Manifest Destiny and the Mexican War

Directions: Use the following documents as a resource in completing a chart that lists arguments for and against American expansion to the Pacific in the 1840s, even at the expense of war with Mexico.

Document 1

Letter from Andrew Jackson to Congressman Aaron V. Brown of Tennessee (February 12, 1843)

But I am in danger of running into unnecessary details, which my debility will not enable me to close. The question is full of interest also as it affects our domestic relations, and as it may bear upon those of Mexico to us. I will not undertake to follow it out to its consequences in those respects, though I must say that, in all aspects, the annexation of Texas to the United States promises to enlarge the circle of free institutions, and is essential to the United States, particularly as lessening the probabilities of future collision with foreign powers, and giving them greater efficiency in spreading the blessings of peace.¹

Document 2

John L. O'Sullivan (1845)

[The influential Democratic editor who gave the movement its name wrote that the American claim to new territory] is by the right of our manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and federative self government entrusted to us. It is a right such as that of the tree to the space of air and earth suitable for the full expansion of its principle and destiny of growth.²

Document 3

Walt Whitman, Editorial, Brooklyn Daily Eagle (July 7, 1846)

We love to indulge in thoughts of the future extent and power of this Republic—because with its increase is the increase of human happiness and liberty. . . . What has miserable, inefficient Mexico—with her superstition, her burlesque upon freedom, her actual tyranny by the few over the many—what has she to do with the great mission of peopling the New World with a noble race? Be it ours, to achieve that mission! Be it ours to roll down all of the upstart leaven of old despotism, that comes our way!³

Document 4

From “The Land-Hunger Thesis Challenged,” Norman A. Graebner

For American expansion to the Pacific was always a precise and calculated movement. It was ever limited in its objectives. American diplomatic and military policy that secured the acquisition of both Oregon and California was in the possession of men who never defined their expansionist purposes in terms of a democratic ideal. The vistas of all from Jackson to Polk were maritime and they were always anchored to specific waterways along the Pacific Coast. Land was necessary to them merely as a right of way to ocean ports—a barrier to be spanned by improved avenues of commerce. Any interpretation of westward extension beyond Texas is meaningless unless defined in terms of commerce and harbors.⁴

Document 5

From “The Mission of the United States,” Albert Gallatin

... However superior the Anglo-American race may be to that of Mexico, this gives the Americans no right to infringe upon the rights of the inferior race. The people of the United States may rightfully, and will, if they use the proper means, exercise a most beneficial moral influence over the Mexicans and other less enlightened nations of America. Beyond this they have no right to go.\(^5\)

Document 6

James Russell Lowell, *The Bigelow Papers* (1846)

"Then—Resolve,—Thet we wunt hev an inch o'slave territory; Thet President Polk's holl perceedins air very tory; Thet the war's a damned war, an' them thet enlist in it Should hev a cravat with a dreffle tight twist in it; Thet the war is a war fer the spreadin' o' slavery;"\(^6\)

Document 7

Abraham Lincoln (June 1, 1860)

... Less than a year before he became president, Abraham Lincoln (1809–1865) wrote, “The act of sending an armed force among the Mexicans was unnecessary, inasmuch as Mexico was in no way molesting or menacing the United States or the people thereof; and ... it was unconstitutional, because the power of levying war is vested in Congress, and not in the President."\(^7\)

Document 8

From *The American Pageant*

Long-memoried Mexicans have never forgotten that their northern enemy tore away about half of their country. The argument that they were lucky not to lose all of it, and that they had been paid something for their land, did not lessen their bitterness. The war also marked an ugly turning point in the relations between the United States and Latin America as a whole. Hitherto, Uncle Sam had been regarded with some complacency, even friendliness. Henceforth, he was increasingly feared as the "Colossus of the North." Suspicious neighbors to the south condemned him as a greedy and untrustworthy bully, who might next despoil them of their soil.\(^8\)

Document 9

From *A Survey of American History*

... In the United States, indecision about American territorial goals further impeded a settlement. At the outset of fighting the ambitions of Americans had been relatively modest: California and New Mexico. But with each new dazzling victory the national appetite grew until the cry "All Mexico" became a powerful slogan and movement. ...

The "All Mexico" issue was ultimately decided by the reluctance of most Americans to take on the responsibility of governing a large non-English-speaking population with different institutions and traditions.\(^9\)

---


\(^8\) Ibid., 395, 398.
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