

5-2014

Tejanos and the Texas Revolution: Their reaction to the Centralist threat

Michael Marino
University of Texas-Pan American

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/leg_etd



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marino, Michael, "Tejanos and the Texas Revolution: Their reaction to the Centralist threat" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations - UTB/UTPA*. 876.

https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/leg_etd/876

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations - UTB/UTPA by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. For more information, please contact justin.white@utrgv.edu, william.flores01@utrgv.edu.

TEJANOS AND THE TEXAS REVOLUTION
THEIR REACTION TO THE CENTRALIST THREAT

A Thesis

by

MICHAEL MARINO

Submitted to the Graduate School of
The University of Texas-Pan American
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2014

Major Subject: History

TEJANOS AND THE TEXAS REVOLUTION
THEIR REACTION TO THE CENTRALIST THREAT

A Thesis
by
MICHAEL MARINO

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Charles Waite
Chair of Committee

Dr. Irving Levinson
Committee Member

Dr. Linda English
Committee Member

May 2014

Copyright 2014 Michael Marino
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Marino, Michael., Tejanos and the Texas Revolution: Their Reactions to the Centralist Threat.

Master of Arts (MA), May, 2014, 118 pp., 1 table, references, 107 titles.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain Tejanos' reasons for rebelling against the Mexican government. Texas was first colonized by the Spanish in the sixteenth century. After the Mexican independence in 1821, Texas became a Mexican territory. Tejanos (Texas Mexicans) lived under Spanish rule and Mexican rule. México enacted a colonization program allowing Anglo immigrants to settle in Texas. Tejanos and Anglo colonists developed a mutual working relationship. This thesis will compare the Spanish and Mexican administrations and how they failed to support and protect Tejanos. This failure is one of the causes for their rebellion. Another cause is the Centralist regime in México which in 1835 stripped power from the Mexican states, favoring the Mexican military officials and local elites. President Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna's brutal military campaign against rebelling states is the last reason why Tejanos decided to rebel against México, siding with Anglo colonists in the creation of independence.

DEDICATION

I owe all of my success to my wife, Cynthia B. Sosa-Marino. Thank you for your support and love. Without you, the completion of my Bachelor of Arts in English and Master of Arts in History would not have been possible. I thank you for her patience, wisdom, and advice which have proven to be invaluable over the years. Without your late night revisions, this document would not have been properly edited. I also thank my parents, Agapito Javier Marino and Alicia Marino, who have supported and encouraged me in my educational pursuits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful for the passion that Professor Juanita Garza had for Texas history. As an undergraduate, she taught me about the plethora of Tejano history that exists in Texas. Her passion and knowledge for valley history is unmatched today. She motivated me to become a Texas history educator so I can enlighten others about our local history. The historical community suffered a great loss when she succumbed to cancer in 2011. I am also thankful for Dr. Charles Waite's advice and suggestions. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Irving W. Levinson and Dr. Linda English for their suggestions and guidance as my committee members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION: TEJANOS BETWEEN TWO WORLDS	1
CHAPTER II. SPANISH TEXAS 1689-1821 TEJANOS: THE FOUNDATION OF FRONTIER TEXAS SOCIETY.....	23
CHAPTER III. TEJANOS AND EARLY ANGLO COLONISTS IN MEXICAN TEXAS: TEJANO-MEDIATED CONFLICTS BETWEEN ANGLO COLONISTS AND THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT	51
CHAPTER IV. TENSIONS RISE: ANGLO, TEJANOS AND MÉXICO.....	72
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION: TEJANOS' REASONS FOR REVOLUTION.....	99
REFERENCES	107
APPENDIX.....	116
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	118

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

TEJANOS BETWEEN TWO WORLDS

Tejanos have played an important role in the history of Texas and were marginalized until the mid-twentieth century. Tejanos were instrumental in the settlement of Texas and helped Anglo settlers prosper in Texas. However, when Anglo-Texian filibusterers with the encouragement of Anglo-American agitators threatened to form a separate state, Tejanos were reluctant to seek separate statehood and were unwilling to rebel against México until Mexican congress enacted the *Siete Leyes*. Author Raúl A. Ramos asked important questions in his book *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861*, when he wrote “Why didn’t Mexicans migrate northward? ‘Why did Mexicans accept Anglos-Americans even though their policy aimed to stop American expansion?’”¹ This study will answer these questions and will explore the reasons why Tejanos chose to rebel against the Mexican government and cast their lot with Anglos who wanted to be independent from México. This study will focus on Tejano elites who resided in Béxar (San Antonio) and the Mexican Federalists who assisted Tejanos. These Tejano elites were from wealthy, land-owning families who obtained Spanish

¹ Raúl A. Ramos, *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 255.

land grants in the eighteenth century, including Juan Nepomuceno Seguín, Erasmo Seguín, José Antonio Navarro, Francisco Ruiz, Placido Benavides, Martín De León, and many others. It is crucial to demonstrate the gradual progression of Tejano opinion against the Mexican Centralist government. This study will also analyze the political, military, and economic reasons why Tejanos chose to support Anglo-Texans. Tejanos stood to lose everything – their land, property, and lives.

The study of Tejano history has become a very popular field among Texas historians. Numerous books were published on specific Tejanos such as Juan N. Seguín, Lorenzo de Zavala, and José Antonio Navarro. Popular topics in Tejano history are religion in San Antonio, Tejanas role in Texas history, and Tejano ethnicity. No scholarly work has been done on the rationale of Tejanos who rebelled against México. Studies and theories that have been published were about why the revolution began and the motivations of Anglo-Texans and Mexican officials in the Texas Revolution. What is sorely lacking is research on the opinions of Tejanos themselves and what motivated them to join the Texas Revolution.

This thesis will focus on Tejanos' opinions and reactions regarding Mexican Centralist government policies as well as the economic relationship between Tejano elites and Anglo Texans. Lastly, it will discuss the Tejanos' response to the brutality of the Mexican army during the rebellions in the Mexican states of Coahuila y Tejas, San Luis Potosí, Querétaro, Durango, Guanajuato, Michoacán, Yucatán, Jalisco, Nuevo León, Tamaulipas and Zacatecas. In this study, the term Tejanos refers to Mexican citizens born in Texas, and the term Anglo-Texans refers to Anglo *empresarios* who obtained land grants legally from México. The term Anglo-Americans refers to Anglos who settled in Texas illegally. Mexican Centralist policier will be

discussed because these policies led to the agitation of both Anglo Texans and Tejanos. From 1821 to 1932 Mexican government had often been unstable. A multitude of presidents ascended to power and were later deposed by military coups. With this political instability in the nation's capital and with little state representation, Texas was abandoned by the federal and state governments to self-govern and repel Indian attacks in the Texas frontier. Centralists led by President Antonio López de Santa Anna's Centralist stripped all political autonomy from the Mexican states. Santa Anna solidified his despotic rule with the *Siete Leyes* (Seven Laws) passed in 1835 which stripped political autonomy from the Mexican states and causing many Mexican states to rebel.

