

ORIGINS AND MOTIVATIONS OF THE GUTIÉRREZ-MAGEE FILIBUSTERS

by

James A. Bernsen, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in History
December 2016

Committee Members:

Jesus F. de la Teja, chair

Ronald Johnson

Ellen Tillman

COPYRIGHT

by

James A. Bernsen

2016

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of the work I, James A. Bernsen, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

DEDICATION

To Stephanie

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank a number of people who have contributed to this work, most notably Dr. Jesus “Frank” de la Teja, who provided invaluable insight and guidance, as well as the other members of my committee, Dr. Ronald Johnson, and Dr. Elaine Tillman. I would also like to thank Dr. Kenneth Margerison, who taught me much about research and documentation. Additional thanks are due to the Briscoe Center for American History at the University of Texas at Austin, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University, and the Houghton Library at Harvard University which provided access to valuable documents. I would like to thank a number of amateur historians to whom I am indebted, including Tom Green and Rick Detwiller. Additional thanks to Patti Violette of the Shirley-Eustis House, the Fauquier County (VA) Heritage and Preservation Foundation, Barbara Kemper, Barbara Price and many others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Spanish Imperial Crisis.....	4
American Westward Migration.....	5
The First Filibusters	9
A Short History of the Expedition	12
II. PRELUDE TO INVASION	16
Traders and Settlers.....	16
The Pull from Within.....	20
French Settlers in Texas.....	26
The “Neutralians”	27
The Veteran Filibusters.....	31
III. THE EXPEDITION ENTERS TEXAS	38
The Military Men.....	38
The Enlisted Soldier.....	48
Doctors and Lawyers	50
Toledo and the Idealists	56
IV. DEFEAT AND AFTERMATH	65
Return of the Filibusters.....	66
Independence and the Search for Pensions.....	69
Return to Texas	74
Other Gutiérrez-Magee Participants	78

V. CONCLUSIONS.....	82
The Roles of Generals Wilkinson and Adair	86
Republican Tradition and Universality.....	89
Embracing Mexico and Settling the Land	92
The Legacy of the Expedition.....	95
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Known or Suspected Participants	83
2. Geographic Origins of the Participants.....	85
3. Known Survivors and their Later Connections to Texas	93

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 8, 1812, an army of approximately 130 men, mostly Americans, crossed the Sabine River into the Spanish province of Texas under a green flag and a lofty name, the *Republican Army of the North*, to make common cause with the revolutionary movement in New Spain. The Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, the largest of all American private military incursions in Spanish territory, dramatically wrested parts of Texas from the clutches of Spanish royalists for nearly a year before collapsing amid recriminations and a royalist counteroffensive. One year after the army first set foot on Texas soil, a Spanish army under General Joaquín de Arredondo crushed the rebels at the decisive Battle of Medina on August 18, 1813, restoring royalist control in the province for another eight years. The revolt, begun by an American volunteer invasion force and completed by a mixed, but mostly native Mexican army, failed in its objective to republicanize Texas. Nonetheless, the war and aftermath ultimately sealed the fate of Spanish, and eventually Mexican, Texas. If an American demographic conquest was still uncertain before 1812, it became inevitable afterwards. That sense of inevitability, however, encourages a problematical backwards-looking historical perspective on the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition. Historians invariably either dismiss the venture for its failure, or interpret it through a lens colored by the later revolution of 1836. Several volumes have traced the course of the war and numerous works have investigated the diplomatic maneuvers of the Jefferson and Madison administrations. Generally, debate centers on the level of American government culpability in the enterprise and whether or not the raid was a deliberate ploy to further expansionist goals.

The goal of this study is not to argue this point, but to investigate a crucial piece of evidence that has been virtually ignored in the debate: the men of the expedition themselves. Historians have often glossed over these individuals to focus the discussion of motivation to grander targets: U.S. presidents, American expansionist philosophy, or the spread of cotton and slavery. This thesis seeks to fill a critical gap by tracing the histories, agendas, and ambitions of the Americans on the ground with rifle in hand who actually made history. This work will demonstrate that the fighters who came to volunteer in the expedition did so for a variety of individual reasons. While these interests *may have coincided with* the goals of administrations, aristocracies, or other outside players, the American participants in the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition were certainly not puppets. By looking closely at the personal histories and experiences of these men, we get a glimpse into their minds and can demonstrate how particular goals, grievances, or ideals drove them. They were not, as two historians dismissively referred to them, “nameless frontiersmen or adventurers seeking new lands” who were unwitting pawns of expansionist presidents.¹ They did indeed have names and histories that we can trace and were, in fact, active agents in the revolution in their own right and on their own terms.

Studying obscure individuals provides deeper insight into a historical event that was very much bottom-up, and can shed new light on the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition in particular because most studies of the episode rely on the same very limited sources, particularly the José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara diary and William Shaler papers. While valuable, these are old, thoroughly exhausted, and unlikely to open new avenues of

¹ Frank L. Owsley and Gene A. Smith. *Filibusters and Expansionists: Jeffersonian Manifest Destiny, 1800-1821* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997), ix.

inquiry on their own. This paper hopefully provides an end-run around this research bottleneck. The approach attempted here has heretofore been virtually impossible, but can be done now due to the wide range of resources that have been made available on the Internet in recent years, including genealogical information, obscure books, and primary sources.

Where does the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition fit in historically? Historians work in boxes, which allows for classification of an event within a genre, for example, Texas History, Louisiana History or Mexican history. The Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition crosses these boundaries, and hence calls for a more nuanced approach. One could certainly place it in the broader box of “Southwestern” or border history, but this runs the risk of losing sight of its primary relation to the Texas story. The fault of many histories of Texas, however, is not including the expedition at all within the broader narrative, leaving it as a historiographical orphan outside of that box. Anglo Texas History, we are traditionally told, begins with the arrival of Stephen F. Austin, and its central event is the revolution of 1835-36. But as I will show, the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition is an important precursor to these events and thus belongs in – and, properly understood, reshapes – that Texas history box. Moreover, to put the expedition into context necessitates drawing comparisons with the future period to draw on the wide range of scholarship which has examined that time, and thereby shortcut the lack of scholarship on the earlier, failed revolution of 1812. Hence this study will occasionally appropriate observations from the second Texas Revolution of 1835-36, showing, on a case-by-case basis, their applicability, or inapplicability, as the facts may warrant, to circumstances of 1812-13.

The Spanish Imperial Crisis

The occupation of Spain by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1808 and his enthroning of his brother Joseph in Madrid created a crisis throughout Spain's vast empire in America that deepened over the ensuing years. In many Spanish provinces, local juntas asserted power in the name of the king, but as the chaos dragged on, these began to assume a more revolutionary character. Many of their leaders saw the United States as an inspiration and, they hoped, as a source of money, arms, and diplomatic muscle to further their rebellions. Agents were soon dispatched to the United States to seek support, including José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, a Mexican revolutionary, and, separately, José Álvarez de Toledo y Dubois, a Cuban rebel who would in time redirect his efforts to Texas.² On the American side, President James Madison was convinced by 1810 that the Spanish regime and its empire would collapse entirely and therefore dispatched a number of agents of his own to the various centers of revolt to observe and report.³ In the case of Mexico, Secretary of State Robert Smith tapped Connecticut merchant William Shaler for the job, and ordered him to Mexico via Cuba. Meanwhile, in Washington, Gutiérrez met with Secretary of State James Monroe and received encouragement but only vague and conditional offers of support. What weighed on the minds of the administration – and many Americans – was the danger that the Spanish borderlands were a fruit ripe for the plucking in the ongoing struggle between European powers. Texas, a coastal frontier province of hundreds of thousands of square miles with a Spanish population of

² Gordon S. Brown, *Latin American Rebels and the United States, 1806-1822* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2015), 45.

³ J.C.A. Stagg, *Borderlines in Borderlands: James Madison and the Spanish-American Frontier, 1776-1821* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 79.

approximately 3,000 facing five times that number of autonomous Indians, was one of the weakest links in the Spanish chain. And no one knew just how weak it was better than the thousands of Americans who had poured into the Western territories in the previous twenty years.

American Westward Migration

The end of the American Revolution unleashed a rush to the frontier of staggering proportions. More so than even the migrations of the 1870s and 80s, Americans in the 1780s and 1790s were on the move. The population of Kentucky, for instance, rose from 12,000 in 1783 to 210,000 by 1800.⁴ As Joyce Appleby notes, Americans in the generation after independence pushed westward in nearly continuous chains of wagons, seeking new lands. They were mostly poor farmers, but were confident and aggressive; long before the term “manifest destiny” was coined, they were making it a reality, and justifying it with a moral imperative. “Westward migrating families viewed their taking up of land in the national domain as a movement to spread democratic institutions across the continent,” Appleby writes.⁵ As a traveling British naval officer and writer, Frederick Marryat would later say of these Americans that “wandering about seems engrafted in their nature. . . . They forever imagine that the Lands further off are still better than those upon which they are already settled.”⁶

The migrants to the frontier between the Revolution and the War of 1812 were a mix of Southerners and Pennsylvania residents, but they were drawn almost exclusively from the *western* portions of those states, and the distinction is important. As Frederick

⁴ Laurie Winn Carlson, *Seduced by the West: Jefferson's America and the Lure of the Land Beyond the Mississippi* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2003), 23.

⁵ Joyce Appleby, *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 2001), 53.

⁶ Appleby, 7.

Jackson Turner notes in *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, before the spread of cotton into the interior of the country, the distinction from Pennsylvania southwards was less North vs. South, but tidewater vs. interior.⁷ The mostly poor Westerners chafed at continued political control from the coasts, where many of them had once been indentured servants or had been forced onto marginal land as wealthy landowners had monopolized the best. “The West was not conservative: buoyant, self-confidence and self-assertion were distinguishing traits in its composition,” wrote Turner. The western frontiersman, he added “had little patience with finely drawn distinctions or scruples of method.” He further wrote: “It followed from the lack of organized political life, from the atomic conditions of the backwoods society, that the individual was exalted and given free play. The West was another name for opportunity. Here were mines to be seized; fertile valleys to be pre-empted, all the natural resources open to the shrewdest and the boldest.”⁸

Although Turner’s overall thesis has been successfully challenged on a number of fronts since its appearance, he very correctly stated the frontier belief in opportunity that lay just over the horizon for most settlers. The political allegiance that this opportunity would flower under was, at least in early years, negotiable. As this westward push moved into Kentucky and Tennessee, it was spreading Americans and their traditions, but not inherently spreading American *authority*. Under the Articles of Confederation, and for some time after the new constitution was adopted, the American identity, like its government, was fragile, contentious, and uncertain. The same forces that unleashed the Whiskey Rebellion in 1791 were pushing migrants further away from their government in

⁷ Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Significance of the Frontier in American History* (London: Penguin Books, 2008), 28.

⁸ Turner, 21.

space and mind. Some, like Daniel Boone and Moses Austin, crossed into Spanish territory and took that nation's citizenship. Others flirted with a variety of secessionist movements. Kentucky itself was born as a secession from coastal Virginia. To its restless citizens, who longed for the right to navigate the Mississippi River, if the United States could not provide them with it, they were willing to join any country – or create one if necessary – that could do so.⁹ This was inherently dangerous for the young republic, and was brought home to Americans by the actions of French envoy/provocateur Edmond-Charles Genêt, who sought to dismember the United States from the outside and Senator William Blount, who sought to do so from the inside. Long before there was a plot among Americans to carve up Spanish territory, there was a “Spanish Conspiracy” to do the same to the young Republic. As Gordon Brown notes, “Separatism was in the air, encouraged by the British from Canada and the French and Spanish from Louisiana and Florida, all of whom wished – regardless of their own bitter rivalry – to limit the power of the new American Republic in the region west of the Appalachians.”¹⁰

There was an alternative to separatism that naturally found more appeal: Western settlers who wanted access to the Mississippi could get it by attacking Spain directly. Spain was a convenient enemy for a number of reasons. Philosophically, Americans saw themselves as inheritors of all European dominions in North America, and for this reason, northern interests coveted Quebec for the same reason that western interests coveted Spanish territory. But Spain in particular was also hated. Americans were Protestant, but Westerners even more so. Americans in large numbers subscribed to a bias known as the “Black Legend” of Spain. “In the popular imagination,” explains Gordon Brown,

⁹ Stagg, 28.

¹⁰ Brown, 19.

“Spaniards generally came to be characterized as cruel, tyrannical, superstitious, intolerant or corrupt – or even all of these.”¹¹ Unlike Canada, moreover, Spain was extremely weak, with an over-extended empire stretching from the borders of Louisiana to Tierra del Fuego, and while its population was large, those provinces closest to America were mostly empty and weakly defended.

In 1790, Revolutionary War hero George Rogers Clark and James O’Fallon signed up thousands of men from the Carolinas, Georgia, and Kentucky for a filibuster into Spanish Louisiana. The operation was so open that advertisements were printed in Kentucky newspapers.¹² Three years later, Clark, working with Genêt, envisioned another scheme, which was suppressed by President George Washington. The 1794 Neutrality Act banned such expeditions, and to further halt them, Washington engaged in a policy of appointing influential Westerners to public jobs that tied them to the government.¹³ In 1795, the Treaty of San Lorenzo opened the Mississippi to U.S. trade and briefly took away the major source of controversy. In 1798, however, Spain revoked the privilege, once again raising the specter of western settlers taking action on their own or doing so with the help of a foreign power. For Thomas Jefferson, elected to the presidency in 1800, the idea of separatism was not concerning, so long as it was multiple American republics living side-by-side in harmony.¹⁴ Nonetheless, the prospect of a European power taking advantage of such discontent to create a colony or client state on American borders was very troubling,

¹¹ Brown, 21.

¹² Carlson, 44.

¹³ Ibid., 52.

¹⁴ Carlson, 136.

and became one of his prime motivations for the Louisiana Purchase, which he effected in 1803.¹⁵

When news of the purchase arrived in the west, it was embraced enthusiastically, but even this did not sap enthusiasm for a Western action against Spain. The Spanish, who still controlled the territory— the French having not taken possession of it – were obstructing American takeover of the territory. In 1804, Aaron Burr conspired to attack Spain, but his plot was uncovered after his scheming partner, Gen. James Wilkinson, got cold feet. Furthermore, while settlers along the Mississippi River had secured their treasured goal of river access to the coast to ship their produce, other Americans in the Eastern Mississippi Territory were still blocked by Spanish possession of West Florida, which controlled the rivers that linked those American lands with the ocean. This situation led to a filibuster into Spanish territory east of Louisiana, which would ultimately have major implications for the later Gutiérrez-Magee incursion in the west.

The First Filibusters

The filibuster, or private freelance soldier invading a foreign land (and, by extension, a group of such adventurers carrying out such an operation), is a characteristically American creation. He is the export version of the Minuteman, a militia soldier of sometimes inconsistent commitment, but capable of dramatic and assertive action in times of revolutionary enthusiasm. To an American frontiersman of the early nineteenth century, raised in a tradition of volunteer militias and decentralized power, the idea of invading a foreign country was hardly treasonous. After all, he could point to incursions into New France before the French and Indian War that helped win the province for

¹⁵ Brown, 11.

England.¹⁶ Furthermore, the frontiersman who faced hostile Indian attack and routinely launched swift reprisal raids without waiting for authorization by distant authority was conditioned to asserting himself first and seeking sanction after the fact, if he bothered about sanction at all. Such men were often encouraged by leaders who, before the advent of national political parties, sought political power through recruitment of followers. And the potential prizes were personal as much as national. As Laurie Winn Carlson writes, “Filibusters, offered what everyone on the crowded frontier wanted: free land.”¹⁷ Indeed, when Gutiérrez made his appeal to American volunteers, he put land at the center of his inducements, alongside more lofty goals such as the “discomfiture of tyrants” and the “emancipation of the Mexicans.”¹⁸

The collapse of the Burr filibuster, ostensibly aimed at Spanish territory, was a result of Jefferson taking swift action to enforce the Neutrality Act. But Burrism endured, and with the collapse of Spain that began in 1808, most American frontiersmen viewed their neighbor in a way similar to what a modern American would describe with the term “failed state,” and here perhaps was an opening that allowed them to split legal hairs. In 1810, a judge in Mississippi wrote to President James Madison of an encounter with a man involved in a secretive organization called the “Mobile Society,” which was planning to attack Spanish West Florida. The Judge, Harry Toulmin, informed the man that the attack would be in violation of U.S. law. As Toulmin reported to Madison,

Upon this he observed, that there was no law of the United States which prohibited such an expedition: that the act of congress related merely to fitting

¹⁶ Frederick Merk, *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 7.

¹⁷ Carlson, 149.

¹⁸ Bernardo Gutiérrez, “Proclamation of José Bernardo Gutiérrez De Lara,” *The Herald of Alexandria, Louisiana*, August 31, 1813. Microfilm: Beinecke Library, Yale University; Microfilm copy on file at the Alamo Library, San Antonio, Tx. <http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/adp/archives/documents/declare.html> (accessed March 31, 2016).

out military expeditions against the dominions of any foreign prince or state, & that inasmuch as the president had rejected the ambassador of the Spanish Junta, and had declared that he would not receive an ambassador from King Joseph; the province of Florida could not be considered as belonging to any foreign prince or state, and consequently an expedition against that province, would not come within the provisions of the act of congress.¹⁹

It was a legalistic justification, perhaps, but one to which there would soon be added an additional argument. As war clouds loomed over the United States and Great Britain in the spring of 1812, it escaped no one's attention that Spain was an ally of Great Britain. Americans from the President down expected that war with one would include war with the other as well, and made their schemes accordingly. The fact that war with Spain never ultimately occurred did not derail the incursion into Texas, as the Republican Army of the North moved in after the declaration of war against Great Britain without waiting for a similar declaration against Spain.

The filibuster mentioned in Toulmin's letter to Madison was a young lawyer named Joseph Pulaski Kennedy. He indeed joined a private invasion of West Florida in 1810, which precipitated Madison's assertion of American authority over the region, in effect, dragging the U.S. into an action that it may not have done on its own. He was, as we will see, one of the many men who later joined the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition into Texas. His background provided one road to Texas. It was not typical, for while there were some themes that stand out, there was no such thing as a typical member of the expedition, and no such thing as a typical road.

¹⁹ Harry Toulmin to James Madison, 28 July 1810, *Founders Online*, National Archives, <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/03-02-02-0562>. [Original source: J. C. A. Stagg, Jeanne Kerr Cross, and Susan Holbrook Perdue, ed. *The Papers of James Madison*, Presidential Series, vol. 2, *1 October 1809–2 November 1810* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), pp. 447–453.] (accessed Sep. 10, 2016).

A Short History of the Expedition

The Mexican Revolution began on September 16, 1810, with the cry of Independence of Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. The governor of Texas, Manuel María de Salcedo, decided to take preemptive action against the revolution by marching South to meet Hidalgo's forces. This precipitated a revolt in Texas among Spanish officers led by Captain Juan Bautista de Las Casas, on January 22, 1811. The Spanish royalist officials were captured and Casas joined the larger rebellion. The Texas revolt, however, was short-lived and Salcedo was freed and re-established royal authority in March. Casas was captured, executed and his head publically displayed in San Antonio. The revolution to the South was floundering too, and Hidalgo commissioned José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, a native of Revilla, one of the towns along the lower Rio Grande valley, to appeal to the United States for aid. The Madison administration encouraged, but would not officially support the rebels. It had already sent to Cuba a special agent to the Mexican Revolution, the Connecticut captain William Shaler. Finding the rebellion in Mexico unsuccessful and with no way to enter the country, Shaler sailed from Havana to New Orleans to await events. He was there when Gutiérrez arrived and offered to take the revolutionary under his wing. Whether Shaler assisted in the formation of the filibuster or simply helped Gutiérrez with propaganda has been the source of much debate, but is outside the scope of this work. Nonetheless, Gutiérrez created a filibuster force of volunteers under a former American army lieutenant, Augustus Magee, and moved into Texas in August 1812.

Magee's force won a brief skirmish at Salitre Prairie, just across the Sabine River and then moved quickly on Nacogdoches, where almost the entire Spanish garrison defected

to the rebels. Marching into the second-largest settlement in Texas, the expedition captured a wealth of supplies and was greeted warmly by the citizens. This initial success was so surprising that even more Americans began to flock to the budding army. The numbers of troops would ebb and flow throughout the campaign, with the filibuster army reaching perhaps as many as 500 Americans at its peak and around 300 at the end.

The army moved on the capital of Texas, San Antonio de Béxar, but spies informed Magee that the Spanish were planning an ambush along the main road. The republican forces then shifted southward and surprised the Spanish garrison at La Bahía (present-day Goliad). The royalist forces then regrouped and laid siege to the republicans in Presidio La Bahía for four months. Republican fortunes dimmed and Magee even considered surrendering, but his troops would not hear it. Soon after, in early February 1813, Magee died of an illness (or poison, according to some), and command passed to Samuel Kemper. The siege was hard on the Spaniards, too. Their supplies were low, and in their absence from San Antonio, the Comanches had launched a series of devastating raids on the city, killing 55 citizens and stealing large numbers of livestock. Finally, a week after Magee's death and following a series of royalist defeats in skirmishes and defections to the republicans, the Spaniards lifted the siege and retreated to San Antonio. The republicans followed a few days later and when the royalists turned to fight them, defeated them at the Battle of Rosillo on March 29, 1813. Salcedo and his military commander, Simón de Herrera, surrendered their army and the Republican Army of the North marched into San Antonio on April 1, 1813.

