Manifest Destiny and Westward Expansion

Posted on September 19, 2025

Introduction

Manifest Destiny was the nineteenth-century belief that the United States was entitled, and in some versions divinely appointed, to expand across North America. The phrase became popular in the 1840s, but the practices it justified had deeper roots in settler colonialism, continental ambition, racial hierarchy, land speculation, and the removal of Indigenous nations. Expansion brought the United States from the Atlantic toward the Pacific, yet the familiar phrase “sea to shining sea” conceals the violence through which land changed political control. (Dunbar-Ortiz)

The Mexican-American War of 1846–1848 was a decisive episode in this history. President James K. Polk defended the war as a response to Mexican aggression and as a means of securing American claims. Critics including Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Abraham Lincoln, abolitionists, and some Whig politicians saw conquest, executive manipulation, and the expansion of slavery. The conflict ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, through which Mexico ceded a vast territory. This essay compares those competing views, explains the roles of religion and race, and considers how the legacy of Manifest Destiny continues to influence the United States.

The Meaning of “Sea to Shining Sea”

The language of continental fulfillment presents expansion as natural movement across empty space. North America was not empty. Indigenous nations possessed territories, political systems, economies, diplomatic relationships, and sacred landscapes. Mexico governed settlements in California, New Mexico, and other northern regions, while Tejano, Californio, Pueblo, Apache, Comanche, Navajo, and many other communities shaped the region.

Expansion occurred through treaties, purchases, migration, military force, annexation, legal manipulation, and settlement. The Louisiana Purchase, Indian Removal, annexation of Texas, Oregon boundary settlement, war with Mexico, and later campaigns against Indigenous peoples were different processes, but they were joined by a national narrative of inevitable growth.

Calling expansion “bloodless” erases conflict and displacement. Even transactions described as purchases took place within unequal power relationships and were followed by settler claims that transformed landholding. The idea of inevitability also removes responsibility from political leaders and citizens who made choices about war, removal, slavery, and citizenship.

Polk’s Case for War

James K. Polk entered office committed to territorial expansion. His administration sought California and New Mexico and supported the annexation of Texas, whose boundary with Mexico remained disputed. The United States claimed the Rio Grande as Texas’s southern border, while Mexico regarded the Nueces River as the relevant boundary. Polk ordered General Zachary Taylor’s forces into the disputed area.

After a clash between Mexican and American troops in April 1846, Polk told Congress that Mexico had invaded American territory and shed American blood on American soil. Congress approved war. Polk’s message framed the United States as the injured party and treated the boundary claim as settled, although it was contested.

Polk viewed the war as a means of defending Texas, resolving claims, and obtaining western territory. Expansion promised Pacific ports, trade, agricultural land, and national power. Supporters interpreted victory as confirmation of American institutions and destiny. The rapid military success strengthened Polk’s position even as critics questioned the origins and morality of the conflict.

Emerson and Thoreau’s Opposition

Ralph Waldo Emerson opposed the annexationist logic of the war and warned that conquest would morally damage the United States. A statement often attributed to him predicted that Mexico would poison the country that swallowed it. The metaphor suggested that territory acquired unjustly would intensify internal conflict rather than create stable greatness. The dispute over whether slavery would expand into the acquired land proved central to the national crisis that followed. (Dunbar-Ortiz)

Henry David Thoreau turned opposition into personal civil disobedience by refusing to pay a poll tax. His night in jail later contributed to the essay commonly known as “Civil Disobedience.” Thoreau argued that individuals must not allow government to make them agents of injustice. For him, the Mexican War and slavery demonstrated that majority rule did not guarantee morality.

Thoreau’s position differed from ordinary partisan opposition. He did not simply argue that Polk had chosen a poor strategy. He challenged the citizen’s responsibility when the state commits injustice. Paying taxes and obeying law could become forms of participation. His argument shifted the question from whether the war was beneficial to whether conscience required resistance.

Lincoln and the “Spot” Resolutions

Representative Abraham Lincoln challenged Polk to identify the exact “spot” where American blood had been shed. The Spot Resolutions questioned whether the clash occurred on territory that the

United States could honestly describe as its own. Lincoln's criticism focused on presidential representation of the facts and Congress's responsibility to examine the grounds for war.

The resolutions illustrate how geographic description can carry legal and moral power. If the land was unquestionably American, Polk's account appeared defensive. If it was disputed or Mexican, the movement of troops looked provocative. Lincoln's challenge did not stop the war and exposed him to accusations of disloyalty, but it preserved an important record of contemporary dissent.

Compare and Contrast the Critics with Polk

Polk and his critics differed in their understanding of national interest, executive authority, and moral obligation. Polk emphasized security, claims, opportunity, and expansion. He treated the war as a legitimate response to aggression and viewed acquisition as beneficial to the republic. Emerson and Thoreau emphasized the corruption produced by unjust means. They doubted that territorial gain could be separated from slavery and moral responsibility.

Polk reasoned primarily from state power and national objectives. Thoreau reasoned from individual conscience. Emerson warned about long-term moral consequences, while Lincoln demanded factual and constitutional scrutiny. All four engaged the meaning of the republic, but they defined its success differently. For Polk, national growth demonstrated vitality. For the critics, republican principles were betrayed when expansion depended on deception, conquest, or slavery.

Religion and the Language of Providence

Religious language helped present expansion as sacred duty. Some Protestant Americans believed that the United States carried a mission to spread republican government, Christianity, commerce, and "civilization." Providence transformed political ambition into apparent moral obligation. If expansion was divinely intended, opposition could be portrayed as resistance to history itself.