The Texas Revolution was a significant event in United States and Texas history. The war was short, beginning in October 1835 with the skirmish at Gonzales and ending with the battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836. The Treaty of Velasco signed by Santa Anna and David G. Burnet formally ended the war on May 16, 1836. Like the American Revolution, the Texas Revolution splintered communities into two factions. Friends and families were forced to choose sides. Tejanos declared loyalties to either Anglo Texans or Santa Anna. For instance, this war divided the Esparza family. Gregorio Esparza was a Tejano revolutionary and his brother, Francisco Esparza, was loyal to México.

Jóse Gregorio Esparza was a member of the Leal Presidios Company of Béxar who fought and died at the Alamo. His brother was Francisco Esparza. Francisco was an officer in the Mexican cavalry that laid siege at the Alamo. Besides tearing many families apart, the war drove many more families to the *ranchos* (ranches) to escape the devastation of the war. People left because they were going to be at odds with one side or both. Since many Anglo-American

volunteers believed there were no differences between a Tejano and a Mexican, they looted from Tejano families, when they encountered them. The Mexican army also had difficulty distinguishing between loyal Tejanos and Tejano rebels, so they stole cattle and horses from Tejano ranchers and conscripted men into the Mexican army.

Tejanos consistently were cultural brokers between Anglo empresarios and Mexican officials. Erasmo Seguín and José Antonio Navarro assisted Steven F. Austin in establishing his successful colony of San Felipe de Austin. The relationship between Anglo empresarios and the Mexican government was a volatile one. At times, Anglo colonists were at odds with Mexican officials. Tejanos often mediated and resolved conflicts. Austin also played a major role as peacekeeper in his colony as well as with other Anglo empresarios. During the Fredonian Revolt in 1826, Austin assisted the Mexican army in suppressing the revolt with the help of Anglo volunteers, thus proving that Austin was a loyal Mexican citizen. By 1832, some Anglos were angry at the Mexican government, so they formed the war party which advocated for independence from México. War party members consisted of young men whose ages ranged from eighteen to twenty-five and were newly immigrated to Texas. During the same time the war party was created, the peace party was also created.

When Anglo agitators such as Sam Houston and William B. Travis incited the war party, Austin and his peace party constituents quelled the rabble-rousers. The peace party lost Austin's support when he sending a seditious letter to the B́exar *ayuntamiento* requesting them to seek separate statehood. Austin was jailed from 1834-1835. When Austin was released from prison in 1835, he changed his opinions about the Mexican government. He then supported the war party.

There is not enough published literature on the ideology of the Tejanos in their choice to side with Anglos and rebel against México. Tejanos had the most to lose if the war was lost, particularly their property and their lives. Tejanos were also outnumbered by Anglo-Americans who were flooding into Texas. By 1834, reports stated that Anglos had outnumbered the Tejanos ten to one. The population of Tejanos in 1834 was 3,500 in comparison to 20,700 Anglos.² Tejanos were keenly aware of the threat that the newly-arrived Anglos posed to the livelihood of the Tejano community, but Tejanos felt that the Centralist regime of Santa Anna was an even greater threat their existence.

Historians have written many works such as *Sleuthing the Alamo: Davy Crockett's Last Stand and Other Mysteries of the Texas Revolution* by James E. Crisp³, Eugene C. Barker wrote *The Life of Stephen F. Austin Founder of Texas, 1793-1836: A Chapter in the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People*.⁴ William C. Davis wrote *Three Roads to the Alamo: The Lives and Fortunes of David Crockett, James Bowie, and William Barret Travis*.⁵ The interpretation of history is fluid and determined by the popular school of thought in which the historian is publishing which changed over the decades from traditional, revisionist and post-revisionist schools of thought. The leading Texas historian of the early twentieth century was Eugene Campbell Barker, who, in his biography of Stephen Fuller Austin noted, that “anything

² Juan Nepomuceno Almonte, *Noticias estadística sobre Tejas* (México City: Ignacio Cumpeide Publisher, 1835) Table 4.

³ James E. Crisp, *Sleuthing the Alamo: Davy Crockett's Last Stand and Other Mysteries of the Texas Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁴ Eugene C. Barker, *The Life of Stephen F. Austin Founder of Texas, 1793-1836: A Chapter in the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1925).

⁵ William C. Davis, *Three Roads to the Alamo: The Lives and Fortunes of David Crockett, James Bowie, and William Barret Travis* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1998).

written prior to 1856 was for the most part frankly intended for propaganda, but this does not seriously militate against their value, if they are used with discrimination.”⁶

Barker’s statement is correct many of the early Texas historians were bias in their opinons. One of the earliest published Texas history was in 1836, in Cincinnati, David Barnett Edwards published *History of Texas or, the Emigrant's, Farmer's, and Politician's Guide to the Character, Climate, Soil, and Productions of That Country: Geographically Arranged from Personal Observation and Experience*. Edwards was born in Scotland in 1797 and emigrated to the United States in 1819. He was one of the first to settle the city of Gonzales in Green DeWitt's Colony. He was an educated man and the principal of an early school in Texas, the Academy at Gonzales.⁷ In his book, Edwards wrote a brief overview of life in México to entice more settlers. He gave his opinion on some topics such as slavery. He stated, “Slavery has been happily abolished, without difficulty.” Edwards was elated about the abolition of slavery in México.⁸ He was a Federalist and a loyal Mexican citizen who had no intentions of seeking separate statehood. His positive attitude toward the Mexican government in the period after the Texas Revolution made Edwards unpopular among the colonists who fought against México. Stephen Austin banned Edwards’s book, which he considered a “... slander on the people of

⁶ Eugene E. Barker, *The Life of Stephen F. Austin Founder of Texas, 1793-1836: A Chapter in the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People* (Dallas: Cokesbury Press, 1926), 532.

⁷ David B. Edward, *The History of Texas or, The Emigrant’s Guide to the Character, Climate, Soil and Productions of That Country: Geographically Arranged from Personal Observation and Experience*. (Cincinnati: J. A. James & CO., 1836), i.

⁸ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 120.

Texas. Edwards's historical work had faults; he plagiarized passages in his book and neglected to give credit to parties interviewed."⁹

A year after Texas gained its independence in 1837, Benjamin Lundy published his interpretation of the war in his book *The War in Texas*. Lundy refuted the idea that "[t]he immediate cause and the leading object of this contest originated a settled design, among the slaveholders of this country, to wrest the large and valuable territory of Texas from the Mexican Republic in order to re-establish the SYSTEM OF SLAVERY; to open a vast SLAVE-MARKET."¹⁰ Benjamin Lundy was an abolitionist from New Jersey, and he believed that the slavery issue would be solved if free blacks were located in low population away from white populated areas. He planned to obtain an empresario contract and populate his colony with free blacks.¹¹ Lundy did not know that México at the time had no authority to issue land contracts. Lundy viewed Texas agitators as using liberty only to cover up individual greed and sin. Lundy's interpretation of the Texas Revolution was an example of an early opinion on Texas history. Lundy believed that the war against México was unjust.

Another author of Texas history was Chester Newell, who published his book *History of the Revolution in Texas* in 1838. His interpretation of the Texas Revolution was that a collision of political beliefs between Texas and México was sparked by despotism in 1835. Newell referred to the despotic regime of Santa Anna as being the catalyst of the revolution. He

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Benjamin Lundy, *The War in Texas: A Review of Facts and Circumstances Showing that the Contests is a Crusade Against México* (Philadelphia: Merrihew and Gunn, 1837), 3.

¹¹ Benjamin Lundy, *The Life, Travels and Opinions of Benjamin Lundy, Including His Journeys to Texas and Mexico; with A Sketch of Contemporary Events, and A Notice of the Revolution in Hayti* (Philadelphia, Merrhew and Thompson, 1847), 63.

mentioned that the Mexican army assumed the voice of the nation. Newell asked “in the spirit of patriots of ’76 if México is sincere in its professions in favor of Texas then why is it preparing for military invasions?”¹² Newell saw the surge of Mexican soldiers entering Texas as a preemptive militarization for war.

French author Frederic Leclerc visited Texas in 1838 and interviewed several veterans. He later published his findings in the Parisian periodical *La Revue des Deux-Mondes* in two installments, one on March 1, 1840 and the other on April 15th of that year. In his articles, “*Le Texas et sa Revolution*,” he compared the Texas Revolution to the French Revolution. He also noted that the Texas Revolution was not a genuine revolution because “those who defended the Texans in this early war of words made no real attempt to rescue their reputations as genuine revolutionaries.”¹³ This sentiment mirrored Lundy’s and Newell’s opinions that the Anglo revolutionaries fought for reasons other than liberty and their rights granted under the Mexican Constitution of 1824. While Lundy viewed Texans as the agitators who were fighting Santa Anna’s despotic rule to hide their real intent to expand slavery in Texas. Newell saw the Texas Revolution as a collision of political beliefs between the Mexican government and the Anglo settlers. Both historians argued that the Texans were fighting the Mexican government. Lundy was an abolitionist which made his arguments weak and biased.

Henry Stuart Foote was born in Virginia in 1804 and was a lawyer and a legislator of the state of Mississippi. In 1840, he visited Texas and conducted his research, and in 1841, he published his book titled *Texas and the Texans; Or, Advance of the Anglo-Americans to the*

¹² Chester Newell, *History of the Revolution in Texas Particularly of the War of 1835 & 1836* (Austin: The Steck Company, 1838), 52.

¹³ Frederic Leclerc, “Le Texas et sa Revolution”, *La Revue des Deux-Mondes* (March 1 and April 15, 1840): 17.

South-West; Including a History of the Leading Events in México, From the Conquest of Fernando Cortes to the Termination of the Texas Revolution. In Foote's Texas history book, he portrayed the Mexican government as the aggressors who antagonized the Texian colonists. In his first chapter, Foote made his disdain for México clear by saying that "tyrannical domination of Bustamante was, happily, not long enough continued to enable that monster of iniquity to inflict any very serious detriment upon the interest of the Liberty in Texas."¹⁴ He later alluded to the Anglo-American ideals of liberty and freedom by mentioning the actions of the colonists in their war against the Mexican government. Foote was also bias because he was a Southerner and he did not mention the points of view of the Tejanos or Mexican officials.

He continued defending his point, stating, "Lofty actions of a superior race of men, who amidst perils and difficulties such as no people of ancient times and modern times had encountered sustained and energized by a fervid and inextinguishable love of freedom of liberty".¹⁵ Foote devoted chapter four to the comparison between the Texas patriots and the American patriots fighting the despotic rule of the British government.¹⁶ As mentioned before, Foote was a product of his time. Historians both amateur and professional cater their historical publications to the popular mentality in society during their time period. At the time of the publication of *Texas and Texans*, Americans were moving west and literature was published about divine destiny that was the part of Manifest Destiny. The idea of manifest Destiny strongly motivated many Americans to expand westward encroaching on Spanish and in 1821

¹⁴ Henry Stewart Foote, *Texas and the Texans: Or, Advance of the Anglo-Americans to the South-West; Including a History of Leading Events in México, from the Conquest by Fernando Cortes to the Termination of the Texan Revolution.* (Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwaite & Co., 1841), 7.

¹⁵ Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, 8.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 93-128.

Mexican Texas. The close proximity of the United States would cause tensions between the Mexican government and the United States. Tejanos benefited from the close proximity of Louisiana which Tejanos exploited for trade and to obtain cheap manufactured goods and other necessities.

William Kennedy was another amateur Texas historian. Born in Ireland in 1799, he was trained as a journalist in 1819 at Belfast College. In 1839, he traveled to Texas. For two years, he researched the history of Texas and published his findings in 1841 in a book titled *Texas: The Rise, Progress, and Prospects of the Republic of Texas in One Volume*. Like David Barnett, Edwards Kennedy's Texas history book was more of a traveler's guide of Texas. He devoted chapters to geography, climate, crops, economy, and government within the colonies. Kennedy sided with the Mexican Federalists arguing that the Texians were defending their rights granted under the Mexican Constitution of 1824.¹⁷ Kennedy was sympathetic to the Texians because he believed that they were justified in rebelling against the Centralist government which suspended the Constitution of 1824 and enacted the *Siete Leyes*, which stripped political autonomy from the Mexican states causing multiple state led rebellions.

Nicolas Dorian P. Maillard was an English lawyer who moved to Texas to practice law in 1839. In his spare time, he researched Texas history and published a book in 1842 was called *The History of the Republic of Texas, from the Discovery of the Country to the Present Time and the Cause of Her Separation from the Republic of México*. Kennedy's book, which was pro-independence, was popular in England after its publication. Maillard's book was intended to be

¹⁷ William Kennedy, *Texas: The Rise, Progress, and Prospects of Texas of the Republic of Texas in One Volume*. (London: R. Hastings, 1841), 473.

written as a reaction to Kennedy's book, *Texas: The Rise, Progress, and Prospects of Texas of the Republic of Texas in One Volume*.¹⁸ Maillard denounced Texas' rebellion against México and the inhumane treatment of Indians and slaves.¹⁹ Maillard went further to call Kennedy a southern sympathizer and arguing that Texas was tranquil until Anglo speculators began to arrive.²⁰ Moreover, Maillard wrote that because of the Fredonian Revolt, México was justified in sending soldiers to Texas to prevent further insurrections and to protect the colonists against Indian depredations.²¹ Maillard mentioned the Law of April 6, 1830 which forbade any Americans from settling in México. He also noted that "no sooner was the law passed that Americans from southern states (slave-holders) flocked to Texas."²² Maillard starkly contrasted with Kennedy he believed that Texians were the agitators who began the Texas Revolution.

After the Mexican-American War, an anti-Mexican sentiment swept over Texas. Tejanos who tolerated by Texians before the Mexican-American War, were now seen as Mexican loyalists and, therefore, the enemy. Henderson Yoakum's *History of Texas*, published in 1855, put the blame for the Texas Revolution on Santa Anna. Yoakum explained that Santa Anna openly expressed his dislike of Vice President Gomez Farias's pro-Federalist policies. Therefore, Santa Anna removed Vice President Gomez Farias from power and established a Centralist government. He also overturned the constitution and instituted an absolute

¹⁸ Nicolas Doran Maillard esq., *Republic of Texas from the discovery of the Country to the Present time; and the Cause of Her Separation from Mexico* (London: Smith, Elder, and Cornhill, 1842).

¹⁹ Doran Nicholas Millard, *The History of the Republic of Texas From the Discovery of the Country to the Present Time: and the Cause of Her Separation from the Republic of México* (London: Smith, Elder, and CO, 1842), iv.

²⁰ Millard, *The History of the Republic of Texas*, vi and 28.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 56.

²² *Ibid.*, 59.

government using the church and the military as instruments to achieve his goals. Yoakum accused Santa Anna as “fanning the flames of civil war”.²³ Yoakum was incorrect in stating that Texans were well supplied with provisions. In fact, the Texas army was always lacking supplies and relied on Tejanos to forage for the Texas army. Yoakum did not mention the aid that Tejanos provided during the Texas Revolution. Jose Antonio Navarro and Juan Nepomuceno Seguín published their historical accounts of the Texas Revolution in the 1850s because of such neglect of Tejanos’ role in the struggle.

José Antonio Navarro defended Tejanos’ interests. He served as the sole Tejano representative in the Republic of Texas Senate for two terms. Navarro attempted to protect Tejano land claims, voting rights, and Tejano citizenship rights by writing articles in the *San Antonio Ledger* to contest the biased attitudes of Anglo Americans. Navarro was the first Tejano to publish his points of view about Tejano history. An example of the bias history of Mexican Texas (Texas under Mexican rule) is found in Francis Baylies *A Narrative of Major General Wool’s Campaign in México, in the Years 1846, 1847, & 1848*. Baylies wrote, “After the expulsion of the Jesuits, everything went to decay, agriculture, learning, the mechanical arts. The decedents of the noble and chivalric Castilians had sunken to level, perhaps beneath it, of the aboriginal savages.”²⁴ It was because of this inaccurate account of Tejano history and poor portrayal of Tejanos that Navarro chose to publish several articles in the *San Antonio Leger*

²³ Henderson K. Yoakum, *History of Texas: From Its First Settlement in 1685 to Its Annexation to the United States in 1846* (New York: Redfield, 1856), 314.

²⁴ Jose Antonio Navarro, David R. McDonald ed., Timothy M. Matovina ed., *Defending Mexican Valor in Texas: Jose Antonio Navarro’s Historical Writings, 1853-1857* (Austin: State House Press, 1995), 22-26.

between 1853 and 1857, defending and clarifying any negative racial stereotypes and misconceptions of Tejanos.²⁵

Juan Nepomuceno Seguín was a Tejano, Texas patriot and the first Tejano to advocate separation from México. Seguín fought with distinction in the battle of San Jacinto, commanding a cavalry unit. After the Texas Revolution, he served as the mayor of San Antonio. During this time, México attacked and captured the city. Local Anglo citizens blamed Seguín for letting the soldiers occupy the city. The citizens threatened Seguín and his family, forcing them to flee to Laredo, a Mexican city. While in Laredo, he was arrested and conscripted into the Mexican army to serve in the Mexican-American War. Seguín fought his fellow Texans and was discharged after the war. He returned to Texas in February 1848 and asked Mirabeau B. Lamar for permission to bring his family to Texas. Seguín asked Lamar for permission because after the U.S.-Mexico War, Lamar was the acting military governor of Texas. He granted Seguín permission to stay in Texas. Seguín lived, in San Antonio on his father's ranch at Casa Blanca.²⁶ In 1852, he won the election as justice of the peace. Seguín tried to offset the rise of anti-Catholic, anti-Tejano sentiments in Texas which was spearheaded by the Know-Nothing Party.²⁷ Like Navarro, Seguín defended Tejanos from blatant discrimination. In retaliation, his credibility and loyalty were attacked. Seguín wrote his memoirs in 1858 to tell his story and obliterate any misconceptions that he was a traitor.

²⁵ Ibid,242-247.

²⁶ Jesús F. de la Teja, *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondences of Juan N. Seguín* (Austin: State House Press, 1991), 50.

²⁷ Teja, *A Revolution Remembered*, 51.

Vincent Filisola was born in Italy and joined the Spanish army in 1804; he fought in the Mexican Revolution as a Spanish officer. In 1831, Filisola failed to fulfill an empresario contract to settle 600 non-Anglo colonists in east Texas. Later, Filisola was promoted to general at the start of Texas Revolution. He fought in the Battle of San Antonio and in the Battle of San Jacinto. Filisola was ordered to retreat by Santa Anna and, after the war, he was branded a coward and court-martialed. Filisola was exonerated and published his accounts during the Texas Revolution. He served during the Mexican-American War. After the Mexican-American War, Filisola published: *Memoirs of the History of the War in Texas*. Filisola's book presents the history of Texas from a Mexican point of view. He noted that the Anglo Americans and the Anglo Texans were the agitators, and after Austin returned from jail, he joined the war party. By 1834, the Anglos were arming and preparing for war.²⁸ Filisola's history of Texas is the first Texas history that had been written from a Mexican officer's point of view. This view has largely been ignored by historians until the mid-twentieth century.

Twentieth-century scholars have changed their approach to the subject. The scholar who dominated the study of Texas history in the early twentieth century was Eugene C. Barker, whose primary focus was on Stephen Fuller Austin. Barker's approach was to purge stereotypes from his writings of history.²⁹ He found similarities between the Texas and the American Revolution. The Anglo Texans felt subjected to a despotic government which was a shared sentiment by the American patriots.³⁰ Nineteenth-century historians, such as Frederic Leclerc

²⁸ Vincent Filisola, Wallace Woolsey ed. *Memoirs for the History of the War in Texas*. (Austin, Eakin Press, 1987), 70-80.

²⁹ Eugene C. Barker, *México and Texas 1821-1835* (Dallas: Turner Publishing Co., 1928), v, 6, 91.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 91.

and Chester Newell, similarly compared the Texas Revolution with the American and French Revolutions.

Barker's *The Life of Stephen F. Austin: Founder of Texas, 1793-1836*, written in 1926, extensively researched the life of Stephen Fuller Austin from his birth in Missouri to his death in Texas. He used primary sources with the assistance of Carlos E. Castañeda, who translated much of Austin's Spanish correspondence. Barker portrays Austin as an honest empresario with aspiration to transform his colony into a law-abiding Mexican society.³¹ Austin's sentiments toward the Mexican government changed from positive to negative. Barker indicates that Austin was a model Mexican empresario until the refusal of the Mexican government to approve the requests of Texas residents.

Samuel Harman Lowrie obtained in PhD in Sociology and was a Professor of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. He was not a trained historian but Texas history piqued his interest. Lowrie only wrote one book on Texas history, utilizing his background in sociology to interpret the events that unfolded during the Texas Revolution. Lowrie's book published in 1932, *Culture Conflict in Texas*, approached the topic of the Texas Revolution differently than authors of previous decades. In doing so, he reaffirmed Barker's theories by showing that a cultural conflict in Texas between Mexicans and Americans was the cause of the war. Lowrie wrote his book when Barker's work dominated the field of Texas history. Therefore, his work was influenced a great deal by Barker's methodology. As Paul D. Lack mentioned in his book *The Texas Revolutionary Experience: A Political and Social History 1835-1836*, "Modern

³¹ Eugene C. Barker, *The Life of Stephen F. Austin: Founder of Texas, 1793-1836 A Chapter in the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People* (Dallas: Cokesbury Press, 1926), 522.

scholarship continued to concentrate primarily on the cause of the struggle rather than on its internal character due partly to the dominance of Eugene C. Barker.”³² Lack noted that Barker’s work dealt primarily with background topics. Lack’s assumptions were correct. The most historical work published during Barker’s era concentrated on superficial events that took place during the war.

Many historians neglected the point of view of the Tejanos and Mexican point of views during the Texas revolution. Carlos E. Castañeda was the first Mexican historian who was trained by Barker and researched Tejano and Mexican side of the Texas Revolution.³³ He born in Camargo, Tamaulipas, Mexico, and his family moved him to Brownsville, Texas when he was six weeks old. Castañeda graduated as valedictorian from Brownsville High School in 1914.³⁴ He enrolled in the University of Texas in 1917 as engineering major. Castañeda’s friend Father Ross introduced him to Dr. Eugene Campbell Barker. Barker needed a bilingual student assistant to help him organize and translate nineteenth century correspondences written in Spanish by Stephen F Austin. This research was used as the bases his biography of Stephen F. Austin.³⁵ Castañeda’s work with historical documents which was the catalyst to his shift in majors from engineering to history. Castañeda looked to Barker as a mentor. However, Castañeda’s historical narrative was more sensitive in the evaluation of Mexicans and Texans’ behaviors. Again, Castañeda was a product of his time. He primarily wrote in the 1930s and

³² Paul D. Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1992), xvi.

³³ Carlos E. Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas 1519-1936* (Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., 1939), 197-266.

³⁴ Felix D. Almaraz, *Knight Without Amour: Carlos Eduardo Castaneda 1896-1958* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1999), 7.

³⁵ Almaráz, *Knight Without Amour*, 10.

1940s, which was a period in American academia when Mexican American history was disregarded.

He left the university because the Texas legislature docked his salary.³⁶ He became a superintendent of San Felipe School District in Del Rio, Texas. Castañeda met resistance as a superintendent by Anglo parents who did not want a person of Mexican descent overseeing the education of their children.³⁷ This is an example of the many ways Anglo Americans thought at the time. This racial intolerance is one of the reasons why historians did not focus on minority groups. This trend was slow to change until the Civil Rights Movement when revisionist historians began researching and publishing articles and books on African American and Mexican American history.

Historians in the 1930s and 1940s only focused on the historical events and the famous historical figures as well as on the superficial background evidence pertaining to the Texas Revolution. Samuel Lowrie published in 1932 a book titled *Culture Conflict in Texas 1821-1835* which was about the misunderstanding between Anglos and the Mexican government leading to the Texas Revolution. His work focused on the cultural disparities between the people of México and the Anglo Texans. In 1952 William C. Binkley published *The Texas Revolution*. He was the first historian who focused on the background and correspondence of the Texas Revolution. Barker's edited collection, *The Austin Papers*, documented the correspondences of Stephen F. Austin to other colonists and Mexican officials. *The Austin Papers* was not intended to be anything except volumes of Austin's letters. Binkley emphasized strong economic issues

³⁶ Almaráz, *Knight Without Armor*, 96.

³⁷ Carlos E. Castañeda Papers, Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, accessed September 26, 2013, <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utlac/00087/lac-00087.html>.

and the Centralist vs Federalist dispute as precipitating factors in the cause of the Texas Revolution.³⁸ He argued that more scholarship was needed regarding the nature of the revolution. Binkley reiterated Barker's assumptions of the causes of the revolution, specifically the topic on economic issues which depicted Texas as a conservative defender of the existing government and cast Santa Anna's Centralists as the aggressors.³⁹

Binkley observed that the Texas governments, particularly its Tejano members, were predominantly loyal to México until Santa Anna disbanded the state governments and nullified the Mexican Constitution of 1824. This action turned many Tejanos against the Mexican government. This is one of the topics of my thesis, which will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapter. Binkley showed that events during the revolution unfolded too rapidly and became complex, resulting in conflict among the Texans. Binkley's assumption that the revolution was unorganized at first was correct. The shortness of the war and command insubordination caused loyalties to be questioned. Different leaders had their supporters, who would not take orders from another commander.

In 1978, Paul D. Lack published *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*. He noted the research that had been conducted about Texas history between the years 1836 to 1946 was superficial and only focused on the background history. Lack stated that Barker, Lowrie, and Binkley all had "conservative credentials."⁴⁰ Lack's assumption is correct. Barker's work essentially rested on an ideological foundation similar to that of the Texas chauvinists and

³⁸ William C. Binkley, *The Texas Revolution* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952), 1, 127, 132.

³⁹ Binkley, *The Texas Revolution*, 1.

⁴⁰ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, xvii.

romanticists who came before him.⁴¹ Barker did no mention in detail the amount of aid that the Tejanos gave to the Anglo empresarios when they entered Texas and during the Texas Revolution. Historians writing before the 1960s neglected the Tejano voices in the Texas Revolution. Historians had no interest in researching Tejano history. In the 1960s scholarly research was conducted and articles were published about Tejanos during the Texas revolution. For example, Joseph Martin Dawson, *José Antonio Navarro: Co-Creator of Texas* written in 1969, A.B.J Hammett, *The Empresario Don Martin De León* written in 1973, Raymond Estep “The Life of Lorenzo de Zavala” Ph. D. dissertation, written in 1942 and Raymond Estep “Lorenzo de Zavala and the Texas Revolution” *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* volume 7, number 3, January 1954⁴² Zavala, a Federalist, was not a Tejano he; was a born in Yucatán. However, he was instrumental in the creation of the Republic of Texas as the signer of Texas Declaration of Independence and the first Vice President of the Republic of Texas from March to October 1836.

In David J. Weber’s book *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846*, which was published in 1982, the author looks at the development of México’s frontiers and theories about the turmoil in México’s political, economic, military, and cultural spheres in the mid-1830s. This combined with Anglo-American culture in the frontier added to the havoc that led to rebellions in Zacatecas, Texas, New México, and California.⁴³ Weber points out that true revolution is

⁴¹ Walter L Buenger and Robert A. Calvert, *Texas Through Time: Evolving Interpretations* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1991), 136.

⁴² Raymond Estep, “Lorenzo de Zavala and the Texas Revolution” *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 3: vol 7, (January 1954) : 322-335.

⁴³ David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under México* (Albuquerque: University of New México Press, 1985), 244.

brought about by conflict in society as well as in the battlefield. He goes on to describe that geographic, ethnic; class, racial, and other dynamic shifts in power, property, and prestige are often the catalysts to a revolution.⁴⁴ This thesis exposes the Texans' reasons for participating in the Texas Revolution. The Tejanos' reasons for joining the Texas Revolution were similar to that of Federalist Anglos.

Historians in the late 1970s began to focus on Tejano and Mexican aspects of the Texas Revolution. Slowly, research shifted from Anglo participants and issues to Tejano leaders' issues. Primarily, the Civil Rights Movement as well as the political and demographic changes in America caused this shift. The Mexican-American population increased steadily since 1970. The United States Hispanic population has grown from 14.6 million people in 1970 to fifty-two million in 2011.⁴⁵ This population increase plays an important role in historical research because new scholars are eager to research Hispanic history. The Chicano consensus was that the Anglo Texans and Anglo American were the abusing the liberal Mexican empresario system. Chicano historians sided with opinions of Manuel de Mier Y Terán who inspected Texas from 1827-1829 and Juan Nepomuceno Almonte who inspected Texas from 1834-1835.⁴⁶ Both had reported that the Anglos outnumbered the Tejanos ten to one and they were not obeying Mexican laws. They both reported to the president of Mexico that Texas would be lost if nothing was done.

⁴⁴ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, xx-xxii.

⁴⁵ Emily Badger, "The Extraordinary 30-Year Growth of the U.S. Hispanic Population" *The Atlantic Cities*, August 30, 2013, accessed October 1, 2013, <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/neighborhoods/2013/08/extraordinary-growth-americas-hispanic-population/6733/>.

⁴⁶ "A Trip to Texas in 1828", José María Sánchez and Carlos E. Castañeda, *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.jstore.org/stable/30234949>. Accessed: 01/03/14 17:22, Vol. 29, No. 4 (April 1926), 258.

In the next few decades, various dissertations and books were published focusing, not only on the Tejanos, but on very specific aspects of Tejano community. Timothy Matovina focused his body of work on religion and ethnicity, specifically in San Antonio. In 1993, he wrote a book titled *San Antonio Tejanos, 1821-1860: A Study of Religion and Ethnicity*⁴⁷. Another author who focused on San Antonio was Jesús Francisco de la Teja who wrote in 1995 *San Antonio de Béxar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier*.⁴⁸ These are only two examples of modern historians who published in the 1990s about very specific topics in Tejano history.

Many books were written on various Tejano issues and biographies about prominent Tejanos and their families since the late 1990s and early 2000s. These books include *Jóse Antonio Navarro* written by Joseph Martin Dawson,⁴⁹ *Lorenzo de Zavala* written by Margaret Swett Henson⁵⁰, and *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondences of Juan Nepomuceno Seguín* written by Andrés Tijerina⁵¹. The majority of historical research on Tejano communities has specifically focused on the Béxar community. Ana Carolina Castillo Crimm wrote *De Leon: A Tejano Family History*, a book that traced the de Leon family's

⁴⁷ Timothy M. Matovina, *Tejano Religion and Ethnicity San Antonio, 1821-1860* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010)

⁴⁸ Jesus F. de la Teja, *San Antonio de Béxar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996)

⁴⁹ Joseph Martin Dawson, *Jose Antonio Navarro, Co-Creator of Texas* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1969)

⁵⁰ Margaret Swett Henson, *Lorenzo De Zavala: The Pragmatic Idealist* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1996)

⁵¹ Andrés Tijerina, *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondences of Juan Nepomuceno Seguín* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2002)

history.⁵² In 2008, Raúl A. Ramos published *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861*, which focuses on Tejanos being the cultural brokers between Anglos and Mexican officials.⁵³ Modern Texas historians have chosen to write about various aspects of Tejanos, such as religion, culture, and ethnicity. Tejana scholarship is a newly emerging research field. Tejano and Tejana history was ignored for decades and has been rediscovered within the last fifty years.

⁵² Ana Carolina Castillo Crimm, *De Leon, a Tejano Family History* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004)

⁵³ Raul A. Ramos, *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press – 2008)

CHAPTER II

SPANISH TEXAS: THE FOUNDATION OF TEJANOS SOCIETY

In the sixteenth century, the Spanish explored present-day México and Texas, claiming those territories for the Spanish crown. Spain plundered gold from the Aztec empire and silver from the Incan empire. Spain's thirst for gold and silver took them to Texas. Unable to find precious metals in Texas and northern México, the Spanish crown lost interest in exploring the northern territories. The lack of precious metals in Texas discouraged Spain from establishing colonies in Texas in the sixteenth century. As a result, Texas was ignored.

Spain allocated resources to the central cities of New Spain – such as Puebla-Tlaxcala, Bajío, Michoacán, Guadalajara, Oaxaca, and Querétaro – to promote their natural resources and exploit them. In 1604, in these Mexican cities, cotton and textile production dominated domestic production. From 1680 to 1730, Bajío and Guadalajara supplied agricultural and industrial products to central México. Querétaro had a strong woolen industry in the 1600s. Bajío transferred from livestock to cereals in the 1800s, and in the 1740s, Puebla transferred to cotton manufacturing.⁵⁴ Towns in central New Spain, such as Guadalajara and Zacatecas, benefited from Spanish merchants due to the proximity of Veracruz and Porto Bello which were the only

⁵⁴ Baron Alexander von Humboldt, *Ensayo político sobre Nueva España* (Paris: Casa de Rosa, 1836) , 226.

ports which the Spanish crown allowed commerce to flow through by 1778.⁵⁵ Texas was far away and held little resources for Spain to profit from therefore the Spanish crown had no interest in its development.

From 1618 to 1648, Spain was embroiled in wars which depleted its treasure. Since ships were destroyed or captured, this made manufactured products scarce and expensive. To replenish the treasury, Spain taxed goods. Goods from Spain were taxed at a rate of 15.5% and imported from the new world at a rate of 17.5%.⁵⁶ This tax dissuaded Spaniards from buying imported goods; therefore, demands for goods from the new world fell. Similarly, Spanish goods were expensive and only the wealthy could purchase them, which forced New Spain's economy to adapt and become self-sufficient. For Tejanos, it was more cost effective to obtain goods from Louisiana than to brave the arduous journey to Monterrey, Saltillo, or México City to obtain finished goods. The Spanish crown refused to give financial support to the Texas frontier and build infrastructure within Texas. Spain had financially neglected Texas to the point of poverty. The Spanish left the frontier undefended, allowing French explorers to trespass into Spanish Texas.

In 1684, René Robert Cavelier Sieur de La Salle traveled south to colonize for the French crown. His expedition to the mouth of the Mississippi River strayed off course and landed on Matagorda Bay. There, five miles north of Garcitas Creek in Lavaca Bay, he established in Fort St. Louis in 1685. Later that year, Karankawa Indian tribe destroyed that fort. La Salle's

⁵⁵ Lillian Estelle Fisher, *The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1971), 87.

⁵⁶ James Lang, *Conquest and Commerce: Spain and England in the America* (New York: Academic Press, 1975), 53.

colonists continued to perish due to attacks and poor nutrition. By January 12, 1687, the colonists' population had diminished to seventeen people out of the original 280 people who arrived at Fort St. Louis.⁵⁷ La Salle's encroachment on Spanish territory alarmed Spanish officials. Spain feared the French would settle in Texas and be reinforced by French military forces, effectively gaining control of Texas.

Spanish officials dispatched Alonso de Leon, governor of the frontier provinces of Coahuila, to find the French intruders. In 1689, with the aid of Indian guides, he found the remnants of Fort St. Louis and buried three dead bodies.⁵⁸ Spain continued to be vigilant of French encroachments and sent scouting expeditions into Texas to deter French trespassers. Spain established two *presidios* as a preemptive protection of Texas. In 1681, Presidio Isleta was reopened in east Texas. In 1702, the Spanish established Presidio San Juan Bautista de Rio in west Texas. These two presidios were the only fortifications in Texas. Furthermore, Spain had no intention of settling Texas until 1713 when Texas was again threatened by French incursions. Diego Ramón's father, Sergeant Major Diego Ramón, was the captain of San Juan Bautista de Rio.

In 1713, Louis Juchereau de Saint Denis journeyed from Biloxi, Mississippi to east Texas to establish a trading post with the Caddo tribe. He established a post near Eagle Pass a year later. By 1714, Spanish officials learned of this post and dispatched soldiers to arrest Saint Denis and bring him to Presidio San Juan Bautista under the command of Diego Ramón, who escorted

⁵⁷ Henri Joutel, *Joutel's Journal of La Salle's Last Voyage: A Journal of the last Voyage Perform'd by Monsr, de la Sale, to the Gulf of Mexico, to Find the Mouth of the Mississippi River* (Albany: Joseph McDonough, 1906), 45-57.

⁵⁸ "Derrotero de la Jornada que hizo el General Alonzo de León para el descubrimiento de la Bahía de Espíritu Santo y Población de Franceses," in *Documentos para la Historia Eclesiástica y Civil de la Provincia de Texas* (Archivo General de la Nación, México), Vol. XXVII.

him to México City for his trial. While in México City, Saint Denis convinced the Viceroy of New Spain that France and Spain would benefit by working together. During a Spanish expedition, Saint Denis established four missions and a presidio between Rio Grande and east Texas. In 1717, Captain Ramón and Fray Antonio Margil de Jesús established two missions east of the French post of Natchitoches named *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Nacogdoches*. Established in 1718, San Antonio de Valero, a presidio (fort), and San Antonio de Béxar, a mission, aided in the protection of Spanish interest in the region.⁵⁹ Central Texas was vital to the protection and trade interest in the fledgling colony. Other missions and presidios established within the vicinity of the Mission of Béxar and Presidio of Valero were San José Mission established in 1721, San Juan Capistrano Mission established in 1731, San Francisco de la Espada Mission established in 1731, and San Fernando Villa Mission in 1731.⁶⁰ Béxar was fundamental to the Tejano government that later played a significant role in the Texas Revolution.

On December 9, 1716, Viceroy Marqués de Valero appointed Martín de Alarcón as commander of Presidio San Francisco de Coahuila and as governor of the province of Texas. He was tasked to resupply Spaniards in Texas.⁶¹ Martín de Alarcón's planning allowed Texas to be settled by Spanish families, resulting in the foundation of the Tejano community of Béxar. Indian converts frequented Mission San Antonio de Valero, and Spanish soldiers inhabited only

⁵⁹ Fray Francisco Céliz, Trans. Fritz Leo Hoffmann, *Diary of The Alarcón Expedition into Texas, 1718-1719* (Los Angeles: The Quivira Society, 1935), 49.

⁶⁰ Céliz, *Diary of The Alarcón Expedition*, 23-24.

⁶¹ Donald E. Chipman, "Alarcon, Martin de," Handbook of Texas Online (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fal02>), accessed April 22, 2014. Uploaded on June 9, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

presidio San Antonio de Béxar.⁶² As decades passed, intermarriage between Spanish soldiers and the Indian population led to the gradual growth of Texas. The town of Béxar grew from the Mission of San Antonio de Valero and the presidio San Antonio de Béxar. The population of settled Texas gradually grew from 3,103 in 1777 to 3,122 in 1809 (Appendix A). Spanish citizens had little interest in colonizing Texas as seen in the population of Bexar from 1777 to 1809. The population only increased by nineteen people. By 1820, missions had become secular satellite civilian communities, and Indians had become the minority. The townspeople held large amounts of mission land.⁶³ Other Spanish missions that were established were Los Adaes in 1721, San Sabá in 1757, Nacogdoches in 1779, Concepción in 1716, and La Bahia in 1721 which was built on the ruins of Fort Saint Louis.

Spain had difficulties enticing *peninsulares* (residents of New Spain born in the Iberian Peninsula) to Texas. Therefore, Spain recruited Spaniards who lived in the Canary Islands. The Canary Islands are a chain of islands off of the coast of Spain. Sixteen Canary Islanders' families established the first ayuntamiento in Texas in 1731 in San Fernando de Béxar.⁶⁴ The Spanish crown elected the constituents who governed the ayuntamientos (city or town council) to limit the powers of Canary Islanders. Ayuntamientos held criminal and civil authority over the municipalities.⁶⁵ Indians ceased to live in the Tejano communities and relocated to other parts of Texas. However, Indian tribes surrounding Béxar were a constant threat to Tejano communities.

⁶² Ibid., 41, first census of Bexar shows only soldiers as inhabiting the surrounding area.

⁶³ Jean Louis Berlandier, *Journey to México During the Years 1826 to 1834*, trans. Sheila M. Ohlendorf, Josette M. Bigelow, and Mary M. Standifer (Austin, 1980), 291.

⁶⁴ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 28.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 26-27.

The Spanish crown had arranged peace treaties with warring tribes such as the Apache and the Comanche. Nevertheless, the Spanish were vigilant of Indian attacks.

Apache Indians constantly raided Tejano communities, breaking the peace treaties. On June 1784, the Apaches killed forty-six people and stole 600 horses and mules in a variety of locations in Texas.⁶⁶ In 1786, in response to these Apache attacks, Bernardo de Galvez, the viceroy of New Spain, outlined an aggressive plan against the Apaches.⁶⁷ Instead of an all-out war, he ordered reprisals against offending Indian raiding parties. He also insisted that settlers assist soldiers in their campaigns against the Apaches; if able-bodied civilians did not volunteer, they were forced into conscription. The war between the Spanish forces and the Apache nation lasted until 1790 when both parties agreed upon peace terms.⁶⁸

The cattle industry was one of the local resources that Tejanos profited from. The first cows were brought by early Spanish explorers who left a cow and bull at every river crossing. Within a few decades the cattle population grew exponentially, and Tejanos profited from this. Cattle law represented one source of conflict between Spanish officials and the Tejano community. Livestock was the major source of income for Tejanos. On August 22, 1776, King Carlos III appointed Teodoro de Croix as *Comandante de Provincias Internas* (Commandant of the Internal Provinces). He was the administrator of frontier territory including Texas, Coahuila, Nueva Vizcaya, New México, Sinaloa, Sonora, and Baja and Alta California. Croix spent the next eight months studying documents and reports relating to the frontier. He left México City

⁶⁶ Donald E. Chipman, *Spanish Texas, 1519-1821* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992), 199.

⁶⁷ Chipman, *Spanish Texas*, 212.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 200.

in 1777, and by January 1778, he arrived in Béxar to inspect Texas. Croix took a hard stance on Indian tribes in Texas, calling for the extermination of hostile savages. He bolstered the Texas militia to wage war on the Apaches and Comanches by creating flying companies or mobile patrols. By 1783, when Croix resigned as *Comandante de Provincias Internas* to take a position as viceroy of Perú, he had established presidial and militia units totaling 4,686 men which patrolled an area consisting of seventeen presidios spanning from La Bahia and Béxar to California.⁶⁹ Tejano militias became experts on waging war with hostile Indian tribes. This experience would prove beneficial in the Texas Revolution.

On January 1778, Commandant General Teodoro de Croix appointed Domingo Cabello as governor of Texas.⁷⁰ Cabello served as governor of Texas for eight years, from 1778 to 1786. Croix issued a decree giving Tejanos had the deadline of May 12, 1778 to register cattle brands with the governor of Texas.⁷¹ After that all unmarked cattle would become property of the king.⁷² Tejanos accused Cabello of confiscating thousands of head of cattle and selling them in Louisiana, thus defrauding the monarchy.⁷³ Spanish authorities conducted an investigation into the allegation against Cabello. Due to insufficient evidence, Cabello was not at fault for any crime. Tejano frustration mounted as they complained about the sluggishness of the Spanish

⁶⁹ Ibid, 201.

⁷⁰ Croix to Ripperda, January 9, 1778, Bexar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas, Box 2C27, Vo. 67, Frame 104.

⁷¹ Croix to Ripperdá, January 11, 1778, Bexar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas, Box 2C27, Vol. 68, Frame 1.

⁷² Croix's Decree, volume 68, series 3-14, Bexar Archives Translation, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin Texas.

⁷³ Jack Jackson, *Los Mesteños: Spanish Ranching in Texas, 1721-1821*, (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1986), 341-342.

administrative system. This issue was not resolved until 1795 when new regulations decreed that only individuals with licenses may “catch cattle”.⁷⁴

Spanish administrators took months to address Tejanos’ complaints therefore, Tejanos were forced to circumvent the law and continue to sell and capture cattle as they pleased. The rigidness of the Spanish system compounded by the distance from Texas to Saltillo and Mexico City delayed actions from Spanish officials. Spanish law forbade trade with any country other than Spain. Croix granted Cabello permission to sell cattle to Louisiana, instructing Cabello “to furnish the governor of Louisiana with whatever he asked in the future.”⁷⁵ Spanish officials bypassed the law for their own benefit, causing distrust and anger within the Tejano community. Cabello was removed from power in 1787 to prevent an outbreak of violence. Rafael Martinez Pacheco replaced him.

In 1762, Kings Louis XV of France and Carlos III of Spain agreed to the Treaty of Fontainebleau, giving Spain control of Louisiana. The acquisition of Louisiana was not formally announced to the people of France and Spain until 1764. Spain now had complete domination of the southwestern territory in North America. Spain was not concerned about English encroachment because the Appalachian Mountains provided a natural barrier between the Spanish territory and English colonies. After the American Revolution, the new country was growing westward, exponentially. To curb the growth, in 1795, Spain and the United States agreed to Pinckney’s Treaty, also known as Treaty of San Lorenzo or Treaty of Madrid, which

⁷⁴ “Año de 1795. