy which has yet been given is found in the fact that we even debate such a question."

**Primary Source Eight: Senator John C. Calhoun, Final Address to the U.S. Senate, March 4, 1850.**

I have, senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion. Entertaining this opinion, I have, on all proper occasions, endeavored to call the attention of both the two great parties which divided the country to adopt some measure to prevent so great a disaster, but without success. The agitation has been permitted to proceed with almost no attempt to resist it, until it has reached a point when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and gravest question that can ever come under your consideration: How can the Union be preserved?.... To this question there can be but one answer — that the immediate cause is the almost universal discontent which pervades all the States composing the Southern section of the Union. This widely extended discontent is not of recent origin. It commenced with the agitation of the slavery question and has been increasing ever since. It will be found in the belief of the people of the Southern States, as prevalent as the discontent itself, that they can not remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union.