Gutiérrez created a government and wrote a constitution so undemocratic that most Americans thought it a farce. But what most angered the American participants was the

brutal murder, on April 3, 1813, of Governor Salcedo, General Herrera, and 12 other royalist prisoners. This event began a slow breakdown of the army's unity, which also suffered from inaction as the revolution seemed to stall in San Antonio. Many Americans accused Gutiérrez of running the country like an Eastern potentate. Soon thereafter, General Toledo arrived in Natchitoches, Louisiana, where Shaler saw in him an answer to the problem of Gutiérrez. If Shaler had only been a cheerleader before, he definitely crossed the line now and meddled in the revolution, pushing Toledo and undermining Gutiérrez. Eventually, with the American soldiers refusing to continue under Gutiérrez, some Mexican rebels also embraced Toledo, who entered San Antonio on August 1. Gutiérrez, out of options, relented and went to the United States, leaving the army to Toledo. However, as this power struggle was taking place, Spanish General Joaquín de Arredondo was hurrying to Texas with an army intent on crushing the revolution.

At first, the republicans seemed ready to meet the challenge. Under a new commander, Col. Henry Perry, the Americans surprised Toledo's advanced guard under Lt. Col. Ignacio Elizondo, and sent it retreating. But Arredondo continued onward, and the Republican Army of the North, now more Mexican in character than American, sallied out of San Antonio to meet it. At the Battle of Medina, fought near the river of that name south of San Antonio, the two armies clashed. At first the battle was going the way of the republicans, but at the crucial moment, the rebels charged into an exposed position and the Spanish crushed the attack, turning the tables and leading to a rout of the rebels. The survivors fled towards the United States. Most of them did not make it and were killed in the pursuit, or were captured and imprisoned by the Spanish. By the time

those survivors made it across into Louisiana, the Spanish had launched a brutal reprisal against their own citizens who had embraced the revolt.

The Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition was a major news story in the United States and was, indeed, the first time the American people truly learned about the region known as Texas. The Spanish on their frontiers, long an abstraction, became a reality, Painted in a brush colored by war, they became identified with brutality, betrayal, and hostility to republican values. It was a failed revolt that would have implications for both sides of the border far into the future, and it was understood by Americans through the eyes of private citizens who created an army for republicanism and briefly pushed back the boundaries of monarchical colonialism.

II. PRELUDE TO INVASION

Traders and Settlers

On December 28, 1809, an article appeared in the *Louisiana Gazette*, published in St. Louis, Missouri, informing readers that “about the 20th ult. Capt. R. Smith, Mr. M’Lanehan and a Mr. Patterson set out from the district of St. Genevieve upon a journey to St. a Fee [Santa Fe]... We presume their objects are mercantile; the enterprise must be toilsome and perilous...altogether through a wilderness heretofore unexplored.”²⁰

It was an innocuous beginning to what would become a harrowing, but eye-opening adventure. **Reuben Smith**, **Joseph McLanahan**, and **James Patterson** would, three years later, draw on that experience to become important players in the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition. Under Spain’s prevailing mercantilist system, trade between Spanish colonies and foreign countries was illegal. Traveling at all in Spanish territory was a punishable offense – wary Spanish authorities had imprisoned Zebulon Pike two years before, and killed Philip Nolan before that. But America, with its policy of free trade, was already in an undeclared war on mercantilism as a result of the embargos arising from the ongoing Napoleonic Wars. For the three Missourians, the lucrative trade opportunities were worth the risk, and breaking the barrier, patriotic. While historians have focused on the trade with England and France that became a spark for war, potential for trade with New Spain was not inconsiderable for American merchants, who began to visit South America with increasing frequency in the 1790s.²¹ Trade with the interior provinces of Spain to this point was insignificant, but Americans were well aware of Mexico’s

²⁰ *Louisiana Gazette*, December 28, 1809, In Thomas James, *Three Years Among the Indians and Mexicans* (Saint Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1916), 286.

²¹ Brown, 29.

fabulous mineral wealth. What they were now learning, however, was that the trade could be very lucrative in both directions. For Smith, McLanahan, and Patterson, the eureka moment on the frontier was the return of Pike in 1807. His experiences were already well known on the frontier before they were published to great acclaim in 1810. New Mexico was locked into a one-way trading relationship with Chihuahua, where monopolies of powerful merchants controlled the prices their neighbors to the north paid for most goods. Consequently, the cost of export products made locally was arbitrarily low: a hundred pounds of flour sold for only two dollars, a load of salt for five. On the other hand, New Mexicans paid exorbitant prices for imported goods: \$4 for a yard of linen, \$20 for fine cloth.²² No doubt the Missouri traders, contemplating this business, hoped to replay the dramatic opening of Louisiana trade by Gen. James Wilkinson in 1787, which had earned him wealth and great prestige throughout the Mississippi Valley. McLanahan explained the motivations for the first-ever expedition from St. Louis to New Mexico in a letter to Missouri Governor Benjamin Howard: “Indulging in common with our fellow citizens of the United States a portion of that spirit of enterprize [sic] which has with unparalleled rapidity advanced our country in the scale of prosperity and happiness the undersigned commenced in the autumn of 1809 a journey into the interior provinces of Spain.” In the letter, written on the expedition’s return, McLanahan admitted to the governor that he was well aware of Spain’s mercantilist history, but “it is well known to your excellency that a new era has taken place.” The Spanish monarchy in Europe had been “shaken to its centre” and a spirit of “consequent amelioration had pervaded many of the glooms on the

²² Max L. Moorhead, *New Mexico’s Royal Road: Trade and Travel on the Chihuahua Trail* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), 58.

continent of America.” He then concluded, “In the spirit of these considerations, and under the genius of our liberal institutions our tour was commenced.”²³

Unfortunately for the three eager traders, no such amelioration had taken place in New Mexico. They were arrested and sent to Chihuahua, where they were clasped in irons. Those awaiting word in St. Louis soon got it via a Spanish report of the capture of “spies or emissaries of Bonaparte.” The notice, printed in a Philadelphia newspaper, promised “justice should not be delayed in order to purge the Spanish soil of such vermin.” An outraged editorialist in the *Louisiana Gazette*, passing along these incendiary remarks, reminded readers of its earlier announcement of the allegedly peaceful mission: “Messrs. Smith, M’Clanahan and Patterson strangers to the policy of Mexico and the monkish barbarism of the natives, they conceived they would visit white men clothed with the christian name; unhappy credulity! They would have found more generosity in the breast of an Arab, more hospitality in the den of a Hiena. [sic] — The assassins of Mexico have ere this butchered three respectable inhabitants of Louisiana!!”²⁴

They had not in fact been butchered. After two years, they were paroled, but required to remain within the city of Chihuahua. With no funds to sustain themselves and separated from their Spanish interpreter, they were reduced to begging on the streets. News of their treatment caused outrage across the borderlands; there was talk of an armed expedition to liberate them. Before that could happen, they were released after the U.S. government complained of their treatment.²⁵ After long suffering, and having learned a

²³ Joseph McLanahan to Governor Benjamin Howard, June 12, 1812, In James, 289.

²⁴ *Louisiana Gazette*, March 14, 1811, In James, 287-88.

²⁵ John Francis Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513-1821*. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970), 218.

great deal about the revolutionary conditions in Mexico (James Patterson may have personally witnessed the execution of Father Hidalgo), the men returned to Missouri as heroes in June 1812. McLanahan penned the above-mentioned letter shortly thereafter. In it, he told the governor that the people of New Spain “ardently desired” free and reciprocal trade with America and “that our return under more auspicious circumstances and with whatever views would be hailed by them with joy and exultation.” It was a perfect confluence of events: When they arrived with their harrowing tale, Spain never seemed weaker and Gutiérrez was already recruiting filibusters throughout the West. The three traders joined up, becoming leaders of one of the expedition’s companies gathering in the Neutral Ground. If stories of a planned relief mission for the three men are true, the volunteers who embraced their cause likely became a ready source of men for the new company.²⁶ Although the new expedition was supposedly secret, McLanahan referred to it obliquely in his letter to the governor:

The reasons Sir, which suggested to us the laudable nature of our first enterprise operate now upon us with double force. Although blindfolded as it were by tyranny we have yet seen enough to awaken enquiry and stimulate exertion... We think we can calculate the amount of opposition, we feel that we can justly appreciate the glowing reception we shall meet from the unfortunate, the imbruted American Spaniards... *The enterprize*, [sic] *Sir, which we contemplate undertaking* may as you will readily perceive be attended with difficulty and danger. [emphasis added]

McLanahan cited the annual message of President James Madison seven months before as “the admonition of our patriotick [sic] President.” He concluded to a possibly wary governor that “we cannot permit ourselves to apprehend that the countenance and approbation of our venerated government will be withheld from an expedition.”²⁷ The

²⁶ Patterson and Smith are well-documented in the records of the expedition; McLanahan is identified as John, rather than Joseph.

²⁷ Joseph McLanahan to Governor Benjamin Howard, June 12, 1812, In James, 291-292.

traders' ambition was scarcely a secret on the frontier. When William Shaler met the three men in Natchitoches, he wrote to Secretary of State James Monroe, "From the information I have of the character of those gentlemen, and from what I hear of their conversations here, I should not be surprised to hear of their again entering that country, and in arms."²⁸

Were McLanahan, Patterson, and Smith legitimate traders only? They were more likely agents of Gen. Wilkinson, who had expressed to Aaron Burr in 1804 a preference to attack Mexico via Santa Fe.²⁹ Reuben Smith's mother was Lucy Wilkinson, born in Essex County, Virginia, a short distance from Wilkinson's home county in Maryland. At least one recent work has seen this as proof of a familial connection.³⁰ Regardless of Wilkinson's involvement or not, Spain's treatment of the men, as well as its hostility to direct foreign trade with its colonies, was an incitement to many on the frontier. In the America of the first decades of the nineteenth century, the lines between trade and liberty were already thin in the American mind. With the contest in Europe continuing, the line between trade and filibusterism was blurring as well.

The Pull from Within

On the other hand, McLanahan's assertion that the people of New Spain would welcome trade would be born out, at least in Texas. Spain's policies had punished the interior provinces particularly harshly, something the people of Nacogdoches, as well as

²⁸ Shaler to Monroe, Natchitoches, May 2, 1812, Shaler papers. Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

²⁹ Andro Linklater *An Artist in Treason: The Extraordinary Double Life of General James Wilkinson* (New York: Walker Publishing Company, 2009), 218.

³⁰ *Descendants of Capt. Nicholas Smith* <http://mendheim-usa.com/Exhibits/Descendants%20of%20Capt%20Nicholas%20Smith%20-%20Nine%20Generations.pdf> (accessed Sep. 27, 2016) and James E. Starrs and Kira Gale, *The Death of Meriwether Lewis: A Historic Crime Scene Investigation*. (Omaha: River Junction Press, 2009), 319.

Santa Fe, knew all too well. Although trade between Texas and Louisiana continued to be banned even after both became Spanish, such trade flourished underground and was pivotal to Nacogdoches' survival. The town was too far from other Spanish population centers and ports, and its dense forests made agriculture difficult. Smuggling was much easier than raising crops and much more profitable. Mattie Austin Hatcher notes, "the temptation to violate the law was obviously great. The people had no inducement to devote themselves to agriculture...Foreign traders offered their wares at tempting prices in return for wild stock...and it's not surprising that many of them fell in with the plans of the intruders." Indeed, despite a complete ban on trade, Texas authorities admitted that sometimes as many as 1,000 head of cattle were shipped across the border to Louisiana in a single month.³¹

The situation was complicated by the immigration of dozens of settlers from Louisiana to Texas in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Immigrants had come even before this time, including **Samuel Davenport**, a native of Pennsylvania who came to Texas after becoming a partner with an Irish-born Nacogdoches resident in the late 1790s. Davenport became a Spanish citizen and was appointed to the important post of Indian agent in Nacogdoches. He was an apparently loyal subject for years, probably because he had secured a monopoly of Indian trade and therefore was not dependent on the illegal variety. Nonetheless, Davenport and other Nacogdoches merchants began to see clear opportunities if trade to Louisiana were opened. After the Republican Army of

³¹ Mattie Austin Hatcher, *The Opening of Texas to Foreign Settlement, 1801-1821*. (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976), 52-53.

the North took Nacogdoches almost without a shot in August 1812, he joined the bandwagon, signing up as the expedition's quartermaster.³²

Davenport's is one of a handful of Anglo, Irish, and French names that appear in an early Spanish census, almost all immigrants through Louisiana, since Texas had no ports. Many of these men desired free land and the lax regulations they expected to find. Mississippi territorial (and later Louisiana) governor William C.C. Claiborne wrote of these expatriates in a letter to Secretary of State Madison, "The facility with which lands may be acquired under the *Spanish* authority, and the prevalence of an opinion that the subjects of Spain are exempt from taxation, are the principle [sic] inducements to the abandonment of their Country."³³

Among these early American settlers were several who would play a role in the Gutiérrez-Magee expedition, including **Charles (Carlos) Beltran**, who came to Texas in 1807, **Benjamin Allen**, who was listed in an 1808 US Census as "Gone to Spain," **Darlington Hall**, who immigrated with his wife around 1810, and **Elisha Roberts**. Some of these men had long and mostly peaceful attachments to Texas, only joining the revolution once the expedition had entered Texas, when even Spanish creoles embraced it. But many others had more complicated relationships with Spanish authorities. One of these was **Edmund Quirk**, who had served in the American Revolution and moved westward after the war. Settling on two successive homesteads in Kentucky, he moved in 1796 to Natchitoches, Louisiana, at the time a Spanish province. A Spanish citizen now known as Reimundo Kuerke, he soon crossed the Sabine River and bought land on the

³² "Davenport, Peter Samuel," *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association. <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fda23>. (accessed September 06, 2016).

³³ William C.C. Claiborne to James Madison, February 16, 1802, quoted in Dunbar Rowland, ed. *The Mississippi Territorial Archives*, Vol. I (Nashville: Brandon Printing Company, 1905), 381.

site that would later become the town of San Augustine. He was listed in the 1799 census of Nacogdoches along with his wife and three sons, aged 6, 10 and 14.³⁴ Quirk was a cattle rancher, and his choosing of land on the Sabine may have been planned to more quickly smuggle livestock into Louisiana. In October 1808, Edmund's brother Henry (Enrique Kuerke), was among five Americans smuggling a herd of 162 horses, mules, and donkeys out of Spanish territory. A patrol of nine Spanish soldiers caught up to them, killing one man and capturing the others.³⁵ During his trial, Henry Quirk stated that he had been living on Edmund's ranch since 1807 and had been selling Texas horses in Natchez and Natchitoches to raise money to aid his impoverished mother in Kentucky.³⁶ Henry Quirk's associates included others who frequented the pages of the Spanish archives as troublemakers, including American settlers with Hispanicized names such as Miguel Quinn and Juan Magee (no relation to Augustus).

Another member of the party was one Juan McFalen – almost certainly the same *John McFarland* who later joined the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition in the Neutral Ground. McFarland is principally known in the expedition history for a recruiting trip among the Tonkawa and Lipan tribes during which he personally recruited as many as 300 warriors.³⁷ Such a prodigious accomplishment necessitated a pre-existing relationship with these tribes, which did not live outside of Texas. Horse trading – likely in exchange for American firearms – is the most likely scenario. Since the early incursions of Philip Nolan, Americans had known of the vast supply of wild horses in

³⁴ Find A Grave, "Edmund Quirk," <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=69131520> (Accessed April 14, 2016).

³⁵ Jean L. Epperson "Trinidad de Salcedo: A Lost Texas Town," *Journal of the Houston Archeological Society*. No. 105 (April 1993), 8.

³⁶ See note 13.

³⁷ Hatcher, 165 and Ted Schwartz and Robert Thonhoff *Forgotten Battlefield of the First Texas Revolution* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1985), 28.

Texas. As cotton cultivation began to spread in the first two decades of the century, this generated an even greater need for horses. “Alongside the Americans who flooded into places near the Spanish border had come an equally powerful new trading market geared toward supplying them,” notes historian Andrew Torget. “Indian nations in Texas, as a result, had vastly escalated the frequency and violence of their raids against Spanish villages in order to feed this voracious new market with horses and mules.”³⁸

Illicit trade was endemic on the frontier, but the American Spaniards proved a particular problem for Spanish officials. Most had immigrated through Louisiana, and utilizing their cross-border ties, they smuggled livestock out and brought American goods in to trade with both Indians and Spanish citizens alike. Edmund Quirk himself owned land in the Neutral Ground directly adjacent to his Texas lands along the Sabine.³⁹ These smugglers may have been assisted by corruption. Quirk and McFarland’s team of cowboys at trial implicated the commandant at Trinidad as tolerating their activities and he was relieved of command. Magee, Quinn, and Henry Quirk were imprisoned in the Alamo. The three were apparently still in custody at least at the end of March 1812, when the commandant general of the Interior Provinces, Nemesio Salcedo, wrote to his nephew, Texas governor Manuel de Salcedo, ordering him to conclude the long-drawn-out trial of the American Quirk.⁴⁰ The Alamo population by that time was growing. Among those imprisoned there was future expedition participant **Josiah Taylor**, of whom

³⁸ Andrew Torget, *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 23.

³⁹ John G. Belisle, *History of Sabine Parish, Louisiana*. (Many, Louisiana: The Sabine Banner Press, 1912), 69-70. Quirk owned 4 leagues of land on the current site of San Augustine, Texas. Sabine Parish, Louisiana is directly adjacent to it.

⁴⁰ Bexar Archives, General Manuscript Series January 1810 – June 1814, Roll 51, Frame 0326.

we will hear more, and a total of seventeen other Americans imprisoned in the old mission.⁴¹

If Edmund Quirk was not hostile to Spanish authorities before, his brother's imprisonment placed him squarely in the revolutionary camp. He traveled to Nacogdoches sometime in 1811 and met with U.S. Indian Agent and future Gutiérrez-Magee booster John Sibley, informing him that a general revolution had broken out in Mexico. Edmund Quirk would join the expedition in 1812. The first battle of the conflict (Salitre Prairie) was fought on Quirk's land, suggesting he may have guided the army across a well-established smuggling route for its crossing of the Sabine. Quirk was later captured at the Battle of Medina, imprisoned in the Alamo just as his brother had been before him, then transferred to Monterrey. He was eventually released and was back in Texas farming in 1818.⁴²

It is possible that many illegal traders justified their actions as harmless civil disobedience. When virtually all trade is illegal and the need is great, the idea of flaunting the rules may appear acceptable. The Spanish governor even admitted that without such trade Nacogdoches would have to be abandoned. The conditions on the frontier were so difficult that the people of the town at one point were even saved from starvation by eating wild horsemeat.⁴³ The poverty of the frontier also produced the absurdity of Davenport, the Indian agent, being authorized to venture to Louisiana to buy presents to purchase Indian loyalty, while at the same time the garrison soldiers of Nacogdoches enforcing the ban on illegal trade could not get sufficient clothing from San Antonio to

⁴¹ Schwarz, and Thonhoff, 30.

⁴² Find A Grave, "Edmund Quirk," <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=69131520> (Accessed April 14, 2016) and Schwarz and Thonhoff, 20.

⁴³ Hatcher, 67.

replace rotten uniforms. It was on this trip that Davenport first heard the rumors of the pending filibuster.⁴⁴ Smuggling food or cloth or even liquor to Nacogdoches was one thing, but trading weapons to Indians was another. The traders may not have known or cared if the horses were rounded up on the prairie or stolen in raids against Spanish settlements, but either way, the Spanish authorities saw them for what they were: an existential threat to mercantilism, to the security of the colonies themselves, and to Spanish authority.

French Settlers in Texas

Possibly more problematic than American illegal traders for the Spanish, was the presence of numerous Frenchmen among the immigrants, since Spain was engaged at this time in a war with Napoleonic France. Following the cession of Louisiana, many French and Spanish families expressed a wish to remain Spanish subjects. Among these were future members of the expedition, including **Bernardo D’Ortolan**, who was granted land in 1798, and **Bernardo Despallier**, who arrived several years later.⁴⁵

Despallier, whose attachment to Texas would become long and enduring (two of his sons fought in the 1835-36 revolution), submitted a petition to immigrate to Texas on January 18, 1804. In it, he stated his longstanding service to Spain and hostility to France and America. He was allowed to immigrate and, along with an Irishman named Brady, promptly proposed a plan to Spanish authorities to colonize more refugees from among the allegedly pro-Spanish citizens of Louisiana. Despallier and Brady wrote: “In view of the fact that the said province has been retroceded to the French Republic and they have

⁴⁴ Hatcher, 215.

⁴⁵ Document No. 2, “Number of Foreigners on the Texas Frontier, 1801, Census of Nacogdoches”. Hatcher, Appendix.

sold it to the United States of America, numerous noble, influential, and rich families, as well as some poor ones, desire to move to the province under your command in order that they may live under the Spanish flag and enjoy the same kind treatment that they, as well as their predecessors, have previously enjoyed.”⁴⁶ Despallier’s petition, and one the next year by the Dutchman the Baron de Bastrop (who would play a large role later in history), did not warm the hearts of Spanish leaders. They desperately wanted Catholic, non-Anglo settlers to people their fragile frontier, but were fearful of possible Napoleonic agents, and foreigners of any origin were inherently distrusted. Spanish authorities rejected such plans, and shortly thereafter began to crack down on outsiders in the province. From 1806 on, they began rejecting new applicants wholesale and expelling many others suspected of illegal trade. Many of these rejected settlers relocated just outside the borders of Texas with a festering resentment, and possibly more: Hatcher notes the case of Juan Sy, a 40-year-old American, who was ordered arrested and fled the province. “It is quite possible that Sy as well as others... carried information to the enemy, for Baton Rouge and New Orleans – the goal of many lawbreakers – were even at this early date (1809) hotbeds of the revolutionists,” Hatcher wrote.⁴⁷

The “Neutralians”

Some refugees relocated to the Neutral Ground, which had been established in 1806 to prevent war, but which had become a lawless region and a thorn in the side of two nations. One of these was **Anthony Parish**, also known as Antonio Pared, a native North Carolinian who had been living in Nacogdoches since 1798, working as a carpenter, but

⁴⁶ Document No. 8, “Petition of Brady and Despallier, 1804,” in Hatcher, Appendix.

⁴⁷ Hatcher, 166.

who had been expelled for illegal trade. He, Quirk, and other refugees hoped to return to their homes and likely found the expedition a convenient vehicle for doing so and legitimizing their trade. The Neutral Ground also attracted deserters, criminals and ruffians from both nations, and it was for this reason that Lt. Augustus Magee had been sent to clean it up.

Most contemporaries pointed to the Neutral Ground as the prime source for early recruits. These men, or “Neutralians” as an 1872 novel about the war dubs them, were among the more shadowy of the participants. As the author, Hesper Bendbow, explains, “It was then, as it still is, notoriously difficult to get out of those south-western bordermen a connected and detailed account of their own exploits; and as they were even poorer writers than talkers when they themselves were the theme, they have since dropped off, one by one, without giving the public their experience.”⁴⁸ The apparent leader of the Neutralians was **James McKim**, who William McLane says “commanded the border ruffians” in the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition. McKim, who had been branded as punishment for some offense in North Carolina, kept a journal (now lost) and reportedly entertained his fellow soldiers by reading from it. Expedition member Warren D.C. Hall described him as a “fit associate of the robbers along the Sabine.”⁴⁹ Another of this rough clan was **William Francis**, who had fled arrest by Louisiana Governor W.C.C. Claiborne. Francis would later lead a pivotal raid at La Bahía that precipitated the final battle that lifted the siege.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Hesper Bendbow, *More Than She Could Bear* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1872), 10-11.

⁴⁹ Henry Walker, ed. “William McLane's Narrative of the Magee-Gutierrez Expedition, 1812-1813,” *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*. 66: No. 4 (April, 1963), 569.

⁵⁰ Walker, 582.

The most colorful Neutralian of whom we know a great deal was **Aylett Buckner**, a notably strong and physical Scots-Irish redhead, who was supposedly given his nickname “Strap” for his size and strength. Much of “Strap” Buckner’s history has come down in the manner of tall tales and frontier exaggeration. Buckner, so the stories say, “Hunted the strongest game with no other weapon than his bare fist; and the wildcat, the wolf, and bear soon became scarce.”⁵¹ It is difficult to separate reality from fiction in such stories, but the known details of “Strap” Buckner’s life indicate a kernel of truth behind the myth: He was young, hot-headed, querulous and courageous, perhaps to a fault. Originally from Eastern Virginia, Buckner may have migrated to Kentucky on the eve of the expedition, briefly served in the militia, before making his way South in 1812.⁵² Buckner was an early soldier in Magee’s army and survived the war, making his way to Natchez, where legend says he captained a river barge and befriended one of his passengers, Stephen F. Austin. He made his way back to Texas, first as a squatter, later as an early Austin Colony settler. His correspondence with Austin in seeking to solidify the title to his farm indicates a strong passion for land. Buckner, by then in his early 30s, was a single man with four servants and one slave. Nonetheless, he begged the empresario for the opportunity to buy as much as 1,000 additional acres. The land may have been for speculative purposes, but Buckner expressed genuine attachment to his property, telling Austin of a desire to be buried on it.⁵³ Buckner’s politics were complicated. He was at various times Austin’s nemesis or a trusted Indian fighter for the empresario. He opposed

⁵¹ Don Blevins, *A Priest, a Prostitute, and Some Other Early Texans: The Lives Of Fourteen Lone Star State Pioneers* (Guilford, Conn: The Globe Pequot Press, 2008), 26.

⁵² Genealogy.com, <http://www.genealogy.com/ftm/j/o/h/Wesley-K-Johnson-MO/GENE24-0030.html> (accessed August 1, 2016).

⁵³ “Buckner, Aylett C.,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association. <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fbu09>. (accessed August 1, 2016).

the Fredonian Revolution, yet took part in the 1832 Battle of Velasco, during which he was killed.

Is Buckner a typical “Neutralian?” If the record of him in Kentucky is any evidence, his stay in the Neutral Ground was absurdly brief. Certainly he did not stake out and farm land – his letters to Austin indicate he did not permanently settle there until 1819. Indeed, it is plausible that he and many alleged Neutral Ground participants may have simply used the lawless region as cover for joining the expedition in the first place, as it gave them immunity for activities that would otherwise be prosecutable under the 1794 Neutrality Act. This suggests a possible answer to one of the most enduring mysteries of the expedition: How did Augustus Magee, who had been commended by the Army for his vigorous, even brutal “cleaning up” of the Neutral Ground, successfully recruit participants from that same region? Buckner’s story suggests the answer: the Neutralians were hardly homogeneous. In addition to the border ruffians Magee targeted, there were likely American-Spaniard exiles seeking to re-open their smuggling networks between Texas and Louisiana and Americans who merely located there to await the signal for the invasion. Harris Gaylord Warren notes that there were three groups of men assembling in the neutral zone, one, a group of “idlers,” another of “somewhat more respectable” men from Mississippi, and a third, under Patterson and Smith, was “still more respectable.”⁵⁴ It is also possible that the Neutral Grounders were somewhat of a strawman for American officials who had no desire to stop the filibuster or enforce the Neutrality Act, and could cite lack of jurisdiction as an excuse for less-than-vigorous efforts to intervene.

Regardless, while many contemporary sources indicate a large percentage of Neutral

⁵⁴ Harris Gaylord Warren, *The Sword Was Their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943), 25.

Ground residents in the expedition, among the more than 120 filibusters identified for this paper, fewer than a half dozen can be confirmed as Neutralians of more than a few weeks' residence.

The Veteran Filibusters

Some of the men who joined the growing army in the Neutral Ground had experience at this game before. Seven years before, the first filibuster against New Spain started improbably when an American congressman asked the Spanish government to evict three Americans from his land in Spanish West Florida. The three men, brothers Reuben, Nathan, and Samuel Kemper, would become notorious in the borderlands and play crucial roles in two major attempts to seize Spanish territory. Late in 1812, **Samuel Kemper** assumed command of the Republican Army of the North on the death of Augustus Magee, leading it to victories at La Bahía and Rosillo.

The Kempers were descendants of German immigrants imported by Virginia's Royal Governor Alexander Spotswood to work a coal mine on his property. Following the end of their indentured service, the immigrants settled in the northwestern reaches of the state, founding the town of Germanna in Fauquier County.⁵⁵ The county soon developed a unique identity as a place of refuge for poor squatters and others who had a disregard for law enforcement, violation of liquor laws, and other transgressions, and was known as a "free state" for its spirit of opposition to the coast.⁵⁶ Two second-generation brothers, Peter and James Kemper, fought in the American Revolution and were both ordained as

⁵⁵ Willis M. Kemper, *Genealogy of the Kemper Family in the United States: Descendants of John Kemper of Virginia; with a Short Historical Sketch of His Family and of the German Reformed Colony at Germanna and Germantown, Va.* (Germanna, Va.: G.K. Hazlett & Company, 1899), 10.

⁵⁶ Fauquier County, VA Historical Association <http://www.fauquierhistory.com/index.cfm> (accessed Sep. 28, 2016).

Baptist ministers. After the war, the nearby frontier provinces called to James Kemper, who moved first to Kentucky, then to Ohio, where he became one of the founders of the city of Cincinnati.⁵⁷ Peter soon followed, leaving two older sons in Virginia and bringing along the three sons, Reuben, Nathan and Samuel.⁵⁸ Peter Kemper was well acquainted with another Baptist minister in the growing Ohio Territory, John Smith, who would soon be elected as one of the first U.S. senators from Ohio. Smith engaged in land speculation in Mississippi on the U.S. side of the border, and across the border in Spanish West Florida.⁵⁹ Because Spanish law at the time frowned on absentee landowners, Smith engaged the eldest Kemper brother, Reuben, to occupy and manage his holdings. Nathan and Samuel (the youngest of the three) followed shortly thereafter.⁶⁰

Reuben Kemper worked hard in pursuit of his fortune, but a series of failures left him destitute. Furthermore, he believed his residence on Smith's land entitled him to it, and soon he was fighting with his patron, who sued him and ordered the brothers removed from his lands.⁶¹ The spat soon grew into a feud between rival factions of Anglo Americans living in Spanish territory, with the Kempers siding with the pro-American settlers, while their opponents were generally loyal to Spain. Nonetheless, as William C. Davis remarks, "Nothing suggests that the Kempers had a fixed determination to foment rebellion or to call on their countrymen to rise against Spain... They were just angry and

⁵⁷ James Kemper's home still exists, and is preserved on the grounds of "Heritage Village" at the Cincinnati Zoo. http://www.heritagevillagecincinnati.org/kemper_house.aspx (Accessed March 12, 2016)

⁵⁸ Kemper, 50.

⁵⁹ West Florida at this time included parts of Eastern Louisiana, Southern Mississippi and Southern Alabama, while East Florida roughly consists of the borders of the present state. Smith was heavily involved in speculation and was even implicated in the Burr conspiracy.

⁶⁰ Andrew McMichael, *Atlantic Loyalties: Americans in Spanish West Florida, 1785-1810* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 83.

⁶¹ William C. Davis, *Rogue Republic: How Would-Be Patriots Waged the Shortest Revolution in American History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011), 12.

vengeful.”⁶² But their anger soon evolved and the divided loyalties began to give a political character to the feud.

In 1804, while Reuben was away in New Orleans, local officials moved on his house, hoping to seize it. Nathan, Samuel, and four other well-armed men barricaded themselves inside and Samuel threatened to fight. The officials backed down, but the feud ratcheted up. The Kempers and their loyalists began a tragic-comic rebellion that petered out with a failed attempt to seize Spanish leaders and declare a republic in West Florida.

Withdrawing to the American side of the border, the Kempers plotted their next move, occasionally raiding into Spanish territory. This led to a violent response in 1805, when a lynch mob of Spanish citizens (of Anglo-American, not Spanish ancestry) crossed the border and seized the three brothers. At the time, Samuel was running a tavern in Pinkneyville, Mississippi. In one of a dozen court affidavits later recorded of the incident, a witness, James Latta, said the vigilantes came late at night to Kemper’s tavern painted black, poorly disguising themselves as runaway slaves. Once they were let inside, they then burst into his private room. Samuel Kemper’s own testimony provides further detail. At around midnight, Kemper heard a knocking on his door and challenged the other party:

The door of the bed room was then forced and a blow made at the bed with a double-barreled gun. [Kemper] was then seized, and dragged out of bed...and from thence after a struggle, into the street. He was then thrown on the ground, and a rope was tied around his neck, by which he was dragged about one hundred and fifty yards. He was then suffered to stand upright, and attempted, by crying out, to give an alarm, upon which he received a stroke of a pistol on the head, by which he was stunned.⁶³

⁶² Ibid., 23.

⁶³ U.S. Department of State. *State Papers and Publick Documents of the United States from the Accession of George Washington to the Presidency, Exhibiting a Complete View of Our Foreign Relations at That Time* (Boston: T.B. Wait and Sons, 1817), 105-108.

At one time, up to five men were pummeling Samuel with clubs. Nathan, likewise, was pulled from his bed as his wife shrieked piteously before she was clubbed unconscious. Reuben received perhaps the worst beating, which many of the witnesses feared would be fatal. The Kempers were then tied and put aboard boats to cross into Spanish territory. They were only saved when an alerted U.S. Army patrol intervened and captured the Spaniards. Tried, they were eventually released on account of time served, and though the Kempers promised no further violence, Reuben assaulted the men as they left the courthouse. The filibuster was effectively over, but the bitterness remained.

The Kemper brothers' motives once they turned the feud into a filibuster have long divided historians. Davis argues that Reuben Kemper's rebellion was inevitable and that the feud only provided the spark. There was even speculation at the time that Reuben, far from seeking to win the province exclusively for America, was seeking British aid for an expedition to capture Spanish territory.⁶⁴ Gene Allen Smith summarizes much of the literature thusly: "On the local level inhabitants seized power at Spain's expense because they wanted an efficient, responsible local government to protect their rights, and because they hoped to acquire land and wealth."⁶⁵ Isaac Joslin Cox said the Kemper raid was "no mere act of bravado, but evidently a serious attempt to overthrow the existing government. However, McMichael is not so eager to elevate the Kempers' motives, calling their actions "nothing more than random thuggery in response to an unfortunate lawsuit."⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Davis, xiii, and Francis Cogliano, *Failed Filibusters: The Kemper Rebellion, the Burr Conspiracy and Early American Expansion*, 6. http://www.shca.ed.ac.uk/staff/supporting_files/fcogliano/failed-filibusters.pdf (Accessed March 12, 2016).

⁶⁵ Gene Allen Smith, "Rogue Republic (Review)," *The Alabama Review* 65 no. 2 (April, 2012): 137.

⁶⁶ Isaac Joslin Cox, *The West Florida Controversy, 1798-1813: A Study in American Diplomacy* (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1967), 155; McMichael, 88.

Nonetheless, for a brief time, the Kempers, men of little wealth or status, became famous throughout the country. Word of the assault in particular spread in the South and further encouraged American plotting against Spanish West Florida, not in the least because of the fact that some slaves had participated alongside their masters in the assault on the Kempers, which enraged many slave owners constantly in fear of a slave revolt. The attention drew scorn from some, praise from others and visits from mysterious suitors. In New Orleans, Samuel was approached by men affiliated with an organization known as the “Mexican Society of New Orleans.” He introduced them to Reuben and his older brother soon took an oath “to use all lawful means to aid and assist in effecting the emancipation of Mexico and Peru.” The men were brought into a conspiracy to raise arms and men for another attempt at rebellion in West Florida which would, they were told, then be extended to Texas.⁶⁷ Reuben Kemper, however, was skeptical of the venture and began to fear that the plot was a continuation of the Burr conspiracy. He was opposed to any venture that involved separatism or would not be legally condoned by the U.S. government. He was also hostile to Burr all the more so because his former landlord and enemy, Smith, was close to the former vice president. One of the final straws came with the arrival of another emissary, a U.S. Army quartermaster and subordinate of Wilkinson named Josiah Taylor, with whom Reuben had a tense relationship. This is almost certainly the same Josiah Taylor who was later imprisoned in the Alamo and joined the Gutiérrez-Magee as a filibuster. The brothers cut ties with the group, which they did not think was serious. Nonetheless, when another, more successful filibuster attempt into West Florida was begun in 1810, Reuben and Nathan joined it. Samuel, for his part, moved on to run a tavern in Alexandria, Louisiana. But the brief encounter in New

⁶⁷ Davis, 87.

Orleans with the “Mexican Society” was not inconsequential, for among the men he met through the group was Gutiérrez, then on his trip northward to Washington to plead the case for the revolution in Mexico. When Gutiérrez returned, it was only natural that Samuel, a known frontier filibuster, hater of Spanish authority, and natural leader of men, would be one of his targeted converts.⁶⁸

The plots of the “Mexican Society” were enough to reach the ears of Spanish minister Luis de Onís y González-Vara, who wrote in 1812 that America (since he believed the government to be involved) had “a famous lawyer of New Orleans to contact the insurgents in Mexico and to offer them every kind of aid in money, arms and officers to make war on the troops of the king.”⁶⁹ While a thorough analysis of the organization is beyond the scope of this study, the known organizers were elite interests generally more likely to pay for muskets to arm frontiersmen than actually take part in an expedition themselves. An exception was a leader of an offshoot, the “Mobile Society,” a controversial lawyer (charged in 1807 for barratry) named **Joseph Pulaski Kennedy**. It was Kennedy who had told Judge Toulmin that an attack on Spain was not a violation of the Neutrality Act because Spain was not recognized by the U.S. Kennedy led the second West Florida filibuster in 1810, and later joined the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition.

Kennedy’s motives are murky because he clearly deceived others about his intentions. In one letter to a Spanish resident of Mobile who he hoped to convert to the cause, Kennedy appears to be a Burr-ite, promoting Western separatism, rather than American conquest of West Florida, as an aim: “As for the King of Spain, he is out of the question. Do you wish to become a free subject of the Emperor of France or of his brother Joseph,

⁶⁸ Davis, 89. While some sources suggest that Reuben Kemper also participated in the expedition, this is not the case, as Davis demonstrates.

⁶⁹ Warren, 22. The lawyer was probably James Workman, a judge. See Davis, 88.

you have only to say so and it is done. The bearer of this will explain everything to you. If you are desirous of embarking in the cause of liberty and your noble country, make your arrangements with my friend.” But, in a letter to the Spanish commandant of Mobile, whom the Americans thought could be persuaded to join, rather than fight them, Kennedy took an entirely different tone:

As a member of the Mobbille (sic) Society I can with certainty inform you that the citizens of these counties never will make an attack on that country without the concurrence of the general Government.... This Society has an origin in the oppression which we have suffered from the Spanish Government in detaining a country which the Supreme law of the State has declared to be ours. We respect the subjects of the King that was of Spain, and as to yourself, I have no difficulty in saying that you have my good wishes for your happiness.⁷⁰

The West Florida Controversy had different origins and purposes than the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, but the former clearly shows that remnants of the Burr conspiracy were still active in Louisiana and Mississippi into the 1810s, providing a ready ideology, source of funds and adherents that made for ground when Gutierrez traveled through the area in 1811 and planted the seeds of the expedition of the following year. Those seeds would grow, attracting veteran filibusters like Kemper, a lower-class border brawler, and Kennedy, a lawyer with elite pretensions. Though they came to the fight from different perspectives, Kemper and Kennedy were both very influential on the frontier and likely drew additional converts to join the cause in Texas when they joined. The army they were joining had grown large enough and was nearly ready to attack.

⁷⁰ J.P. Kennedy to Z. Orso, 7 June 1810 and J.P. Kennedy to D. Perez, 19 July, 1810, In J. Franklin Jameson, ed. *The American Historical Review* Vol. II (New York: MacMillan Company, 1897), 700-701.

III. THE EXPEDITION ENTERS TEXAS

The Military Men

As recruits for the filibuster began to come in, Gutiérrez de Lara began to look for a leader for his expedition. The natural choice was Gen. John Adair, a former Continental Army officer who was believed to have been the choice of commander for the Burr Expedition. Adair appears to have turned Gutiérrez down. Gen. James Wilkinson had made Adair the scapegoat for the Burr affair, and though Adair was acquitted of any charges, the controversy cost him his U.S. Senate seat from Kentucky. He needed rehabilitation, not controversy. Unless the expedition had official U.S. government support, Adair was not likely to lead it, though he did aid in raising men for the venture in the end.

Wilkinson himself was a possibility, but he too was suspected in the Burr affair and he was the senior officer in the U.S. Army at a time when clear war clouds were on the horizon. Although he had been a loyal agent of Spain for 20 years, he had since cut those ties, and that was not an impediment to undermining his former employer now.

Wilkinson allowed two of his sons, **James Biddle Wilkinson** and **Joseph Biddle Wilkinson**, to join the expedition. James, who served as an aide-de-camp to Toledo, brought the first news of the defeat at Medina, and died shortly thereafter of his wounds.⁷¹

Gutiérrez eventually settled on a young army officer and favorite of Wilkinson. In 1812 **Augustus William Magee** was a lieutenant in the U.S. Army stationed at Fort Claiborne on the road between Nacogdoches and Natchitoches. He had been tasked with clearing out the neutral zone of the many squatters, thieves, and other undesirables who

⁷¹ Schwarz, 126.

had settled there. In June 1812, Magee resigned his commission as a result of being passed over for promotion. He then signed up with Gutiérrez, taking command as the expedition's colonel.

Magee's background has largely been untouched by historians. A biographical sketch attempted in 1944 found little beyond the recycled information found in Shaler's letters and other well-worn sources. The standard narrative is that Magee was a West Pointer and favored subordinate of Wilkinson, "evidently of Irish extraction."⁷² Nonetheless, Magee's history, when fully considered, is very informative of possible motivations for his unusual career move. Augustus Magee was, in fact, no poor junior officer dependent upon his meager earnings in the army or awed by the mercenary sums Gutiérrez offered. He was, rather, the scion of one of the wealthiest families in Boston. His father James Magee was an Irish Presbyterian who immigrated to America before the revolution. During the war, he served as a privateer, commanding four vessels during the conflict before being captured in 1781.⁷³ After the war, Magee prospered as a trader and married Margaret Elliot of Boston, daughter of a successful tobacco dealer. His real springboard into the Boston elite came when his wife's sister married Thomas Handasyd Perkins, member of one of the city's great mercantile families. Magee and Perkins formed a business partnership that cemented the Irishman's success. The two brothers-in-law would become the foremost American merchants in the lucrative China trade, and, by all accounts, the best of friends as well. Magee's family, moreover, profited from the Perkins

⁷² Col. M.I. Crimmins, "Augustus William Magee, The Second Advanced Courier of American Expansion into Texas," *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 20 (1944): 92.

⁷³ Henry Lee, "The Magee Family and the Origins of the China Trade," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 81 (1969): 104.

family relationship for over thirty years.⁷⁴ For Augustus, born during one of James' extended voyages (he would not see his father until he was four years old), this meant a lavish lifestyle and an exemplary education. In 1798, when the young boy was nine, his father purchased the opulent former mansion of Massachusetts royal governor William Shirley.⁷⁵ Augustus' years in the house, however, did not last long, for a pair of tragedies struck the family soon afterwards. In 1801, James Magee died of an illness. The same year, his brother Bernard, also a sea captain, was killed by natives in the Pacific Northwest. Besides Augustus' two older brothers, T.H. Perkins was the closest male relative remaining in young Magee's family. Circumstantial evidence suggests Perkins took a strong interest in his brother-in-law's orphaned children. Several years before, he had given Augustus' brother James Jr. an early start running a hotel. He had remained at James Magee's side steadfastly in his final days, accompanying him on a trip to a New York Spa in a failed effort to recover James' health.⁷⁶

The year after his father's and brother's deaths, Augustus, now 13, was enrolled in the Phillips Exeter Academy in Exeter, New Hampshire, about fifty miles away. It was then, as today, one of the elite schools in America. The principal of the school, Benjamin Abbot, had married a sister of T.H. Perkins. As a double in-law, Magee was a distant relative indeed, but Abbot and Perkins were close and it is likely the latter helped young Augustus enter the school. When he did, he became the only child of James Magee to acquire a significant education.⁷⁷ His name appears in the catalogue of students alongside

⁷⁴ Lee, 107.

⁷⁵ Margaret would later sell the house in 1819 to former Secretary of War William Eustis – the same man to whom Augustus Magee had penned his letter resigning his commission. The Shirley-Eustis House still exists today and is a National Historic Landmark. <http://www.shirleyeustishouse.org/>

⁷⁶ Frederick C. Detwiller, "Magee Family Mariners ca. 1750-1820," 2012. Unpublished manuscript provided by the author, of Georgetown, Massachusetts.

⁷⁷ Lee, 117.

some of the weightiest names in early American history. George Washington's nephew Bushrod attended a few years before, as had future senator Daniel Webster. Among Magee's own classmates was another boy his same age, George Pickering, whose father Timothy had been Secretary of State in the Washington and Adams administrations.⁷⁸ Future graduates included President Franklin Pierce and the sons of Presidents Abraham Lincoln and U.S. Grant. Of Phillips Exeter, it would be said in 1859 that "Such a galaxy of names as appear upon the catalogue of this institution will not, perhaps, be found in connection with any other academy on this continent."⁷⁹ Magee's instructor, Abbot, became a legend at the institution. Under his hand, the curriculum was rigorous and a day at the school full of "exacting duties," including readings from the Bible, memorization and recitation exercises all day long.⁸⁰ Discipline was firm, but tolerant. Abbot was "feared, respected and loved alike by student and townspeople," a graduate of the class of 1811 wrote, adding, "the decorum and manly bearing which characterized the school while he was at its head must have deeply impressed itself upon the lives of those who were so fortunate as to be his pupils."⁸¹ One of those pupils was Augustus Magee.

Magee moved on to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, graduating in 1809 and qualifying as an artilleryman.⁸² He was assigned to the Atlantic coast and eventually to the frontier in Louisiana. Again, it is likely that T.H. Perkins's hand was the guiding one in

⁷⁸ Phillips Exeter Academy, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Phillips Exeter Academy* (Exeter, N.H.: J&B Williams, 1838), 14. Despite the title, there was no military training curriculum at the academy at the time.

⁷⁹ Austin Coolidge and John Mansfield, *History and Description of New England, General and Local, Vol. 1* (Boston: Austin J. Coolidge, 1859) 491.

⁸⁰ Laurence M. Crosbie, *Phillips Exeter Academy, a History* (Exeter, N.H.: Phillips Exeter Academy, 1923), 57.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁸² While most sources state that Magee was either 2nd or 3rd in the class of 1809, this is inaccurate, as class ranks were not instituted until 1815. Magee was the second person to graduate in that year, but students studied at different paces and merely graduated when they finished the coursework. Magee graduated 7 months after beginning, which was average for the time.

Magee's career progression. Augustus's immediate family consisted entirely of seafarers and none of had any army background. However, his uncle-in-law did. As one of the founders of a local Massachusetts militia company, Perkins rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel and was frequently addressed by those who knew him as "Colonel Perkins."⁸³ At the time of Magee's appointment to West Point in 1808, the Secretary of War was Henry Dearborn, a former major general, also of the Massachusetts militia. Perkins was also very active in Massachusetts politics, and although a congressional nomination was not required at the time, West Point was very small and the appointments coveted. Perkins was well-placed to aid Magee.

Such a benefactor, however, came as a mixed blessing. By 1812, Lieutenant Magee had by all accounts served well in "cleaning up" the Neutral Ground. He had the support for his promotion of Gen. James Wilkinson, the senior general in the army. Furthermore, he was a rare and valuable West Pointer at a time when the army was in the midst of an expansion that ultimately grew the ranks of the officer corps from 191 in 1808 to 3,495 by the end of the War of 1812.⁸⁴ But despite all of this he was still denied a promotion in Early 1812. Though three years was hardly a long time to endure in one rank, Magee certainly felt he had earned promotion, and his record seems to back him up.⁸⁵ The evidence strongly suggests politics as the most likely reason for Magee's rejection. Such political meddling in the army was common at a time when Republicans, hostile to a standing army in the first place, were in power in Washington. As Joyce Appleby notes, "The fierce partisanship that flared up during the bitterly contested presidential elections

⁸³ Carl Seaburg and Stanley Paterson, *Merchant Prince of Boston. Col. T.H. Perkins, 1764-1854* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 40.

⁸⁴ Appleby, 113.

⁸⁵ Spencer Tucker, ed. *The Encyclopedia of the War of 1812, A Political, Social, and Military History*, Vol. 1 (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012), 970.

of 1796 and 1800 cast a long shadow over the lives of the first generation. Parties monopolized political life in a totally unexpected way.”⁸⁶ This monopoly extended to the army’s officer corps. After his election in 1800, Jefferson famously purged the army of all Federalist officers above the rank of captain. He had gone to the extent of interviewing one candidate for appointment to West Point personally and asking, “To which of the political creeds to you adhere?” After the young man mentioned that his family were federalists, Jefferson responded, “There are many men of high talent and integrity in that party, but it is not the rising party.” The young man, Joseph Swift, was admitted anyway, but the intimidation was taken in earnest.⁸⁷

In March 1809, two months after Magee had graduated West Point, the new President, James Madison, replaced Dearborn as Secretary of War with another Massachusetts man, William Eustis, and it was to him that Magee’s promotion in 1812 fell. The change was likely fatal for Magee’s prospects. Eustis, a former military surgeon, had no militia tie to Perkins, but he did have a political connection to him, and it probably was not a pleasant one: Eustis had served in the Massachusetts legislature as a Republican at the same time that Perkins served as a Federalist. Perkins had always been politically active. As early as 1794, he was listed as a “vote distributor” for the party, a kind of local organizer and election fixer, and served on the Massachusetts Federalist Central Committee. He was at the center of one of the most charged political incidents of the day, the 1806 murder of Republican Charles Austin by the Federalist Thomas Selfridge. Perkins served as the foreman of the jury that found Selfridge guilty of a lesser

⁸⁶ Appleby, 20

⁸⁷ Appleby, 31 and Linklater, 196.

charge of manslaughter but acquitted him of murder – a ruling which appalled Republicans.⁸⁸

While these sins may not have offended Dearborn any more than Joseph Swift's family's federalism offended Jefferson, Perkins' politics took an even more partisan shift during and after the 1808 election, and almost certainly offended Eustis, as well as President Madison himself. Perkins worked conspicuously against Madison's election in 1808, and again antagonized the President in 1810 when he led the official escort through Boston for the British minister Francis James Jackson, whose behavior in America so incensed the President that he was declared "persona non grata" by him.⁸⁹ Perkins was also involved in the separatist movement that culminated in the Hartford Convention, and would in 1815 serve as one of three ambassadors to Madison from the convention. But long before, his connection to a movement that Republicans thought treasonous, was well known⁹⁰ The Magee family was not overtly political, but were likely also Federalist. Their wealth and status argue for it, as does their early residence on Federal Street, a hotbed – as the name implies – of Federalist activity in Boston.⁹¹ The graduates of Philips Exeter Academy, including those mentioned above, were almost all Federalists, or later, as Daniel Webster was, Whigs. The totality of the evidence therefore suggests that Eustis denied the promotion on political grounds, perhaps as a slight intended for Perkins. This certainly accounts for the bitter, injured tone of Magee's letter of resignation, which he wrote to Estes on June 22, 1812. "Feeling myself dissatisfied with the service and

⁸⁸ *Trial of Thomas O. Selfridge, Attorney at Law, Before the Hon. Isaac Parker, Esquire for killing Charles Austin on the Public Exchange in Boston, August 4, 1806* (Boston: Russel, Cutler, Belcher and Armstrong, 1806), 5.

⁸⁹ Seaburg and Patterson, 217.

⁹⁰ Thomas Gary, ed. *Memoir of Thomas Handasyd Perkins containing extracts from his diaries and letters* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856), 219.

⁹¹ Detwiller, F.C. *Magee Family Mariners ca. 1750-1820*.

personally slighted,” Magee wrote, “I have the honor to offer to you my resignation of the commission which the President of the United States had been so pleased to bestow upon me.”⁹²

Magee was giving up a lot. He was by all accounts a competent and capable officer. Not only was he part of the moneyed elite, but also of the intellectual one, a legacy of his time at Phillips Exeter. With such a background, Magee was clearly intelligent, and was indeed described by Shaler as one of the best-informed officers in the army.⁹³ He was from a wealthy and industrious family (his father and brothers, despite all their fortunes, sailed personally with their precious cargos rather than remain in the comfort of home). He had lost that father as a young man, with all the psychological baggage that brings. He spurned the seafaring profession, which his two older brothers continued to exercise to great success. Whether he abandoned the family business out of rebellion, fear of the sea, or a desire to prove himself on his own terms is unknown. The lure of Gutiérrez’ expedition was strong to a man who was smarting under a slight to his honor, and he had proved that he was willing to risk everything for honor. In 1811, he fought a duel, killing a Frenchman in a sword fight in which Magee lost a little finger.⁹⁴

One other factor may have sealed the deal: the personal entreaties of William Shaler. Although it is probable that it was Wilkinson or an ally who initially pointed Gutiérrez to Magee, Shaler was certainly acquainted with the young officer, describing him to Monroe as “a very tall, robust Bostonian, handsome of person and countenance, commanding in

⁹² Augustus Magee to William Eustes, Baton Rouge, June 22, 1812, quoted in Ed Bradley, *We Never Retreat: Filibustering Expeditions into Spanish Texas, 1812-1822* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015), 37.

⁹³ “Magee, Augustus William,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association. <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fma12>. (accessed April 15, 2016).

⁹⁴ Warren D.C. Hall, *Notes furnished by W.D.C. Hall* in D.W.C. Baker, *A Texas Scrapbook Made up of the History, Biography and Miscellany of Texas and Its People* (New Orleans: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1875), 224.

appearance and withal prepossessing in manner.”⁹⁵ Moreover, Shaler’s biography closely parallels that of James Magee. Like the young officer’s father, Shaler was a New England merchant captain who had plied Asiatic waters. He had visited Hawaii only a few years after James Magee had made America’s first visit there. He had sailed the same waters in the Northwest, where Bernard Magee had been killed. In the small, club-like circle of New England merchantmen, Shaler certainly knew of the Magee and Perkins families. Even if the young officer concealed his family ties, any conversation about Spain would have made an impression. Had Shaler shared his own history of Spanish obstructionism while attempting to open up trade, it would have sounded familiar to the young lieutenant. His father, like Shaler, had been interrogated by the Spaniards at Valparaiso and T.H. Perkins’s brother Samuel had had his cargo seized at Lima.⁹⁶

An opportunity for glory had allure for Magee as well. Shaler, writing to Secretary of State James Monroe, said Magee’s “sole object in undertaking the command of that expedition appears to be military fame.” We know too that Gutiérrez adopted as the expedition’s emblem an emerald-green flag – a symbol of Ireland – in honor of Irish-descended Magee. Gutiérrez supposedly chose such a symbol to appeal to Magee’s vanity.⁹⁷ It is noteworthy that unlike rebels in Spanish Florida, where the first “lone star” flag was raised, Magee did not insist on a banner containing any American symbolism. Indeed, when American envoy John Robinson passed through the filibuster camp en route to meet with Spanish officials, Magee exhibited marked hostility towards Robinson,

⁹⁵ William Shaler to James Monroe, August 18, 1812. Shaler Papers.

⁹⁶ Madeline Coughlin, “Commercial Foundations of Political Interest in the Opening Pacific, 1789-1829,” *California Historical Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (Mar., 1971): 17 and James Yard to James Madison, 19 March 1802, *Founders Online*, National Archives <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/02-03-02-0053> (accessed April 1, 2016).

⁹⁷ Bradley, 36.

specifically for carrying a flag of the United States. Historian Ed Bradley suggests that while a minor incident, the argument indicates not all filibusters were pro-American expansionists, and “Magee in particular held considerable hostility toward the United States over his lack of advancement in that nation’s army.”⁹⁸ Indeed, at the army’s lowest ebb, it was the Mexican revolutionary Gutiérrez, not the American officer-turned mercenary Magee, who desperately begged for U.S. military support in exchange for ceding Texas to the United States.⁹⁹ Indeed, when one considers Magee’s connections to the Federalist party and a key leader connected to the Hartford Convention movement, Magee as commander was probably the worst American choice from the perspective of the Madison Administration, if suggestions of its complicity in the expedition are to be believed.

Magee was not the expedition’s only West Pointer. Joining him in Texas was 1807 graduate **Samuel Noah**. Noah was a London-born Jew who had emigrated to the United States at age 20. After several years working in New York City, he applied for an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy, but was turned down and in 1805 was accepted into West Point. Also well-educated and reputedly excellent in penmanship, he was employed as a secretary and transcriptionist for the superintendent, as well as a court reporter at the academy. Appointed to the infantry arm, he was stationed at Fort Adams, Mississippi. Here he met then-captain Winfield Scott and, of course, Wilkinson. A student of history with a passion for the lives of great men, Noah engaged in a private study of Napoleon’s campaigns while waiting, like Magee, for a promotion that never came. As an official West Point history recorded, “Wearied finally with slow promotion,

⁹⁸ Ibid., 44.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 47.

and disgusted that ignorant civilians were appointed to rank him, he resigned March 31, 1811, his commission of First Lieutenant in the Army.” The date is noteworthy, because unlike Magee’s resignation, which was likely submitted *after* he had learned of the proposed filibuster, Noah resigned months before the project was even rumored, while Gutiérrez was still in Saltillo. Nonetheless, a year later, when he presumably heard of the expedition for the first time, Noah joined it, “allured by visions of a golden future.”¹⁰⁰

The Enlisted Soldier

But trained military men like Magee and Noah were the exception. While the known names of expedition participants are heavily skewed towards officers, we know of a few ordinary soldiers whose stories are enlightening. One such soldier was **Samuel Barber**. A native of Harpers Ferry, Virginia, Barber joined the army on June 30, 1801, enlisting for a period of five years. He was assigned to the First Infantry, which over the next few years ranged up and down the Western frontier. He served at Fort Mackinac, in what is now Michigan, until 1805, when his unit was reassigned to the newly acquired Louisiana territory. Near the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers, his unit constructed Fort Belle Fontaine, the first U.S. Army post west of the Mississippi River.¹⁰¹ The fort, constructed after Louis and Clark left the spot on their expedition, welcomed them on their return, and Barber likely was there at the time. Indeed, Fort Belle Fontaine was the starting point for a number of subsequent westward explorations, including that of Zebulon Pike, as well as a meeting place for settlers, trappers, Native Americans,

¹⁰⁰ George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Gazetteer/Places/America/United_States/Army/USMA/Cullums_Register/30*.html (Accessed April 14, 2016.)

¹⁰¹ Alan Barber, “Barber Family in Louisiana.” (June 15, 1997) http://www.barberhome.com/histories/Sam_LA.pdf (accessed July 31, 2016), 3.

Spaniards, and Frenchmen.¹⁰² At the time, Gen. Wilkinson was theoretically the commander of the fort from his headquarters several miles away in St. Louis. Life at the outpost – the name of which optimistically, but incorrectly, meant “beautiful spring” – was miserable. Disease was rampant and discipline harsh. In one instance, Captain Benjamin Lockwood, Barber’s commanding officer, summarized the day’s floggings in a letter to his superior with the casual comment, “The men has [sic] been punished this Evening that was ordered except one that received but Forty Lashes before he fainted being a youth and a delicate Constitution...”¹⁰³

Barber, in his teens or early 20s, lived in a crude tent, but likely participated in building the soldiers’ housing along the way, since his pre-army occupation was listed as a sawyer. Although the poor conditions were scarcely bettered by the improved housing, Barber reenlisted on Jan. 30, 1806. Before the year was out, Barber’s unit moved south to modern Louisiana.¹⁰⁴ The move coincided with increasing tensions between the United States and Spain over the western boundary of the territory. The controversy brought the two countries perilously close to war before Gen. Wilkinson’s timely expedient of establishing a neutral zone between the two sides averted the crisis. Barber, arriving at Fort Adams, Mississippi, in May 1806, was acutely aware of the crisis, and the competing boundary claims.¹⁰⁵ He subsequently was on hand for the Burr conspiracy, and his unit moved to New Orleans as a response to it. When the crisis passed and the unit was ordered back to the frontier at Fort Adams, Barber apparently deserted, possibly for

¹⁰² St. Louis County Parks and Recreation, *Fort Belle Fontaine Website*, <http://www.stlouisco.com/ParksandRecreation/ParkPages/FortBelleFontaine> (accessed July 31, 2016).

¹⁰³ Kate L. Gregg, “Building of the First American Fort West of the Mississippi,” *The Missouri Historical Review* 30, no 4 (July, 1936): 358.

¹⁰⁴ Barber, 5.

¹⁰⁵ Barber, 6

the lure of the city but most likely over the horrible conditions. By 1809, out of his division of 2,000 men, over 800 had died of disease.¹⁰⁶

Barber fled to West Florida, where he was given permission by the Spanish governor to stay, and at one point was so destitute that he worked for a local inhabitant for wages that included, among other things, clothing. Barber skipped out on his job before the work was done and took the clothing with him, moving on to Bayou Teche, Louisiana, where he continued working as a laborer for wealthier Anglo and Cajun neighbors, and found an interest in raising cattle.¹⁰⁷ Barber likely joined the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition in the Neutral Ground. He fought through several campaigns and survived the Battle of Medina. He married soon after his return and joined the Louisiana militia's 16th Regiment during the War of 1812. Texas, however, continued to call to him, and by 1829, Samuel brought his family and a small herd of cattle to the department again, settling in what is now Chambers County, Texas.¹⁰⁸

Doctors and Lawyers

In a moment of frustration after his hold on the army began to slip, Gutiérrez complained in his diary that the American volunteer force was “mostly doctors and lawyers gifted in all matters, especially in the matter of rascality.”¹⁰⁹ An exaggeration perhaps, but the expedition did attract a number of young professional men who may have sought military success to burnish their reputations in the status-conscious era, when a few months of service could earn one the honorific “Major” or “Colonel” for the rest of

¹⁰⁶ James Ripley Jacobs, *The Beginning of the U.S. Army* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), 342-352.

¹⁰⁷ Barber, 9-10.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁰⁹ Elizabeth Howard West, “Diary of Jose Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, 1811-1812,” *The American Historical Review*, 34, no. 1 (Oct., 1928): 59.

one's life. Among the educated adventurers who joined the army was David Phelps. A previously unidentified member of the expedition in the existing literature, his participation is referenced in his family history. Born in Connecticut, he was a relative of a Revolutionary War general, Noah Phelps, who had helped capture Fort Ticonderoga. For his part, David Phelps fought at the Battle of Wyoming, Pennsylvania (1778), in which some patriot survivors of the battle were reportedly massacred by Iroquois allies of British loyalists. He later attended Yale and became a doctor. He moved west and may have lived in Kentucky.¹¹⁰ The new territory of Louisiana at the time was still bursting with new immigrants, and Phelps, who had married a widow, apparently trailed relatives of his new wife to the region. He settled in Catahoula Parish, where he was the community's first doctor.¹¹¹ In addition to his wife's older children from her previous marriage, Phelps had two children under ten years old living with him listed in the 1810 census. Phelps was around 46 years old at the time.¹¹² Catahoula Parish, about ten miles west of Natchez, was one of several new parishes carved out of existing ones by Gov. Claiborne in the decade following the Louisiana Purchase. Practicing medicine in a rural area, even a growing one, was not very lucrative given the lack of hard currency, and Phelps appears to have struggled. In 1809, the doctor went into debt to a neighbor for the sum of \$500, putting up as collateral property, household goods, livestock, and two slaves named Dick and Kate.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Oliver Seymour Phelps, and Andrew T. Servin, *The Phelps Family in America and their English Ancestors*, Vol. 1 (Pittsfield Mass: Eagle Publishing Company, 1899), 402.

¹¹¹ Alcee Fortier, ed. *Louisiana: Comprising Sketches of Parishes, Towns, Events, Institutions, and Persons, Arranged in Cyclopedic Form*, Vol. I (Century Historical Association, 1914), 174.

¹¹² MyTrees.com "David Phelps Born 1764 in CT Died in LA" <http://www.mytrees.com/ancestry-family/1e000781-1058-4642/David-Phelps-Born-1764-in-CT.html> (accessed July 18, 2016).

¹¹³ Afrigeneas.com "Catahoula Parish Louisiana Courthouse Records" Sourced from: *Ark-La-Tex Genealogical Association*, Volume 13, No. 1, (Jan. 1979). <http://www.afrigeneas.com/slavedata/Morgan-LA-1809.txt> (accessed July 17, 2016).

Phelps' motivation in joining the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition was likely financial and possibly included land speculation, for which he later showed a clear interest. Phelps survived the Battle of Medina and fled northward, but was captured by the royalists at Spanish Bluffs. He was imprisoned in San Antonio, but later released and walked home to Louisiana. He actively traded land, and in January 1823 bought a tract near Sicily Island, Louisiana, along the Mississippi River, for \$100 and then sold the same land for \$400 later that year.¹¹⁴

Two other participants who left budding professional careers to join up were the brothers **Darius** and **Orramel Johnston**. Their grandfather, Achibald Johnston, was a captain in the American Revolution and then ran an iron works in Connecticut.¹¹⁵ His son, John Johnston, attended medical school and then joined the westward movement to Kentucky, where he settled in Macon County, then on the frontier, and began what would become a prodigious family that encompassed twelve children, Darius was the third, Orramel the fifth, and three wives. The eleventh child, a half-brother who was nine years old when Darius and Orramel went to Texas, was Albert Sidney Johnston, who later rose to fame in the armies of the Republic of Texas and the Confederacy. It is due to him that most of the family history is preserved.¹¹⁶

The Johnston family was middle class and well-educated by frontier standards. Darius and Orramel were known to have studied under private tutors, perhaps Mann Butler, who later instructed their younger brother Albert Sidney. If so, Butler was known to be a

¹¹⁴ Carol Young Knight, *First settlers of Catahoula Parish, Louisiana, 1808-1839* (Aledo, TX.: Self-Published by Carol Young Knight, 1985), 83-85. The land in question has the same boundaries in the records. The purchaser of the land is listed as a John J. Bowie, likely the same John J. Bowie who was the elder brother of Alamo defender James Bowie.

¹¹⁵ Charles P. Roland, *Albert Sydney Johnston, Soldier of Three Republics* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 6.

¹¹⁶ William Preston Johnston, *The Johnstons of Salisbury* (New Orleans: L. Graham and Son, 1897), 153-4.

strong nationalist and disciple of Henry Clay.¹¹⁷ Darius studied at Transylvania University in Lexington and then studied law under William T. Barry, who served in the Kentucky legislature and later rose to be U.S. Postmaster General under President Andrew Jackson. Orramel followed his father into the practice of medicine, studying in New Orleans.¹¹⁸ When they joined the expedition in 1812, Darius was 23, Orramel 20. They survived the Battle of Medina but were evidently captured and imprisoned for a time. They were released and returned to the United States, both with constitutions wrecked by the experience. Darius died in 1819 at 29, Orramel in 1826, at 34.¹¹⁹ The Johnstons were well-connected with the elites of Kentucky and Louisiana. An older brother, Josiah Stoddard Johnston, was a member of the Louisiana territorial legislature until 1812, and later a member of Congress. He knew and courted the Kempers for their political support, and married the daughter of Dr. John Sibley, the U.S. Indian agent and avid supporter of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition.¹²⁰

Orramel, like his politician brother, was politically minded. An 1818 essay on banking and finance that shows him to be well educated and squarely in the Jeffersonian/Jacksonian mindset on the issue: “We learn from the history of antiquity,” Johnston wrote, “the deplorable and lamentable fact, that money was the cause of the downfall of its governments, and under its scourge, the fairest flower of republican virtue withered.”¹²¹ Spouting a proto-nullification doctrine in opposition to the bank, he also sounds a populist note opposed to the consolidation of capital, calling on a convention to

¹¹⁷ Roland, 9-10.

¹¹⁸ Johnston, 7.

¹¹⁹ Johnston, 8.

¹²⁰ Davis, 288 and Johnston, 6.

¹²¹ Orramel Johnston, *The Chartered Rag Light, Or an Impartial View of the Banking System in the United States* (Maysville, Kentucky: A. Crookshanks, 1818), 4.

“destroy entirely the old constitution and form a new one & expressly say that there shall be no banks.”¹²²

Orramel, though only a youth, had the boldness to write a cryptic letter to an unknown correspondent of some apparent influence in May 1812, asking the reader to “forward this letter to Mr. James Madison President of the United states of America with all the haste imaginable it contains something of a very serious Nature the faster it is forwarded the better it is for him.” The contents of the forwarded letter are lost.¹²³

In a separate letter written a month later from Natchitoches that exists in the papers of James Monroe, Johnston reveals what he is afraid is a “very excentrick movement contrary to the orders of government.” He warns an unknown reader (who apparently forwarded the letter to Monroe, of “a man by the name of Colonel Bernado, but goes by the title of the Spanish Ambassador and a Mr. Shaler who is the American Counsel who have lately arrived here about six weeks ago from the Federal City no one knows their business yet.” Johnston further reveals that General John Adair, a “Major Welsh” and a “Captain Glass” are recruiting volunteers. Not privy to the plans, Johnston says it remains to be seen “whether Mr. Bernardo and Mr. Shaler are here under the cloak of deception.”¹²⁴

Thus, as late as a month before the departure of the expedition which he would himself join, Orramel Johnston was completely in the dark about its purposes. He likely suspected another Burr plot due to the actions of Adair, and felt it his patriotic duty to

¹²² Orramel Johnston, 8.

¹²³ “Orramel Johnston to an Unidentified Correspondent, 18 May 1812 (Abstract),” *Founders Online*, National Archives, <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/03-04-02-0424>. [Original source: *The Papers of James Madison*, Presidential Series, vol. 4, *5 November 1811–9 July 1812 and supplement 5 March 1809–19 October 1811*, ed. J. C. A. Stagg, et al. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 395–396.]

¹²⁴ Orramel Johnston to Unidentified Recipient *The Papers of James Monroe*, University of Mary Washington.

write a letter to be forwarded to Madison and another to Monroe about the affair. Either someone close to Shaler set his mind at ease about the expedition, or he may have joined it to continue his self-appointed role as a spy over the operation. No further letters have come to light to answer this question.

It was Darius, however, who played a role in what would become the most critical event of the expedition: the trial and subsequent execution of fifteen Spanish officials by the Junta. After their capture, Mexican revolutionaries seemed bent on summarily judging them. Kemper, the new leader of the American contingent following Magee's death, appointed Darius Johnston to serve as counsel for the accused. The Junta prevented him from speaking, however, and the court subsequently found the Spaniards guilty. Only a threat of violence by the Americans saved their lives and commuted the sentence to banishment, but the reprieve was short-lived and they were executed shortly after leaving San Antonio.¹²⁵ Darius left no known writings that provide more insight into the event, but the brutal crime soured many Americans on the whole enterprise. Along with Gutiérrez' very non-republican constitution, the murder of the Spanish royalists disabused American notions that they were fighting a battle for liberty as they conceived it. Another blow, for those who may have hoped for America to press claims on part or all of Texas according to their conception of the borders of Louisiana, was that Gutiérrez, who only months before, when in desperate straits was ready to exchange the entire province, now made Mexican ownership of Texas non-negotiable when he seemed to be victorious. Though other Americans continued to flock into Texas even at this late date, many of the original members of the expedition quit it or embraced a new leader, Toledo, who soon arrived in Texas.

¹²⁵ Bradley, 68.

Toledo and the Idealists

When Gutiérrez and Toledo were in Philadelphia in 1811, they found a community as enthusiastic for the venture of liberating Spanish America as the one Gutiérrez had found on the frontier, but for different reasons. Philadelphia was a hotbed of Latin American dissidents who thrived in its cosmopolitan atmosphere, breathed in the Spirit of '76 and gravitated to its large collection of publishing houses. A new generation of post-independence printers, inspired by the ever-present memory of Benjamin Franklin, competed vigorously for business in the intellectual capital of the American Republic. Spanish exiles seeking to enter the business of propaganda embraced them to publish their works, and the printers in turn embraced the idea of spreading liberty to the provinces of New Spain.¹²⁶ After Gutiérrez departed for Texas, leaving Toledo behind, the latter began to build a following among these men, collecting his own mini-filibuster that included three printers, **Samuel Alden, Aaron Mower, Goodwin Brown Cotton**. All would follow Toledo to Texas. It was Mower who set the type for the *Gaceta de Tejas*, Toledo's propaganda newspaper, the first and only edition of which praised Mower for having "abandoned all of his interests, and tranquility...in order to come to offer his services to the Mexican patriots." Cotton, who assisted him, is almost certainly the same man who later returned to Texas in 1829 and publish the *Texas Gazette* at San Felipe de Austin.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Brown, 39.

¹²⁷ Kathryn Garrett, "The First Newspaper of Texas: 'Gaceta de Texas'," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (Jan., 1937): 201; Ike Moore, "The Earliest Printing and First Newspaper in Texas," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (Oct., 1935): 97. Mower is alternatively spelled as Moore in some sources.

Toledo's Philly filibuster was assisted in its growth by a fellow resident of the boarding house the Cuban lived in, Vermont native Ira Allen, an American independence pioneer and brother of Ethan Allen, who saw great opportunities for trade between America and potentially independent Spanish-American Republics.¹²⁸ Among the enthusiastic supporters who gravitated to Toledo were two young lawyers, **Nathaniel Cogswell** and **Henry Adams Bullard**. Bullard was born in 1788 in Pepperell, Massachusetts. He attended Harvard, where he graduated at age nineteen with both the bachelor's and master's degrees, staying on and working at the university for two years after graduating to pay his expenses. Relocating to Philadelphia, he began studying the law. Bullard circulated in elite circles, becoming acquainted with Matthew Tilghman, a former member of the Continental Congress, and young George Dallas (later vice president).¹²⁹ He had a passion for languages; having studied French at Harvard, he wanted to learn others. A memorial written at the time of his death indicates this interest as one of the key reasons he chose vibrant, cosmopolitan Philadelphia over Puritan Boston to start his career, noting that while he pursued his legal studies, he "acquired the Spanish, Italian and German, all of which he critically understood and appreciated."¹³⁰

Bullard's interest in Spanish revolutionary activity may have begun before he arrived in Philadelphia. He is listed in several sources as the probable author of a history of the Venezuelan revolution published in Boston in 1808. If so, he likely wrote the account

¹²⁸ Ibid., 209.

¹²⁹ B.F. French, "Memoir of Hon. Henry A. Bullard, LL.D., president of the Louisiana Historical Society, and late judge of Supreme Court of Louisiana," in *Historical Collections of Louisiana...Compiled with Historical and Biographical Notes* (New York: B.F. French, 1851), 6.

¹³⁰ C. Little and James Brown, ed. "American Obituary for 1851" in *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge, 1852* (Cambridge: Metcalf and Company, 1852), 334.

from the notes of an American who fought alongside Francisco Miranda.¹³¹ In Philadelphia, Bullard practiced his Spanish while circulating among the colonial exiles. A biography at the time of his death, written by a friend, V.H. Ivy, noted that Bullard, a youth of common origins, circulated among the most elite men of the city:

We now find him, at that most critical period of his life, a young man of vigorous mind, with a liberal education... full of the high hopes and aspirations which the fame and example of such men would excite; and yet, without influential relations and friends to give him the first impulse, without which so many of the noblest and best so frequently fall into despair. About this time Mexico was in revolution against Spain... He was fascinated with the splendid pictures painted by the imaginative mind of the Spanish revolutionary soldier [Toledo]. Can we wonder what was his course?¹³²

And so the 24-year-old Bullard, just having passed the bar, abandoned a potentially lucrative legal career to accompany Toledo to the revolution, signing up as an aide and military secretary.¹³³ He, along with Toledo's printers, a long-time revolutionary from South America named Juan Pincornel and several Frenchmen (including a chef) formed an entourage that began to grow as Toledo moved west towards Texas. When Gutiérrez jealously demanded Toledo stay out of Texas, Bullard made his way to San Antonio as Toledo's de-facto spy. He helped persuade Shaler to switch commanders, writing with unbridled criticism that Gutiérrez should be replaced because he did little in San Antonio

¹³¹ Pierce Welch Gaines, ed. *Political Works of Concealed Authorship During the Administrations of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson* (New Haven: Yale University Library, 1959), 116. The book, which two sources have attributed to Bullard, is the *History of Don Francisco de Miranda's Attempt to Effect a Revolution in South America*. The account claims to be a series of letters by a "Gentleman who was an officer under that General, to his friend in the United States." The book was published anonymously in its first printing, then in later printings attributed to a James Biggs, who is unknown. Bullard could not possibly have gone to Venezuela personally.

¹³² V.H. Ivy, "The Late Henry A. Bullard," In *Debow's Southern and Western Review* 12 (1852): 51-52.

¹³³ Little and Brown, 334.

beyond “lolling on his sofa and catching flies.”¹³⁴ Bullard survived the Battle of Medina and fled back to the U.S. The defeat would leave him “destitute and worn down with fatigue and sickness” in Louisiana, unable to return home. He turned back to the legal profession and soon found dramatic success, owing to his fluency in Spanish and French, which brought him into high demand in Louisiana.¹³⁵ He was appointed a district judge in 1822, elected to Congress in 1831, appointed to the Louisiana Supreme Court, served as Louisiana Secretary of State, and taught as a law professor at the Law School of Louisiana (today’s Tulane University Law School).¹³⁶

The post-expedition Bullard’s erudite personality comes through via his voluminous library, which was cataloged after his death and offered for sale, the titles preserved in court records. He had great interest in foreign cultures and their systems of law, though he believed America’s democratic legal tradition superior. He was a profound believer in natural law theory, and his library “revealed him to be both a practical man and a scholarly one.”¹³⁷ Bullard also served as president of the Historical Society of Louisiana, and in a speech to the organization on January 13, 1836, he told the members their purpose: “Each generation, as it passes away, is under obligations to its successors to furnish them those authentic materials for which alone its true character can be known to

¹³⁴ William Shaler to James Monroe, 14 July 1813, *Founders Online*, National Archives <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/03-06-02-0411> [Source: The Papers of James Madison, Presidential Series, vol. 6, 8 February–24 October 1813, ed. Angela Kreider, et al. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 439–440.]

¹³⁵ Ivy, 52.

¹³⁶ U.S. Congress, “Biographical Dictionary of Congress,” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=B001049> (accessed March 13, 2016).

¹³⁷ Robert Feikema Karachuk, “A Workman’s Tools: The Law Library of Henry Adams Bullard,” *The American Journal of Legal History* 42, No. 2 (Apr., 1998): 188.

posterity.”¹³⁸ Although Bullard never penned any works under his own name on the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, he is the author of an unsigned 1836 article in the *North American Review*. The piece, published shortly after the Battle of San Jacinto, is part history lesson, part current affairs for its readers. It shows Bullard to be well-read in Mexican history, and despite 25 years residence in the South, and at the time a sitting justice on the Louisiana Supreme Court, still possessing a New England bias against slavery.¹³⁹ In the article, Bullard denies any government inclination to “take possession of the country as soon as it should have been wrested from the dominion of Spain,” though he does note Shaler’s presence as an agent for the government observing and assisting the rebellion. As for the filibusters themselves, Bullard gives as the prime motive the disputed boundary of the Louisiana Purchase:

At that time, the American people and government were wearied with the protracted negotiation with Spain, its interminable delays, and the evident reluctance of the cabinet of Madrid, to do justice to the United States; and there was a strong disposition among the people to seize upon that part of the territory which was still in dispute.¹⁴⁰

Bullard, driven by youthful idealism in 1812, was considerably less idealistic by 1836. He expressed skepticism of whether Mexicans could ever understand democracy as the Americans did, writing “The great mass of the population of Mexico were absolutely ignorant of the simplest elements of popular self-government,” a condition he blamed on

¹³⁸ Henry Adams Bullard, “A discourse delivered before the Historical Society of Louisiana” (speech, New Orleans, LA, January 13, 1836.), in *North American Review* Vol 43 (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1836): 281.

¹³⁹ “Mexico and Texas” *North American Review* Vol 43 (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, 1836). While the published article does not have an attributed author, the original draft of the document is attributed to Bullard. Notably, Bullard’s comments negative to slavery were redacted by the publishers before printing. Bullard was a Whig, but found respect in Southern society despite his views. Ivy’s editors state in their biography that “Neither Mr. Ivy nor ourselves agree with the political tenets held by Judge Bullard; but find nothing in that to militate against our high appreciation of his learning, his talents, and his constant and unwavering services to the state.” Ivy, 50.

¹⁴⁰ Henry Adams Bullard, “Mexico and Texas” [Original Manuscript] *North American Review Papers*, 1831-1843. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

the legacy of Spanish authority. In the January, 1836 speech, he laid out a vision of history in which Spain's colonization is depicted as brutal and oppressive compared to the English and French models.¹⁴¹

Another source of Bullard's character comes from a historical novel written about the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition. *Francis Berrian; or, The Mexican Patriot*, was a novel by Timothy Flint, a friend of Bullard's who used the latter's remembrances as told to him as his prime source for the expedition and patterned his swashbuckling lead character on the young Bullard. The novel, written in 1823, is historically confused and was generally panned as horrible by the press of the time, but provides detailed insights into how the filibusters – or at least Bullard, speaking through Flint – wanted their motivations to be interpreted. As James Weldon Long writes of the book, “If we read Berrian as a prototypical filibuster, then Flint's novel registers as a representative national narrative conveying an exceptionalist vision of the United States and its position in the Age of Revolutions.”¹⁴² While one must avoid conclusions based on a work of fiction, the close connection between Bullard and Flint – and corresponding information in Bullard's background – makes the work relevant to Bullard's viewpoint – at least the viewpoint he held in the years after the expedition.

In the novel, Berrian, the hero/lawyer claims of his fellow filibusters, “Their avowed object was to aid the Patriot natives in communicating to this oppressed and beautiful country, the entire freedom of their own.” These, the author contends, are “gallant and high-minded men.” He contrasts them with “self-denominated patriots,” of one of whom he writes, “it was difficult to ascertain which element preponderated in him, revenge, or a

¹⁴¹ Henry Adams Bullard, “A discourse delivered before the Historical Society of Louisiana.”

¹⁴² James Weldon Long, “Revolutionary Republics: U.S. National Narratives and the Independence of Latin America, 1810–1846” (Ph.D. diss., Louisiana State University, 2011), 13.

love of liberty, cupidity and ambition, or a desire to liberate his country.”¹⁴³ The latter is a reference to a fictional character clearly based on Gutiérrez, and exposes the strong bias to be expected from Bullard, a committed partisan of Toledo.

Just as Bullard exhibited a bias in his speech, Flint shows a conceit of the Spanish as inherently hostile to liberty. They are “instinctive enemies to every form of republican government...[are] contemplating with horror and disgust the development of republican principles.” Long notes, “As ‘the Mexican Patriot,’ Berrian remains indelibly a U.S. citizen, devoted to the nation’s foundational principles, a characterization that literalizes the cultural assumption that the American Revolution was in fact a global rebellion against tyranny that could spread its influence to any oppressed group.”¹⁴⁴ This second-hand portrayal completes a picture of Bullard as an idealist who at once loves Spanish culture, language, and people – or at least the cosmopolitan variants he found in Philadelphia – but who ultimately maintains a paternalistic view of the Spanish struggle for liberty.

While Bullard was paving the way for Toledo in Texas, another member of the Philadelphia filibusters had broken with his mentor and sought to stop him at all costs. He was another New England-born lawyer named **Nathaniel Cogswell**. Born in Haverhill, Massachusetts, in 1773, he graduated at nineteen from Dartmouth. He read law under Ebenezer Smith, who had the impressive distinction of serving in the Massachusetts militia for the entire duration of the Revolutionary War.¹⁴⁵ Like many of the expedition participants, Cogswell idealized founding generation leaders like Smith. After opening

¹⁴³Long, 88.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., 93.

¹⁴⁵ Everett S. Stackpole and Lucien Thompson, *History of the Town of Durham New Hampshire*, Vol. 1 (Unknown), 279. <https://archive.org/details/historyoftownofd01stac> (accessed July 20, 2016).

his own legal practice and relocating to the town of Newburyport, Massachusetts, in 1805, Cogswell quickly established himself in the community and in 1808 was selected to give the Fourth of July oration to the city's "republican citizens." He began with a tribute to revolutionary soldiers who endured "with undaunted fortitude and patience, the numerous privations and hardships which they were doomed to suffer."¹⁴⁶ Their model, however, should not be forgotten by his generation. Turning to the crowd before him, he noted that many veterans were still there who had become "old and grey in the cause of freedom." Others, he told his fellows of his generation "are just entering upon the theater of action." Cogswell led his listeners through a detailed history of republics, contrasting them with the persecutions and bondage of monarchies. He followed with a spirited lauding of Washington and "the great and good" Jefferson. He praised the "enlightened, independent, and virtuous yeomanry," who were the heart of the nation, and added that, "so long as they retain and own the soil which they cultivate, so long are our liberties on a sure, a certain, and immovable foundation."¹⁴⁷ America, Cogswell told his audience, was "The first and only independent nation on the fourth quarter of the globe."¹⁴⁸

Within three years, Cogswell would join the effort to add a second independent nation in that quarter. Making his way to Philadelphia, he fell into company with Toledo, at first embracing the would-be-revolutionary. While his revolutionary ardor never waned, he quickly fell out with Toledo, whom he began to suspect of being a double agent of Spain. Cogswell, in turn, was accused by Toledo and his acolytes, including Bullard, as having committed theft or some other petty crime, but that hardly explains the lengths to which

¹⁴⁶ Nathaniel Cogswell, *An Oration Delivered before the Republican Citizens of Newburyport in the Rev. John Giles' Meetinghouse on the Fourth of July, 1808* (Newburyport: W. and J. Gilman, 1808), 8.

¹⁴⁷ Cogswell, 19.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

he went to stop Toledo. After the latter left for Texas, Cogswell set out on a personal mission to stop the Cuban, who in fact *already had* approached the Spanish ambassador with an offer to betray the revolution, although the Spanish had rejected him and Toledo seems to have stayed true to the revolutionary cause. Cogswell wrote to Gutiérrez on Dec. 12, 1812, informing him of his suspicions. If Gutiérrez allowed Toledo to come to Texas, Cogswell wrote, he would “rue it in tears of blood.”¹⁴⁹ Cogswell felt so passionately about the danger from Toledo that he traveled to Natchitoches and lay out the case against Toledo before Shaler, who dismissed the idea of a conspiracy and treated the lawyer as a scoundrel. Cogswell, of course, was vindicated by events, but he would die of disease shortly before Medina and therefore never knew it.

¹⁴⁹ “Colonel Nathaniel Cogswell to Generals Gutiérrez and Magee, Pittsburgh, December 29, 1812, quoted in Garrett, 212.

IV. DEFEAT AND AFTERMATH

Following the defeat at Medina, the remaining filibusters fled across Texas, chased by the Spanish. Some, like Quirk, were captured and held in such deplorable conditions that over a dozen of them suffocated inside a house on the first night after the battle.¹⁵⁰ The family history of **Henry Munson** preserves a story that he survived only when his life was saved by a Spanish officer named Mordella, for whom Munson later named his son.¹⁵¹ While General Arredondo killed hundreds of Mexican republicans, after the rebels were decisively defeated, the pursuit of the fleeing Americans was not prosecuted as vigorously. The filibusters straggled across the border in small groups. Some were wrecked by wounds or disease, including **James Biddle Wilkinson**, who died very soon after the expedition, and **Samuel Kemper**, who died some time in 1814 of measles. Many of the survivors, finding their country embroiled in a war of its own, dispersed to fight in it. Most, finding themselves in Louisiana, joined the army there and fought at the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, including **Samuel Barber**, the enlisted man who had suffered so much in army life before the expedition, and **Henry Perry**, the expedition's final American leader. Others who fought at New Orleans included **John "Jack" W. Hall**, **Warren D.C. Hall**, **Joshua Childs**, **Anthony Dubois**, **Isaac Foster**, **Michael Prudhomme**, **Elisha Roberts**, and possibly **Peter Foster**, **William Walker**, and a man identified only by the name **Gormley**. **Aylett Buckner** may have returned to Kentucky to join the militia there, **James Gaines** fought in Virginia and **Walter Young** fought in the

¹⁵⁰ Bradley, 89.

¹⁵¹ Thurmond A. Munson, *The Munsons of Texas – An American Saga* (N.p., 1987), chapter 7. <http://www.munsons-of-texas.net/c7.html> (accessed Sep. 29, 2016).

war at an unknown location.¹⁵² **Samuel Noah**, the West Pointer, attempted to regain his commission in the army he had abandoned three years before, but as a native of England in the midst of a war with that nation, he was refused. He made his way to New York, where he joined up in a militia brigade stationed near the city under Col. Nathan Myers, who like Noah, was also Jewish.¹⁵³

Return of the Filibusters

Attempts to try once more to liberate Texas began almost immediately after the defeat, but all plans were shelved until the end of the War of 1812. John Robinson, the agent of the U.S. government who had so antagonized Magee with his American flag, went from an official envoy to Mexico to planning a filibuster himself, but the effort, like many others, came to naught. The first serious expedition was led by the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition's last American commander, **Henry Perry**. Perry was born in 1785 in Newtown, Connecticut, and raised in nearby Woodbury. He was the son of the Reverend Philo Perry, who had been a doctor before being ordained as an Episcopal clergyman. Young Henry trained to be a doctor and was thus, after his father and grandfather, a third generation physician. In a community history, he is described as "one of those heroic and chivalrous youth, whose courage springs from the noblest impulse of nature, an

¹⁵² U.S. National Parks Service, Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, *Battle of New Orleans, War of 1812 American Muster and Troop Roster List*, www.nps.gov/jela/learn/historyculture/upload/Battle-of-New-Orleans-Muster-Lists-final-copy-01062015.pdf (Accessed September 22, 2016). All of the names appear in War of 1812 Muster rolls, but Foster and Walker have no other substantiating records. The Gormley in the expedition records is not identified with a first name, but there is a John Gormley who fought at New Orleans.

¹⁵³ Simon Wolf and Louis Edward Levy, *The American Jew as Patriot, Soldier and Citizen* (Philadelphia: The Levytype Company, 1895), 36.

enthusiastic love of liberty, and a generous sympathy for all who are unfortunate subjects of despotic power.”¹⁵⁴

Perry may have served in the army before the expedition, and certainly joined it afterwards, serving in the quartermaster’s corps during the New Orleans campaign. In July of the same year, Perry signed up with Juan Pablo Anaya in New Orleans for a filibuster that would have gone through La Bahía and Béxar and then link up with rebels in the interior of Mexico. Perry recruited heavily in New Orleans, among a populace flushed with enthusiasm amid the recent victory. “The favorable moment has at length arrived for making a successful attempt in favour of the patriots of New Spain,” Perry wrote in a Louisiana newspaper. “Our cause embraces the best interest of humanity – the general enlargement of an oppressed people.”¹⁵⁵ Such public recruiting, and possibly a fear that the expedition might endanger the new peace led President Madison to issue a proclamation against it on September 1. Perry organized 300 volunteers, but did not have the funds to proceed, possibly as a result of Madison’s proclamation. A second attempt safely brought Perry and his force to Galveston Bay, where the schooner sank after hitting a sandbar and 60 men drowned. Undaunted, Perry joined Francisco Xavier Mina’s expedition in November 1816, capturing Soto la Marina, Tamaulipas, in April 1817. Convinced that Mina’s expedition would fail without Texas to the north properly secured, Perry led a mere 43 men north into Texas. At La Bahía they found the Spanish too strong for their small force and fled northwards. Two days later, they were surrounded by the

¹⁵⁴ William Cothren, *History of Ancient Woodbury, Connecticut, From the First Indian Deed in 1659 to 1854, Including The Present Towns of Washington, Southbury, Bethlehem, Roxbury, and a Part of Oxford and Middlebury* (Waterbury, Connecticut: Bronson Brothers, 1854), 454. Further genealogical information is found at Geni.com *Rev. Philo Perry Genealogy* <https://www.geni.com/people/Rev-Philo-Perry/6000000028181151909> (Accessed March 17, 2016).

¹⁵⁵ David Head, *Privateers of the Americas: Spanish American Privateering from the United States in the Early Republic* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015), 142.

Spaniards and attacked. With most of his men killed or wounded, Perry committed suicide rather than be captured.¹⁵⁶

The next major attempt to revolutionize Texas was the Long Expedition in 1819, which included many survivors of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, including a now much-diminished Gutiérrez himself under the command of James Long, a Virginian and veteran of the Battle of New Orleans. There were two men who had fought in the first filibuster and also in Perry's recent filibuster, **Warren D.C. Hall** and **Aylett Buckner**. Seizing Nacogdoches, Long established a supreme council including several Gutiérrez - Magee men, including **Samuel Davenport**, **W.W. Walker**, **Hamlin Cook**, **Joshua Child**, **Stephen Barker** and **Horatio Biglow**. The expedition left Natchez with about 75 men, which increased to 300 along the way. In June 1819, it took Nacogdoches and declared a republic.¹⁵⁷ A full account of the expedition is unnecessary here; it suffices to make the case that the participants in the Mina, Aury, and Long expeditions show continuity with that of the Gutiérrez-Magee, and indicate a continued interest among Americans in the Southwest in supporting Mexican revolutionary efforts via Texas. However, these efforts were effectively abandoned following the Adams-Onís Treaty of 1819 and the collapse by that time of much of the Mexican revolutionary armies. Nevertheless, within two years, Mexico would gain its independence as deteriorating conditions in Spain led to a revitalization of the independence movement.

¹⁵⁶ "Perry, Henry," *Handbook of Texas Online*. Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fpe42>. (accessed September 23, 2016).

¹⁵⁷ Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of the North Mexican States and Texas* in *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*, Vol XVI. (San Francisco: The History Company, 1889), 48. Biglow is spelled Bigelow in some cases.

Independence and the Search for Pensions

The new Mexican republic in 1823 recognized the Republican Army of the North as a legitimate revolutionary force that contributed to the independence of the nation, and independence revived hopes for pensions among veterans of the campaign. In recruiting the Americans, Gutiérrez promised land to all who fought, and now a number of them stepped up to make their claims. One claimant was the estate of **Joseph Carr** of Mississippi, who was listed in *Niles' Weekly Register* as “missing” after the Battle of Medina, but who evidently escaped. His wife submitted a claim in 1825 that included several original documents he had brought back from Texas, which are preserved in the Texas State Archives. One is a note from Gutiérrez dated June 14, 1813 that states:

We the Governor and Junta of the State of Texas in conformity to the proposals by us made to the American Volunteers dated April 13, 1813, and accepted by all the Commanding Officers of Said Volunteers on the 16th of said month do hereby certify that Joseph W. Carr is entitled to one League square of Land to be located on any unappropriated land in this State according to the 1st and 2nd Articles of said proposals.

Along with this note, with the same date, is a document signed by then American commander, Perry, certifying that Carr was owed a total of \$426.33, “for the payment of which the State of Texas and the faith of the Mexican Republic stand pledged to the said Volunteer.”¹⁵⁸ It is unlikely that Carr’s estate ever got the \$426.33 or the league of land. Although the Mexican government had the land in abundance, it wanted settlers, not estates, occupying Texas lands. Carr’s case is rare, because such documentation was generally lost in the chaos after the Battle of Medina. The archives of the expedition had been abandoned in San Antonio in the flight after the battle, and the only alternative was eyewitness accounts. Even if these could be obtained, pension-seekers had to travel to

¹⁵⁸ “Carr (Joseph W) Legal Papers” Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Austin, Texas.

Mexico to make their claim and navigate the bureaucracy of a brand-new nation, all amid a language barrier. The government had precious little to offer veterans, but promised \$40 and a league of land to any who could surmount the barriers and make a claim.

Only one Gutiérrez-Magee veteran is known to have actually succeed in submitting a completed pension claim. **George Orr**, a Pennsylvanian and one of the original captains in the expedition, fought all the way through, surviving the Battle of Medina, and submitted a claim, but it was denied. Orr nonetheless settled in Atascocita, Texas, where he and fellow expedition veteran **Henry Munson** served as *alcaldes*.¹⁵⁹ Other Americans who applied for pensions were **Aylett Buckner**, **Thomas Luckett** and **Reuben Ross**.

Ross, originally from Virginia, was an early company captain in the expedition. When Magee died and Samuel Kemper took command, Ross became second-in-command of the Americans. When the Spanish royal officials were murdered and a disgusted Kemper took a leave of absence to go to the U.S., Ross assumed command. His experience was one of the more colorful of the whole expedition. At the Battle of Rosillo, Colonel Ross fought a “swashbuckling saber duel” with a Spanish colonel named Montura, and after the force captured B exar, he fell in love with a local woman whose father was a Spanish soldier. As the decisive battle neared, she warned him that the Spanish were planning to incite the locals to rise against the Americans and Ross in particular was to be killed. Already disenchanted in Guti errez, he fled the city and abandoned the expedition, leaving Perry in command.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁹ W. T. Block, *A History of Jefferson County, Texas* (Nederland, TX.: Nederland Publishing Company, 1976), <http://www.wtblock.com/wtblockjr/History%20of%20Jefferson%20County/chapter%205.htm> (accessed Sep. 25, 2016).

¹⁶⁰ Schwartz, 50.

Ross returned to Virginia for a time, then in 1821, settled in Sparta, Tennessee. He had been 30 years old at the time of the expedition, and now, ten years later, he had a family – and debts. On paper, he was wealthy, owning property and slaves, but it was a house of cards. His father, Randolph Ross, sold him 21 tracts of land and 10 slaves, leaving Reuben a \$20,000 debt to Randolph, which he was to pay in annual installments of \$2,000. Yet the land Randolph Ross had sold to his son was itself under a lien for a loan, as were the slaves, who were mentioned by name in the loan and therefore could not be hidden. Eventually, Randolph Ross' creditors came calling and put Reuben Ross squarely in their sights. The complex case went all the way to the Supreme Court of Tennessee and was still pending in 1828 when a desperate Ross sought salvation through his claim on the Mexican government.¹⁶¹

To make his claim, Ross had to venture to Mexico and argue his case in person, which he did. His preserved letters document the trip, his hopes for a pension and his worries about his wife and family, who he had left behind to face the creditors alone. To a friend in Mexico who he had enlisted to help, he wrote of his object in September 1825: “In the settlement of my accounts by the Junta [of] 1813 the Government was due to me some upwards of \$10,000 for cash, merchandise &c. &c. advanced and rendered this connected with my humble services I have though w[oul]d intitle [sic] me to some remote claim at least on the existing government.”¹⁶² Before he left for Mexico, Ross traveled through Philadelphia and there found the same Spanish community that Bullard had embraced thirteen years before. He became close with a Manuel Simón de Escudero, a

¹⁶¹ Galt v. Dibrel and others. Nashville, December, 1836 in George S Yerger, ed. *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of Tennessee* Vol. 10 (Louisville, KY: Fetter Law Book Company, 1903), 111-119.

¹⁶² Reuben Ross to Col. Jas. C. Hays, Sep. 11, 1825. *Reuben Ross Family Papers*, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin.

member of the new Mexican provisional congress, who was in the city on business. He described Escudero to his wife: “This Gentleman was one of the first, with Hidalgo to take up arms in favor of Liberty in the South American Provinces.” Ross reported to his wife that Escudero had decided to take up his case: “Previous to our parting, he gave me a letter,” to the Secretary of State for Internal Relations. Ross continues: “The letter to Belasco is one of the best and warmest that I ever saw, he requests Belasco to make me acquainted with the president and to consider my claims and negotiations with the Government...you will please consider Ross as Escudero, and Escudero as Ross, for Ross is my friend, and you will therefore please furnish him with any and everything that he may wish.”¹⁶³

Ross sailed from New York to Veracruz, and on April 8, 1826, wrote his wife that he was leaving from there into the interior of the country. To his surprise, he was not the only American veteran making the trip. He had encountered a man named “Ofete,” who is unknown to the histories of the expedition, but whom Ross clearly knew. “This man’s deposition I have taken who has a very retentive memory and has given a naritive [sic] of all the important services rendered by me during the campains [sic] in Texas,” Ross wrote. The second man is not named, but Ross indicated his next stop was a visit to Gutiérrez, who had since returned to Mexico and was now the governor of Tamaulipas. Another expedition member who was seeking a pension at the time was Luckett, who wrote to Ross in Mexico. Luckett was stuck in Washington and apologized that he had missed Ross there when the latter passed through, “as I should have had the pleasure of embracing an old friend & fellow soldier.” Luckett informed Ross that a mutual friend

¹⁶³ Reuben Ross to Frances Ross, New York, Feb. 5, 1826. *Ross Family Papers*.

“has disclosed to me your views” on a business venture. “How would you like to associate yourself with me, in trade, with whom you have cooperated in Battle?”¹⁶⁴

The business venture to which Lockett referred was likely a plan to establish a steamboat line on the Rio Grande, which was referenced in a March 1827 document by H.I. Offett – the same man Ross had encountered in Mexico – with Reuben’s father and other relatives as shareholders.¹⁶⁵ But that was only one iron in the fire. Ross’ grander plan was to monetize his grant to pay his debts, for he wanted to become an *empresario*. Certainly aware of the contract recently obtained by a newcomer to Texas Stephen F. Austin, Ross believed that his service to Mexico justified at least as much, if not more than what Austin had received. Prior to leaving, he signed up eight stockholders in Tennessee for his company, and by 1828 he felt confident enough that he would get his contract. In a letter addressed to “The President & Company of the Ross Association,” he described a visit to Saltillo for “the double purpose of procuring testimony and conferring with the Governor of Coahilla & Texas in relation to a grant for land.” He was then shunted back to Mexico City, had papers lost by officials there, and finally received a positive decision to bring in colonists, with the caveat demanded by the Mexican government that two thirds of the proposed 400 families be Mexicans. Ross then accepted an offer of the government to visit Nacogdoches as a commissioner to treat with the leaders of the Fredonian Rebellion, but it had been suppressed before he arrived.

¹⁶⁴ Reuben Ross to Frances Ross, Mexico. April 8, 1826. and Thomas Lockett to Reuben Ross, Washington, March 6, 1826, *Ross Family Papers*. Lockett is sometimes spelled Lockett in expedition sources, but he signed his name Lockett.

¹⁶⁵ H.I. Offett to Reuben Ross, *Ross Family Papers*.

Nonetheless, Ross took advantage of the travel to return home briefly to Nashville, but by January 1828 was back in Mexico, he told his investors, to tie up a few loose ends.¹⁶⁶

Had he been successful, Ross may have become one of the great *empresarios* of Texas, but it was not to be. Traveling across the interior of Mexico in the summer of 1828, his party was attacked by robbers and Ross was killed. He left behind his long-suffering wife Frances and two nephews who he had adopted and wrote to as “my dear sons.” They were John and a namesake Reuben Ross. Both later followed their uncle’s path, and in 1836 came to Texas to fight in the revolution. Reuben Ross the younger fought at San Jacinto and John, too late for the revolution, was appointed by Republic of Texas President Sam Houston as an Indian agent.

Return to Texas

The veterans who traveled to Mexico were probably fewer than five, but a larger number of participants eventually returned to Texas as settlers in the years following Mexican independence. Of the 120 men identified as participating in the expedition, only 39 named participants are known to have survived the expedition, with five dying in the next few years. Of the remaining 34 alive when Mexico opened Texas to immigration in the 1820s, seventeen of them can be definitively identified among the settlers, with two more probable. These included “Old 300” colonists **Aylett Buckner, Martin Allen, John W. Hall, and A.W. McClain**, as well as possibly **John McFarland** and **William Parker**. Others who came to other colonies included **Warren D.C. Hall, James Gaines,**

¹⁶⁶ Reuben Ross to the Ross Association, Mexico, January 12, 1828, *Ross Family Papers*. The Fredonian Rebellion is the only post Gutiérrez-Magee filibuster that had no known veterans of that first filibuster as participants. Indeed, members of the expedition who were in Texas at the time, including Aylett Buckner and Edmund Quirk, were hostile or neutral towards the Fredonians.

Edmund Quirk, William McLane, Henry Munson, George Orr, Andrew Robinson, Goodwin Brown Cotton, John Gladden King, Horation Biglow, Samuel Barber, Josiah Taylor, and John Villars.¹⁶⁷

Warren D.C. Hall fought in four filibusters in Texas before settling in 1828 with his wife Julietta near Columbia in Brazoria County. He fought in the Battle of Velasco in 1832, where fellow Gutiérrez-Magee veteran **Aylett Buckner** was killed. During the Texas Revolution, he served as the temporary Secretary of War for the Republic. **James Gaines**, who also fought in the Long Expedition, returned to prominence as well. Gaines, a relative of American general Edmund Pendleton Gaines, had established a ferry across the Sabine River along the Nacogdoches-Natchitoches road as early as 1809. He joined the expedition in 1812, but like many Americans, quit the army after the massacre of the Spanish royalist officials. On March 2, 1836, Gaines was a delegate to the convention that adopted the Texas Declaration of Independence, served on the committee to draft a constitution and was elected to the Republic of Texas Senate in 1839.¹⁶⁸

Another returnee was **Martin Allen**. There were several sets of brothers in the expedition, but Allen's family was unique. Alongside Martin was his father, **Benjamin Allen**, his brother **Hiram Allen**, as well as a third-generation member, **David Allen**, Martin's nephew. Benjamin Allen was an American Revolution veteran who had been among the founders of Campbell County Kentucky, where in 1800 he purchased rights

¹⁶⁷ Lester G. Bugbee, "The Old Three Hundred," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, 1, No. 2 (October 1897): 108-117. McFarland and Parker appear in the list, but their names are common and there are no other substantiating sources as exist for the others. There was a **William Fisher** in the expedition who it is possible is the same as the William S. Fisher who served in the Republic of Texas House of Representatives and was captured at Mier, but there is no clear evidence to substantiate the claim.

¹⁶⁸ "Hall, Warren D. C." *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/pha23> (accessed September 23, 2016.) and Sam Houston Dixon, *The Men Who Made Texas Free: The Signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence* (Houston: Texas Historical Publishing Company, 1924), 303-306.

for a mill dam and a landing for a ferry on the banks of the Licking River in Kentucky. His ferry was connected by a road to another ferry operated by the young David Allen. But the venture failed. Benjamin Allen was listed as delinquent on his taxes in 1806 and in 1807, was declared insolvent. In 1808, the Kentucky tax rolls listed him as “gone to Spain.”¹⁶⁹ By 1812, the Allens lived in Louisiana and joined the expedition, likely as a way to escape their financial hardships. Martin was the only one who survived Medina because he had returned to Louisiana on a trip to recruit more volunteers. He returned to Texas in 1825 with his wife and seven children. He served in a volunteer company to defend the colony against Indian attacks. He signed a resolution in 1827 opposing the Fredonian Rebellion and was made a road supervisor in 1830. In 1836, he fought in the Texas Revolution.¹⁷⁰ He presented a petition to the first congress of the Republic of Texas in November 1836, in which he wrote:

Your Petitioners farther and nephew ware both killed at the battle of the Medeena, 18 miles W of San Antonia on the 18th day of August 1813 Where our Whole Army was Defeted and a Jenral Masseecree took place no quarter ware given by the Enimy... Your petitioner was promised One League Square of Land in any unappropriated Lands in the province of Texas, this was the terms of our inlistment, my farther brother & nephew All Had Drawn there certificates, but ware all lost on the Day of the Defeete.[sic]

Allen’s petition also laid out the poverty his stepmother (Benjamin’s wife Sarah) endured after the death of her husband. The woman was left impoverished and had to be supported by her son. In addition, Martin Allen expressed indignation that the late settlers of Texas under Austin and other empresarios had been given rewards that he, a Gutiérrez-Magee veteran, not to mention an Indian fighter for many years, should have earned,

¹⁶⁹ FindAGrave “Benjamin Allen” <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=75679900> (accessed June 6, 2016)

¹⁷⁰ “Martin Allen” *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fal23> (accessed Sep. 29, 2016).

stating, “It is painfull [sic] for me to say that I have not been treated with Equal Justice with the first Settlers of the Country.”¹⁷¹

Many participants who did not return to Texas had family who did, including the two nephews of **Reuben Ross** mentioned above. William Shaler Stillwell, nephew of American agent William Shaler, fought at the Battle of San Jacinto. **Darius** and **Orramel Johnston’s** younger brother, Albert Sydney Johnston, moved to Texas and fought as an officer in the revolution and the Civil War. **Bernardo Despallier**, the immigrant from Louisiana who hoped to start a colony under Spain before revolting against that country, died at the Battle of the Medina, but at least two of his sons fought in the Texas Revolution of 1836, including Alamo defender Charles Despallier and Blaz Philippe Despallier, who fought at the Siege of Bexar but was not in the Alamo when it fell. A third son may have taken part as well.¹⁷² Alongside Charles Despallier at the Alamo was also William Phillip King, son of Gutiérrez-Magee veteran **John Gladden King**. **Josiah Taylor**, the man Reuben Smith distrusted when he had come as an emissary of the Mexico Society, who was imprisoned in the Alamo, did not return to Texas, but his son Creed Taylor and four other children did. All five fought in the Battle of Salado Creek during the Mexican invasion of 1842.¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ “Petition of Martin Allen 23 Nov, 1836” Martin Allen Legal Files Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas.

¹⁷² “Despallier, Charles,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fde89> (accessed September 23, 2016).

¹⁷³ “Josiah Taylor” Texas Historical Marker Texas Historical Commission <http://www.stxmaps.com/go/texas-historical-marker-josiah-taylor.html> (accessed Sep. 22, 2016).

Other Gutiérrez-Magee Participants

There were a number of participants who had unique and revealing histories both before and after the expedition, including **Samuel Forsyth**. Forsyth (sometimes spelled Forsythe) was a surgeon's mate in the U.S. Army, and appears on the promotion rolls of the Second Regiment in 1807.¹⁷⁴ He was a rare loyal supporter of Gutiérrez and left the filibuster with him after he was ousted for Toledo. He then practiced medicine in Rapides, Louisiana. His passion for revolution must have been strong because he then appears in Venezuela in 1816 as a doctor in service to Simón Bolívar. Bolívar wrote a letter on Feb. 13 of that year to a merchant in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, stating, "The bearer of this letter is Dr. Forsyth whom I beg leave to recommend to your notice and protection. I understand there are two boxes of medicines in the possession of Westenfeldt disposable at invoice price. I have commissioned him to examine them and if they are agreeable to his *gusto* to purchase them."¹⁷⁵ When Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry visited Venezuela on a mission to Bolívar, Forsythe was there, and indeed, became the treating physician at the death of the American naval hero. A history of naval medicine describes the event:

Dr. Forsyth, an expatriate former U.S. Army surgeon now resident in Angostura, accompanied Perry's return. According to contemporary sources, Perry himself had a chill, but remained well until [USS] Nonsuch anchored at the mouth of the Orinoco on the evening of the 17th. That night, in his cabin shared with Dr. Forsyth, Perry began to feel fevers, chills, headache, and myalgias...Dr. Forsyth's experience with tropical fevers led him to apply the lancet and administer cathartics.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Henry Dearborn to Thomas Jefferson, 23 November 1807," *Founders Online*, National Archives <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/99-01-02-6830> (accessed Sep. 23, 2016).

¹⁷⁵ Simón Bolívar, *Escritos del Libertador* IX (N.p., 1973), 26.

¹⁷⁶ Capt. James R. Bloom, "Why We Vaccinate Sailors" *Military Medicine*. Vol. 181, (April 2016), 297.

In 1820 Forsyth returned to the U.S. in the service of Bolívar, buying arms for the revolution. On March 30, he met President James Monroe and later with Secretary of State John Quincy Adams in Washington, who noted in his diary, “Visits from...Dr. S.D. Forsyth, the ambidexter personage who is a sort of Agent here from Venezuela, and has been winding up-stairs here to get appointed Agent from the United States to that country.” Later, Adams wrote a note indicating this may not have been the first time he had heard from Forsyth: “He spoke of the new Republic of Colombia and General Bolivar in a manner suited to give a high opinion of them; and as he had not always expressed the same opinions, at least of the man, he now accounted for the change...Dr. Forsyth thinks that he has greatly improved by his experience; that he has learnt virtue in adversity; that he is another and now quite a great man.”¹⁷⁷

Back in Columbia, Forsyth managed to stir controversy with the musket sale. Upon delivery of the 4,350 French muskets to Bolivar’s forces from an American arms merchant, Forsyth examined them, declared them of poor quality and discounted them, benefiting the rebels. This minor event created a decades-long claim against the government of Venezuela by the party that sold the muskets, a case that would ultimately necessitate U.S. government interference before relations between the republics could be put on a stable footing.¹⁷⁸

Among the many participants in the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, there were several Frenchmen, which was of great concern for William Shaler, who was constantly fearful of French agents hijacking the filibuster. Most of these men, when examined, are little

¹⁷⁷ John Quincy Adams, Diary Entry for March 30, 1820, in Charles Francis Adams, ed. *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, Containing Portions of His Diary from 1795-1848* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1875), 5:48.

¹⁷⁸ Jane Lucas de Grummond, “The Jacob Idler Claim Against Venezuela 1817-1890” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 34, 2 (May, 1954): 131-157.

more than Louisiana natives with no Bonapartist or Bourbon connections. This is not the case of a member identified in the literature as a 27-year-old “Native of New Orleans” known only by the last name **LaTour**, “formerly known as Calinette,” who accompanied Toledo into Texas.¹⁷⁹ This man was almost certainly Arsène Lacarrière-Latour, not a native but a French-born military architect who studied at the Paris Academy of Fine Arts and likely participated in the French Revolution. In 1793, he moved to Haiti, but left due to the ongoing revolution there. He established himself in New Orleans but frequently traveled to north, where he joined Toledo’s group.

The proof that this Latour is the correct one is through his associations. In Philadelphia, he became close with fellow Toledo traveler and long-term Spanish revolutionary **Juan Mariano Bautista de Pincornell**, who was also among Toledo’s retinue. Indeed, following failure of the Gutierrez-Magee filibuster, the remnants gathered in Natchitoches to plot, and Pincornell took advantage of Toledo’s temporary absence from the scene to have himself chosen as president. He gave command of his imaginary army to a former French general, Jean Joseph Amable Humbert, who had a history of filibusters, including a failed invasion of Ireland on behalf of Irish rebels in 1798. Humbert in turn appointed Latour to his staff. This would-be reborn Republican Army of the North never materialized, primarily because the Spanish/French leaders could not convince Henry Perry and his American followers to join their cause.¹⁸⁰

The fact that some of the details of this person are sketchy – his age is given incorrectly and there is the alternative last name – are evidence strongly supporting the claim. Gene A. Smith, in a biographical sketch of Latour explains, that the Frenchman in

¹⁷⁹ Schwartz, 57.

¹⁸⁰ William C. Davis, *The Pirates Laffite: The Treacherous World of the Corsairs of the Gulf* (Orlando: Harcourt, 2005), 145.

the New World “adopted many personas” including an advance agent for Napoleon’s new empire in the Caribbean, businessman and, in his most prominent role, an engineer on the staff of Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans. After the battle, Latour wrote the first detailed history of the conflict, with interviews from dozens of sources. He was a man who “wore many social masks and spoke in a variety of cultural dialects,” a man of shifting loyalties, but for whom the ultimate loyalty was to himself. “Propelled by the same self-interest that obsessed the sober-minded, this French adventurer exploited the competing empires and rival nationalities in the Gulf Coast to achieve personal success if not eternal glory.”¹⁸¹ For all this ambition, Latour appears to have left Toledo’s group before it entered Texas in 1813, as there is no record of him in the Spanish province. It is possible that Toledo left him behind to avoid arousing Shaler’s suspicions. Nonetheless, Latour is an example of another archetype of the man attracted to the expedition, though he was probably more selfish adventurer than French agent. Nonetheless, French influence, either due to Shaler’s vision or a lack of manpower, ultimately never did obtain the control over the expedition that so troubled Americans all the way up to President Madison.

¹⁸¹ Gene A. Smith, “Arsène Lacarrière-Latour: Immigrant, Patriot-Historian, and Foreign Agent,” in Michael A. Morrison, ed., *The Human Tradition in Antebellum America*. (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2000), 83.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This survey of the members of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition investigated 117 non-native Mexican participants in the 1812-13 filibuster identified through various sources as active in the expedition (see Table 1, following page). Depending on the widely-varying figures of how many actually took part, this number represents 15-25 percent of the total. The sources from which these names are drawn are not the muster rolls (long since lost), but rather letters, diary entries, affidavits, and family histories. The nature of such sources skews the sample slightly towards officers: colonels, majors and captains; though there are, clearly, a number of enlisted soldiers within the survey.¹⁸²

In age, expedition participants were as young as 12 (**Peter Boone**) and as old as 58 (**Benjamin Allen**). Most, however, were in their twenties and thirties. In addition to the Allen family, there were several groups of relatives who fought together. **Warren D.C. Hall**, who would later play a significant role in the Republic of Texas, fought alongside his brother **John “Jack” Hall** and possible relative **Darlington Hall**. In terms of wealth, those who we know appear to be diverse. A few, such as **Reuben Ross** and **Joseph Carr** were identified as men of distinction, although wealth on the frontier could be fleeting and Ross found himself nearly bankrupt by 1828, and died trying to validate his claims in Mexico. Many were poor or middle-class farmers like **Edmund Quirk**, **Aylett Buckner**, or **Henry Munson** who were seeking new lands for cultivation and possibly speculation, or insecure frontier professionals like **David Phelps**. Some were men with elite

¹⁸² While approximately 130 Americans entered Texas at the beginning of the expedition, the numbers swelled with success and may have reached nearly 800. There are additional names that were not included because the connection to the expedition could be investigated and proven to be spurious. For instance, Juan Davis Bradburn, who became infamous as a pro-Mexican foil for Anglo settlers in the 1830s, has been tied to the expedition on purely speculative grounds. Additionally, non-military personnel and Spanish citizens who joined from within Texas are not included in this list. The purpose is to encompass “outsiders” as the Spanish regime would have defined them.

pretensions like **Henry Adams Bullard, Darius Johnston, and Orramel Johnston** who saw a path to distinction and respect through military glory.

Samuel Alden	Martin Allen	Hiram Allen	Benjamin Allen	David Allen
John Ash	Samuel Barber	Stephen Barker	Carlos (Charles) Beltran	Jose Benitis
Horatio Bigelow	Peter Boone	Matthew Bonnette	Aylette C. Buckner	Henry Adams Bullard
John G. Burnett	Evariste Calvettes	Joseph Carr	? Caston	Andrew Chase
Michael Chesneu	Joshua Child(s)	Nathaniel Cogswell	Albert Cole	Colonie
Hamlin Cook	Godwin Brown Cotton	Henry Derbonne	Bernardo Despallier	? Deen
George M. Dick	Peter Dillon	Peter Dolet	Bernardo D'Ortolan	Anthony Dubois
Eoses	William Fisher	Dr. Samuel D. Forsyth(e)	Isaac Foster	William Francis
James Gaines	? Gemaile	Pierre "Pedro" Girard	? Gormley or Gromby	Alexis Grappe
Nathan M. Hale	Darlington Hall	John "Jack" W. Hall	Warren D.C. Hall	Eli Harris
Charles A. Hickman	? Holmes	Darius Johnston	Orramel Johnston	Samuel Kemper
Joseph Pulaski Kennedy	John Gladden King	Amalie Lafitte	Bernard Lafitte	Abner Lane
Louis Lathum	Arsine Latour	David Long	Thomas Lockett	Augustus Magee
Dan MacLean	Louis Massicott	A.W. McClain	John McLannahan	Daniel McClean
John McFarland	James McKim	William McLane	? Menepier	Tenoss Moinet
Aaron Samuel Mower	Henry William Munson	William B. Murray	Samuel Noah	H.I. Offeet
George Orr	William Owen(s)	William Parker	Anthony Parish (Pared)	James Patterson
Henry Perry	David Phelps	W. Phierson	Juan Pincornel	William A. Prentiss
? Prudhomme	Edmund Quirk	Elisha Roberts	Andrew Robinson	Reuben Ross
James Royall	Charles Rollins	? Rollins	Joseph Ruth	? Scott
Samuel Sexton	Peter Sides	Thomas Slocum	William Slocum	Reuben Smith
William Snodgrass	Josiah Taylor	Thomas Taylor	Chesneau Tontin	John Villars
W.W. Walker	Stephen Wallace	George Westfield	James Biddle Wilkinson	Joseph Biddle Wilkinson
? Wolforth	Walter Young			

Geographically, they came from across the nation. There were New Englanders like **Augustus Magee, Henry Adams Bullard, Henry Perry, and Nathaniel Cogswell**; New Yorkers like **Walter Young**; Pennsylvanians like **Samuel Alden, George Orr, and William McLane**; Georgians like the Allen family, Marylanders like **William Parker**;

and Mississippians like **Joseph Carr**. This diversity is notable, but deceptive. With the exception of Toledo's group formed in Philadelphia, almost all participants identified by region came *through* the West, having immigrated to Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Mississippi, or Louisiana in the years before joining the expedition, and likely absorbed the frontier ethos in their adopted homes. Thus, **Darius** and **Orramel Johnston** are born New Englanders (from Connecticut), but their family moved west and they (and their much younger half-brother Albert Sydney) were raised in Kentucky. **Samuel Kemper's** family moved from the Virginia backcountry progressively west as the population followed them. They settled first in Ohio, then Kentucky and finally Mississippi. A small number of participants were native Westerners like **George Westfield**, who was born in Kentucky (see Table 2, following page).

The men of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition were the products of the migration described in the introduction, made up primarily of the democratic elements of the southern and middle states, formed into a new western nation-within-a-nation that was unified economically and culturally by the north-south highway of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. This region's interests pointed west and south along the great river, in opposition to the coastal states, which still dominated them politically. This relationship would change in time, particularly as the Southwest became integrated into the South's cotton culture, but the year 1812 was a hinge moment in American history, before which nationalism was still embryonic, and sectionalism existed along a more of a horizontal, rather than vertical axis. For westerners, the prime driver in everything that they did was the desire for land. It was why they had left the original 13 states to begin with. Annual sales of western land rose from 100,000 acres in the 1790s to over 500,000 after 1800.

Table 2: Geographic Origin of the Participants		
Name	Born in	Resided in 1812
Samuel Alden	Pennsylvania	
Martin Allen		Campbell County, Kentucky
Hiram Allen		Campbell County, Kentucky
Benjamin Allen	Wilkes County, Georgia	Campbell County, Kentucky
David Allen		Campbell County, Kentucky
Samuel Barber	Virginia	Louisiana
Carlos Beltran	Wheeling, Virginia	Ohio
Horatio Bigelow		Pennsylvania
Peter Boone		San Antonio, Texas
Aylette C. Buckner	Louisa County, Virginia	(Possibly) Kentucky
Henry Adams Bullard	Pepperell, Mass	Philadelphia
Joseph Carr	Woodville, Mississippi	
? Caston	Mississippi	
Nathaniel Cogswell	Haverhill, Massachusetts	Philadelphia
Godwin Brown Cotton		Philadelphia
Bernardo Despallier	Louisiana	Texas
? Deen	Mississippi	
Bernardo D'Ortolan	Louisiana	Texas
William Francis		Louisiana
James Gaines	Culpeper County, Virginia	Louisiana
Darlington Hall	Fairfield County, South Carolina	
Warren D.C. Hall	North Carolina	
Darius Johnston	Connecticut	Kentucky
Orramel Johnston	Connecticut	Kentucky
Samuel Kemper	Fauquier County, Virginia	Louisiana
Joseph Pulaski Kennedy		Mississippi
Thomas Lockett	Virginia	
Augustus Magee	Massachusetts	Louisiana
A.W. McClain	North Carolina	
John McLannahan		Missouri
James McKim	North Carolina	Louisiana
William McLane	Pennsylvania	Louisiana
Henry William Munson	Volla Gayoso, Mississippi	
George Orr	Pennsylvania	
William Owen(s)	Baltimore	Natchitoches, Louisiana
Henry Perry	Newtown, Connecticut	
David Phelps	Hebron, Connecticut	
? Prudhomme	Louisiana	Louisiana
Edmund Quirk	Virginia	Kentucky
Reuben Ross		Missouri
Peter Sides	North Carolina	Tennessee
Reuben Smith		Missouri
William Snodgrass		Mississippi
Josiah Taylor		Natchitoches, Louisiana
George Westfield	Kentucky	Kentucky
James Biddle Wilkinson	Pennsylvania	Kentucky
Joseph Biddle Wilkinson	Kentucky	Kentucky
Walter Young	New York	

Land was a status symbol; Joyce Appleby notes that ownership of real estate put a settler on “the right side of the critical divide between independence and dependency, probably the most salient of all social markers in an America that was still preponderantly rural.”¹⁸³ This desire for land predated the nation, and burst forth after the revolution as British restraints on westward migration were moved. It would grow to a flood before 1812 and a torrent afterwards. Western land was desirable, and its costs were increasing proportionately. On the other hand, land in Mexico, even under the Spanish, was available for a nominal fee. Although as we have seen, the expedition’s members were very diverse, Gutiérrez’ offer of free land was certainly the prime motivation for most recruits, because land was the universal currency of the frontier. And it was so by design: as the Mexican revolutionary agent had traveled throughout the West in 1811, Gutiérrez had observed and spoken with many westerners, and this land hunger would have been the most outstanding facet of frontier society, as we saw in the early accounts in the introduction. Gutiérrez also added other inducements – the right to capture and sell livestock and work mines, which may have sweetened the deal for some participants, but those were illusory goals; land was real. Joseph Carr’s promissory note proving his claim to a league of land would have been among the former soldier’s most prized possessions, and most participants would have felt the same way. The fact that so many survivors did eventually return to Texas indicates that the desire to settle was strong.

The Roles of Generals Wilkinson and Adair

Designs on Spanish territory were not new, and it is impossible to ignore the role of the arch frontier schemer, General James Wilkinson, and his possible role in the

¹⁸³ Appleby, 138.

Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition. There can scarcely be any doubt that the general's influence on the filibuster was strong. His own words and deeds convict him as far as a motive is concerned, and his fingerprints are found not infrequently. The first of these fingerprints is Magee, Wilkinson's protégé, who led the Americans in the raid, though Wilkinson eventually threatened to arrest him, either as bluster or to buff out the tarnish on his own loyalty created by the Burr affair. Also, as we have seen, Magee had his own independent reasons to choose a Mexican revolutionary army over an American frontier one. Another Wilkinson fingerprint was the Santa Fe traders, including Reuben Smith, a probable relative of the general. Next is Josiah Taylor, the former army quartermaster under Wilkinson, who apparently traveled to Texas and was imprisoned in the Alamo shortly before the expedition was launched. The biggest Wilkinson imprint is Gen. John Adair, who clearly was involved in the organization of the filibuster and was offered command but refused it. Adair was a confidant of Wilkinson and Burr who wrote the former in 1804 that "the Kentuckians are full of enterprise, and although not poor, as greedy after plunder as ever the old Romans were. Mexico glitters in our Eyes – the word is all we wait for." Wilkinson later wrote to Adair, "The time looked for by many and wished for by more has now arrived for subverting the Spanish government in Mexico. Be you ready to join me; we will want little more than light-armed troops..."¹⁸⁴ This characterization, written in 1806, closely describes the men of the expedition that eventually took place six years later.

On the surface then, they would seem the agents. But this strong desire aside, by the time the filibuster kicked off in 1812, Adair and Wilkinson were both men under watchful eyes, and moreover had a strained personal relationship between themselves.

¹⁸⁴ Linklater, 220 and 244.

Wilkinson had arrested Adair in the Burr affair and Adair had counter-sued Wilkinson. Their careers had been rocked by scandal and if they were not chastened, they were at least cautious. Neither man was in a position to take a lead role, and may indeed have thought the filibuster to be impractical. After all, the proposed numbers of men that had been conceived for the Burr affair were generally reckoned in the thousands. In the end, the Republican Army of the North had only around 130 men at the outset. Spain was weak, but the generals may have thought, probably not *that* weak.

Nonetheless, Wilkinson, Adair, and other frontier leaders and intriguers of various stripes had been sowing seeds of the expedition in the West for years, and now some of these seeds were growing on their own, without the necessity for an individual to cultivate them. The impulse to dismember Spain was common to frontiersmen and presidents alike, but was particularly ingrained in the people of the West, who long remembered the Spanish intransigence over navigation of the Mississippi and other slights, and who daily lived with evidences of Spanish vulnerability. There was no single author of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition, except perhaps Gutiérrez himself, although he was probably little more than the grain upon which the pearl grows. The heterogeneity of the members makes this clear. No one but Gutiérrez controlled the recruitment process, and what is dramatically lacking in any of the existing sources is any indication of recruits being turned away, as one would expect if an authority had a particular desired ideal type of filibuster in mind. On the contrary, all volunteers were embraced, regardless of connections or motives. The only exception to this is Shaler, who, fearful of French influence, tried to prevent Gutiérrez from meeting with Napoleonic agents. Given the conditions on the frontier and the strong sentiment against Spain, it is not surprising that

the expedition was as big as it was. It is rather, surprising that it was so small. A larger number of frontiersmen who did not take up arms may have been sympathetic, but held back because the effort lacked official government sanction. The same effect had been seen with the Burr raid, and was evidenced in Reuben Kemper's reticence to join the effort without the administration's support.

Republican Tradition and Universality

The cause of independence in Spanish America was embraced widely in the United States, especially in the West. Europe was in the throes of a revolution against monarchy under Bonaparte, and for westerners who were generally of republican and pro-French leaning, it was perhaps difficult to watch from the sidelines as cheerleaders. A Spanish filibuster was a way to be a part of the great crusade for republicanism. It was also a way to live up to the example of the American revolutionary generation and embrace that laurel-covered tradition. These men lived daily in the shadow of this greatest generation, whom they saw as patterns of emulation, as Cogswell's Fourth of July oration demonstrates. A historian of the later Texas Revolution would cite such hero-worship in that contest as a strong motivation. "Far from serving as a form of rhetorical window-dressing, their frequent allusions to the past reveal a fundamental connection between the political crisis in Texas and the American revolutionary experience," asserts Sam W. Haynes.¹⁸⁵ As strong as this impulse was in that third generation of 1836, it was as powerful if not more so in the second generation of 1812, for whom the American revolutionary generation were not mythical heroes, but beloved parents, mentors, and in a

¹⁸⁵ Sam W. Haynes, "'Imitating the Example of Our Forefathers': The Texas Revolution as Historical Reenactment," in Sam W. Haynes and Gerald D. Saxon, eds., *Contested Empire: Rethinking the Texas Revolution* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015), 44.

few cases comrades-in-arms. At least four members of the expedition were veterans of the American Revolution, although there are others who may have been as well.

Benjamin Allen, as we have seen, fought in the revolution. **Peter Sides** was born in 1750 in North Carolina. He served in that state's regiment as an ensign before moving west to Tennessee after the war, then south to New Orleans. He was killed at the Battle of Medina. **Edmund Quirk** also fought in the war, serving in the Virginia militia. **Bernard D'Ortolon**, a French Louisianan, fought in the war as a French ally, and remained in Louisiana afterwards.¹⁸⁶ Far more of the participants had fathers, uncles, or other close relatives who fought in the American Revolution, including **Augustus Magee's** privateer father James.

The drive to live up to the legacy of the founders and spread democracy was not incompatible with serving and settling in a foreign nation. Westerners very easily and naturally embraced the change in citizenship because in an era when few had contact with their government on a daily basis, the nation itself was a nebulous concept. Changing allegiance was rarely objectionable, as long as the new nation to which allegiance was given was still democratic. In a New York newspaper in 1798, a writer suggested a sentiment not uncommon, especially among those farthest from America's very small governmental power. "When one deliberately quits a society, without having transgressed its laws, his subjugation to them ceases and his connection with, in the aggregate, is dissolved." This concept is nothing less than the Declaration of Independence on a personal level.¹⁸⁷ This sentiment was still alive and well 35 years later, even after

¹⁸⁶ "American Revolutionary War Patriots Buried in Texas," *Texas Society Sons of the American Revolution*, www.txssar.org/buried.htm (accessed Sep. 29, 2016).

¹⁸⁷ Eric R. Schlereth, "Voluntary Mexicans: Allegiance and the Origins of the Texas Revolution," in Sam W. Haynes and Gerald D. Saxon, 13.

attachment to America had ostensibly grown among its people. As later Mexican Texas resident Asa Brigham wrote a relative in 1832, “You may ask why we leave the United States of America, for that of the United States of Mexico – in answer, I can only say, that it was through choice, with a view of bettering my fortune.”¹⁸⁸ Historian Erich Schlereth, in an essay entitled *Voluntary Mexicans*, notes that among Americans who moved to Mexico before 1836, this attitude was common. There is no reason to suggest that such transitory nationalism was new. The men of the frontier in 1812 were, in the words of their hero Wilkinson, free to move wherever their own notion of patriotism took them, and that did not require them to “remain fixed like a vegetable.” Mexico was merely fresh territory for an every-migrating class of frontiersmen.¹⁸⁹

But even for participants who felt more attached to America, fighting for Mexico was not inconsistent with that goal. If nothing else came from the fight, a sister republic was a good thing. McLanahan’s letter quoting Madison is a case in point. The collapse of the Spanish Empire would roll back the Old World’s hold on the new, Madison was saying, and McLanahan felt it patriotic to speed up the process. As the older Bullard, writing his anonymous history of Texas, would recall, many westerners were motivated by the belief that Texas, like West Florida was part of the Louisiana Purchase, and rightfully American. Imperial Spain, which had stymied America at every chance in Louisiana and Florida, would never give it up. An impoverished and dependent Mexico might do so, or at least would negotiate “honorably”, which most understood to mean Mexico would accept the presumed clear case for the American claims on its border. This might have encompassed Texas to the Trinity, Nueces or Colorado rivers, any of which was

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 11.

¹⁸⁹ Schlereth, 15.

preferable to the Arroyo Hondo or Sabine. And if Mexico could not agree on the border, certainly the new impoverished nation would sell, as Napoleon had. Alternatively, if the revolution failed in Mexico proper, but succeeded in its northern provinces, these would be incapable of standing on their own, and might sue for America to annex them, as Gutiérrez actually did when failure seemed likely without American government aid at La Bahía.

Embracing Mexico and Settling the Land

In the end, Mexico did gain its independence and the desire for land easily took primacy over American nationalistic concerns. The proof here is in what the survivors did *after* the new sister-republic to the south was created. As noted in chapter 3, of the known American survivors of the expedition, at least half chose to settle in Mexico and take Mexican citizenship. Nine fought in future filibusters within Texas, all against royalist Spain, but none of the survivors fought in – and some strongly opposed – the one filibuster (the Fredonian Rebellion) against republican Mexico. This shows a strong continuity of interest in Texas' future.

Important too is the impact of the expedition on the American knowledge of Texas. In the months before the expedition, a French account of Texas spurred an American editor of the *Daily National Intelligencer* to conclude that the Spanish region “appears, from all accounts, to be really a kind of paradise... Who would not wish to inhabit such a spot?” Within two years, a large group of Americans had traveled much of the territory, becoming the first of their countrymen to gain and disseminate much knowledge of the richness of the land. These reports confirmed the earlier account with reliable *American*

Survivor	Future Filibuster	Settled in Texas	Pension Application	Notes
Martin Allen		✓		Old 300 colonist
John Ash				No information
Samuel Barber	✓	✓		Settled 1829 with wife and seven children
Stephen Barker	✓			No information
Carlos (Charles) Beltran		Possibly		Wrote account of expedition
Horatio Bigelow	✓	✓		Edited Nacogdoches Texas Republican
Peter Boone		✓		Settled in Mexico
Aylette C. Buckner	✓	✓	✓	Old 300 Colonist
Henry Adams Bullard	X	X	X	Settled in Louisiana
Joshua Child(s)	✓			Long Expedition
Hamlin Cook	✓			Long Expedition
Godwin Brown Cotton		✓		In 1829 co-owned "Texas Gazette"
Bernardo D'Ortolan				Given Spanish amnesty.
Dr. Samuel D. Forsyth	*	X		Settled in Louisiana
Isaac Foster		X		Settled in Louisiana
James Gaines		✓		Signed Texas Declaration of Independence
? Gormley		X		No information
John "Jack" W. Hall		✓		Settled in Texas
Warren D.C. Hall	✓	✓		Wrote memoir of expedition
Darius Johnston		Died 1824		Settled in Louisiana
Orramel Johnston		Died 1826		Settled in Louisiana
Samuel Kemper		Died 1815		Died of disease
John Gladden King		✓		Settled in Gonzales, 1830
Thomas Luckett			✓	Sought pension
A.W. McClain		✓		Old 300 Colonist
William McLane		✓		Settled in San Antonio, 1854
Henry William Munson		✓		Served as alcalde in Atascocita
Samuel Noah	X	X	X	Lived in Virginia in 1840s
H.I. Offeet			✓	No information
George Orr		✓	✓	Served as alcalde in Atascocita
Henry Perry	✓	Died 1817		Died near La Bahia, Tx.
Edmund Quirk		✓		Returned to land near present-day San Augustine
Reuben Ross		Died 1828	✓	Died in Mexico pursuing pension
Josiah Taylor		✓		Green DeWitt colony settler
John Villars		✓		Settled in Mexico
W.W. Walker	✓			No information
Joseph Biddle Wilkinson		X		Did not return
? Wolforth		X		Living in Mississippi, 1840s
Walter Young	*	X		Believed died fighting with Miranda

* Non-Texas filibuster

tales, from men *known personally* to observers throughout the West. One striking feature of the participants is the degree to which they were all interconnected. In researching their histories, these characters bump into each other with the frequency of a small town. They had business dealings with each other, got their loans at the same banks, bought and sold property or slaves. On the frontier, personal networks were strong, deep and broad, making the expedition personally relevant to many thousands of people who never participated themselves.

For those who did survive and return to Louisiana or Kentucky, Texas never left their minds and this obsession would have influenced their neighbors. When Stephen F. Austin began to recruit his colonists in the 1820s, his marketing effort was building on a prior knowledge of Texas that had been established in the previous decade and a half and which facilitated his efforts. Immigration to America has always been driven by such personal stories of pathfinders who fired ambition in the hearts of those who would follow with their experiences. Texas was little different, and when the survivors of the expedition had their own opportunity in the early 1820s to choose to immigrate to Mexico in peace, many if not most, voted with their feet and settled in Texas. Only six to nine of the 34 known survivors alive in 1828 were neither filibusters, future settlers or sought a Mexican pension (see Table 3), and at least one of these, Bullard, had already obtained wealth and standing in Louisiana by this time with his unique mixture of languages and legal training, making immigration unnecessary.

The Legacy of the Expedition

Many historians have ventured answers as to why the expedition occurred and how it may or may not have been driven by national leaders or national forces. Yet an investigation of the men who participated shows that they were free agents, westerners who took their fate into their own hands as they always had. In contrast to macro-view histories, only a few historians of the expedition have previously descended to the man-with-a-musket perspective, and only in passing. Richard W. Gronet notes correctly that, although “many of the North Americans joined the force for reasons of land, loot, and adventure, the guiding purpose of its commanders and many in the ranks was the seizure of Texas for the proclaimed Republic of Mexico.”¹⁹⁰ Ed Bradley strikes a different, but also accurate note, saying that “a large number of filibusters were motivated by material concerns,” but also supported a “balance of republican idealism and wished-for material gain.”¹⁹¹

These arguments in their own way are valid, but have heretofore lacked a key piece of evidence that can provide the test for the various premises. Were there men in the expedition who placed idealism on a pedestal and sacrificed their fortunes and sacred honor for a foreign revolution? Indeed: Henry Adams Bullard and Aaron Mower gave up their budding careers as a lawyer and a printer and followed a romantic figure, Toledo to the revolution. Did some men pursue monetary gain? Undoubtedly, some did, though certainly not all. Augustus Magee, born and raised in the Boston elite, when faced with disappointment in his career, could have simply resigned and returned home to wealth, yet he turned his back on his past and devoted himself to a desperate venture instead. Did

¹⁹⁰ Richard W. Gronet, “United States and the Invasion of Texas, 1810-14,” *Americas* 25 (January, 1969): 293.

¹⁹¹ Bradley, 62.

men seek new lands for starting families or for speculation? Certainly they did, as the settlement data proves. Whatever their motivations may have been at the beginning of their journey, many of those who survived were attracted to Texas in later years *to live in it*.

The latter point is the most important, and is illustrative of the need for further research into the filibuster. The Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition has frequently been treated as a historical flash-in-the pan, unrelated to subsequent Texas history. It is appropriate to re-appraise this view of history towards a more contiguous narrative. Arredondo's reprisal and its deleterious effect on the Spanish/Mexican population in Texas has long since necessitated a reappraisal on its own. Adding to this imperative is the fact that over a dozen of Stephen F. Austin's first colonists – and possibly more since so many participants are lost to history – had experience in Texas that predated his by a decade. For these settlers, the sons of other veterans who followed their parents' paths to Texas, and the thousands of westerners who knew them, colonization under the *empresario* was the *second* act in their Texas drama, directly connected to and dependent on the first, which the men of the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition wrote in the years 1812-1813.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

- Bexar Archives. General Manuscript Series January 1810. Dolph Briscoe Center, University of Texas, Austin.
- Bullard, Henry Adams. "Mexico and Texas." North American Review Papers, 1831-1843. Houghton Library, Harvard University.
- Cogswell, Nathaniel. *An Oration Delivered before the Republican Citizens of Newburyport in the Rev. John Giles' Meetinghouse on the Fourth of July, 1808*. Newburyport: W. and J. Gilman, 1808.
- Gutiérrez De Lara. "Proclamation of José Bernardo Gutiérrez De Lara." *The Herald of Alexandria, Louisiana*, August 31, 1813. Microfilm: Beinecke Library, Yale University.
- Gutiérrez De Lara. "Diary of José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, 1811-1812."
- James Madison Papers. *Founders Online*, National Archives.
- John Quincy Adams, Diary.
- Johnston, Orramel. *The Chartered Rag Light, Or an Impartial View of the Banking System in the United States*. Maysville, Kentucky: A. Crookshanks, 1818.
- Joseph W. Carr Legal Papers*. Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Austin, Texas.
- Martin Allen Legal Files*. Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas.
- Papers of James Monroe*. University of Mary Washington.
- Reuben Ross Family Papers*. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin.

Simón Bolívar, *Escritos del Libertador* IX N.p., 1973.

Trial of Thomas O. Selfridge, Attorney at Law, Before the Hon. Isaac Parker, Esquire for killing Charles Austin on the Public Exchange in Boston, August 4, 1806. Boston: Russel, Cutler, Belcher and Armstrong, 1806. Transcript of proceedings.

William Shaler papers. Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Yerger, George S., ed. *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of Tennessee* Vol. 10. Louisville, KY: Fetter Law Book Company, 1903.

Secondary Sources:

Appleby, Joyce. *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans.* Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 2001.

Baker, D.W.C. *A Texas Scrapbook Made up of the History, Biography and Miscellany of Texas and Its People.* New Orleans: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1875.

Bannon, John Francis. *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513-1821.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, Vol XVI.* San Francisco: The History Company, 1889.

Belisle, John G. *History of Sabine Parish, Louisiana.* Many, Louisiana: The Sabine Banner Press, 1912.

Bendbow, Hesper. *More Than She Could Bear.* Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1872.

Blevins, Don. *A Priest, a Prostitute, and Some Other Early Texans: The Lives Of Fourteen Lone Star State Pioneers.* Guilford, Conn: The Globe Pequot Press, 2008.

- Block, W. T. *A History of Jefferson County, Texas*. Nederland, TX.: Nederland Publishing Company, 1976.
- Bloom, Capt. James R. "Why We Vaccinate Sailors" *Military Medicine* Vol. 181, (April 2016).
- Bradley, Ed *We Never Retreat: Filibustering Expeditions into Spanish Texas, 1812-1822*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015.
- Brown, Gordon S. *Latin American Rebels and the United States, 1806-1822*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, 2015.
- Bugbee, Lester G. "The Old Three Hundred," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 1, No. 2 (October 1897): 108-117.
- Carlson, Laurie Winn. *Seduced by the West: Jefferson's America and the Lure of the Land Beyond the Mississippi*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2003.
- Cogliano, Francis. *Failed Filibusters: The Kemper Rebellion, the Burr Conspiracy and Early American Expansion*. [Online]
- Coolidge, Austin and John Mansfield. *History and Description of New England, General and Local, Vol. 1*. Boston: Austin J. Coolidge, 1859.
- Cothren, William. *History of Ancient Woodbury, Connecticut, From the First Indian Deed in 1659 to 1854, Including The Present Towns of Washington, Southbury, Bethlehem, Roxbury, and a Part of Oxford and Middlebury*. Waterbury, Connecticut: Bronson Brothers, 1854.
- Coughlin, Madeline. "Commercial Foundations of Political Interest in the Opening Pacific, 1789-1829." *California Historical Quarterly*, 50, no. 1 (Mar., 1971).

- Cox, Isaac Joslin. *The West Florida Controversy, 1798-1813: A Study in American Diplomacy* Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1967.
- Crimmins, Col. M.I. "Augustus William Magee, The Second Advanced Courier of American Expansion into Texas." *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 20 (1944).
- Crosbie, Laurence M. *Phillips Exeter Academy, a History*. Exeter, N.H.: Phillips Exeter Academy, 1923.
- George W. Cullum. Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy. [Online]
- Davis, William C. *Rogue Republic: How Would-Be Patriots Waged the Shortest Revolution in American History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011.
- Davis, William C. *The Pirates Laffite: The Treacherous World of the Corsairs of the Gulf* Orlando: Harcourt, 2005.
- DeBow, J.B.B. *DeBow's Southern and Western Review* 12 (1852).
- Detwiller, Frederick C. "Magee Family Mariners ca. 1750-1820." 2012. [Unpublished manuscript].
- Epperson, Jean L. "Trinidad de Salcedo: A Lost Texas Town," *Journal of the Houston Archeological Society*. 105 (April 1993).
- Fortier, Alcee ed. *Louisiana: Comprising Sketches of Parishes, Towns, Events, Institutions, and Persons, Arranged in Cyclopedic Form, Vol. I* Century Historical Association, 1914.
- French, B.F. *Historical Collections of Louisiana...Compiled with Historical and Biographical Notes*, New York: B.F. French, 1851.

- Gaines, Pierce Welch ed. *Political Works of Concealed Authorship During the Administrations of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson*. New Haven: Yale University Library, 1959.
- Garrett, Kathryn. "The First Newspaper of Texas: 'Gaceta de Texas'." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 40, No. 3 (Jan., 1937).
- Gary, Thomas ed. *Memoir of Thomas Handasyd Perkins containing extracts from his diaries and letters*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856.
- Gregg, Kate L. "Building of the First American Fort West of the Mississippi." *The Missouri Historical Review*, 30, no 4, (July, 1936).
- de Grummond, Jane Lucas. "The Jacob Idler Claim Against Venezuela 1817-1890." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 34, 2 (May, 1954): 131-157.
- Hatcher, Mattie Austin. *The Opening of Texas to Foreign Settlement, 1801-1821*. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976.
- Haynes, Sam W. and Gerald D. Saxon, eds., *Contested Empire: Rethinking the Texas Revolution*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015.
- Jacobs, James Ripley. *The Beginning of the U.S. Army*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.
- James, Thomas. *Three Years Among the Indians and Mexicans*. Saint Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1916.
- Johnston, William Preston. *The Johnstons of Salisbury*. New Orleans: L. Graham and Son, 1897.
- Head, David. *Privateers of the Americas: Spanish American Privateering from the United States in the Early Republic*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015.

- Kemper, Willis M. *Genealogy of the Kemper Family in the United States: Descendants of John Kemper of Virginia; with a Short Historical Sketch of His Family and of the German Reformed Colony at Germanna and Germantown, Va.* Germanna, Va.: G.K. Hazlett & Company, 1899.
- Knight, Carol. *Young First settlers of Catahoula Parish, Louisiana, 1808-1839.* Aledo, TX.: Self-Published by Carol Young Knight, 1985.
- Linklater, Andro. *An Artist in Treason: The Extraordinary Double Life of General James Wilkinson.* New York: Walker Publishing Company, 2009.
- Little, C. and James Brown, ed. "American Obituary for 1851" in *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge, 1852.* Cambridge: Metcalf and Company, 1852.
- Lee, Henry. "The Magee Family and the Origins of the China Trade." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 81 (1969).
- Long, James Weldon. "Revolutionary Republics: U.S. National Narratives and the Independence of Latin America, 1810–1846." Ph.D. diss., Louisiana State University, 2011.
- McMichael, Andrew. *Atlantic Loyalties: Americans in Spanish West Florida, 1785-1810.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Moore, Ike. "The Earliest Printing and First Newspaper in Texas." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* Vol. 39, No. 2 (Oct., 1935).

- Moorhead, Max L. *New Mexico's Royal Road: Trade and Travel on the Chihuahua Trail*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.
- Morrison, Michael A., ed. *The Human Tradition in Antebellum America*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2000.
- Munson, Thurmond A. *The Munsons of Texas – An American Saga* N.p., 1987.
- Owsley, Frank L. and Gene A. Smith. *Filibusters and Expansionists: Jeffersonian Manifest Destiny, 1800-1821*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997.
- Phelps, Oliver Seymour and Andrew T. Servin. *The Phelps Family in America and their English Ancestors Vol. 1*. Pittsfield Mass: Eagle Publishing Company, 1899.
- Phillips Exeter Academy. *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Phillips Exeter Academy*. Exeter, N.H.: J&B Williams, 1838.
- Roland, Charles P. *Albert Sydney Johnston, Soldier of Three Republics*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.
- Rowland, Dunbar, ed. *The Mississippi Territorial Archives, Vol. I*. Nashville: Brandon Printing Company, 1905.
- Schwartz, Ted and Robert Thornhoff. *Forgotten Battlefield of the First Texas Revolution*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1985.
- Seaburg, Carl and Stanley Paterson. *Merchant Prince of Boston: Col. T.H. Perkins, 1764-1854*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Smith, Gene Allen. "Rogue Republic (Review)." *The Alabama Review*. Vol. 65 Issue 2, (April, 2012).
- Stagg, J.C.A. *Borderlines in Borderlands: James Madison and the Spanish-American Frontier, 1776-1821*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

- Starrs, James E. and Kira Gale. *The Death of Meriwether Lewis: A Historic Crime Scene Investigation*. Omaha: River Junction Press, 2009.
- Stackpole, Everett S. and Lucien Thompson. *History of the Town of Durham New Hampshire, Vol. 1*. [Unknown].
- Torget, Andrew. *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
- Tucker, Spencer ed. *The Encyclopedia of the War of 1812, A Political, Social, and Military History Vol. 1*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2012.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*. London: Penguin Books, 2008.
- U.S. Department of State. *State Papers and Publick Documents of the United States from the Accession of George Washington to the Presidency, Exhibiting a Complete View of Our Foreign Relations at That Time*. Boston: T.B. Wait and Sons, 1817.
- Walker, Henry, ed. "William McLane's Narrative of the Magee-Gutierrez Expedition, 1812-1813." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 66: no. 4 (April, 1963).
- Warren, Harris Gaylord. *The Sword Was Their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943.
- West, Elizabeth Howard. "Diary of Jose Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara, 1811-1812." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Oct., 1928).
- Wolf, Simon and Louis Edward Levy. *The American Jew as Patriot, Soldier and Citizen*. Philadelphia: The Levytype Company, 1895.