The religious contrast between predominantly Protestant Americans and predominantly Catholic Mexicans also shaped prejudice. Anti-Catholicism was strong in the United States, and Mexico could be represented as backward or tyrannical. These stereotypes ignored the diversity within both societies and converted theological difference into an argument for political superiority. (Polk)

Religion did not produce one position. Abolitionists and other religious critics condemned the war as an instrument of slavery and injustice. Moral language could therefore support conquest or resistance. The key question is how religious claims were connected to power.

Race and the Justification of Expansion

Racial ideology was central to Manifest Destiny. Many white Americans described Indigenous peoples and Mexicans as incapable of using land properly or governing effectively. Anglo-Saxon superiority, white settlement, and civilization were presented as reasons that American control should replace existing sovereignty.

These ideas justified unequal citizenship after conquest. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo promised protections to Mexican residents, yet many lost land through legal costs, fraud, taxation, violence, or discriminatory administration. Indigenous peoples in the ceded territory were not treated as equal parties to the transfer. The treaty between states claimed authority over lands whose Native nations had never ceded sovereignty to either government.

Race also shaped the debate over annexing all of Mexico. Some expansionists wanted greater territory but opposed incorporating a large nonwhite population. This contradiction reveals that Manifest Destiny combined hunger for land with limits on who could belong fully to the republic.

Slavery and Sectional Conflict

The acquisition of western territory reopened the question of slavery's expansion. The Wilmot Proviso proposed excluding slavery from territory acquired from Mexico, although it did not become law. Southern politicians argued for equal access to the territories, while antislavery voices feared that the war had been designed to strengthen slaveholding power.

The Compromise of 1850 addressed some territorial issues but did not resolve the conflict. California entered as a free state, while other territories were organized through contested arrangements. The Fugitive Slave Act intensified resistance. The land gained through the war therefore contributed directly to the political crises preceding the Civil War.

Emerson's warning about moral poisoning can be understood in this context. Expansion did not simply enlarge the nation; it enlarged the arena in which slavery, citizenship, and federal authority were fought over.

Consequences for Mexico and Indigenous Nations

Mexico lost a vast portion of its claimed territory and experienced political and economic disruption. The war occupies a different place in Mexican historical memory than in traditional American narratives. What one side called fulfillment appeared to the other as invasion and territorial loss. (Polk)

For Indigenous nations, the change from Mexican to American sovereignty often brought intensified

settlement, military campaigns, treaty violations, reservation systems, and resource dispossession. American control did not end conflict; it expanded settler pressure across the West. The history of Manifest Destiny must therefore include Native survival, resistance, adaptation, and continuing sovereignty.

How Manifest Destiny Still Influences the United States

The phrase is no longer an official doctrine, but its assumptions persist. American exceptionalism can present the United States as uniquely authorized to spread political or economic models. Foreign interventions may be described as benevolent missions while local perspectives and unintended consequences receive less attention. The parallel is not exact, but the moral confidence resembles nineteenth-century claims of civilizing purpose.

Manifest Destiny also influences memory and public land debates. School narratives that celebrate pioneers without examining dispossession continue the idea that westward settlement was inevitable and broadly beneficial. Disputes over monuments, place names, tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, and resource extraction reveal that expansion is not only a completed past.

Immigration debates contain another contradiction. The United States acquired large regions formerly governed by Mexico, yet contemporary political rhetoric can portray Mexican and other Latin American migrants as outsiders without history in the region. Recognizing the border's historical movement complicates simple claims about belonging.

Infrastructure and economic development can still use the language of empty or underused land. Energy, mining, water, and transportation projects may affect tribal lands and sacred sites. A more responsible national identity treats Indigenous nations as political communities with rights, not as symbols from a vanished past.

Reassessing National Expansion

Historical analysis does not require denying every material consequence of expansion. The continental United States developed powerful markets, transportation networks, and Pacific connections. The ethical question concerns how those outcomes were achieved and whose losses were excluded from the national account.

Manifest Destiny was effective partly because it turned choices into destiny. Once expansion appeared inevitable, war and removal could be described as regrettable but unavoidable. Restoring contingency shows that alternatives existed: negotiated boundaries, respect for sovereignty, opposition to slavery, and different forms of coexistence were advocated at the time.

Conclusion

Manifest Destiny joined territorial ambition with religious providence, racial hierarchy, economic opportunity, and national power. Polk used the language of defense and American claims to justify war with Mexico, while Emerson, Thoreau, Lincoln, and other critics questioned conquest, executive truthfulness, slavery, and moral complicity. The resulting territory extended the United States to the Pacific but intensified sectional conflict and dispossessed Mexican and Indigenous communities. Its legacy remains in exceptionalist foreign-policy language, public memory, border politics, and disputes over land and sovereignty. Understanding Manifest Destiny requires replacing the story of inevitable progress with an account of contested decisions and unequal consequences. (National Archives).

References

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Beacon Press, 2014.

National Archives. "Lincoln's Spot Resolutions." https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/lincoln-resolutions

National Archives. "Monuments, Manifest Destiny, and Mexico." https://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2005/summer/mexico

Polk, James K. "Message to Congress Requesting a Declaration of War with Mexico." 11 May 1846.

Thoreau, Henry David. "Resistance to Civil Government." 1849.

Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. 1848.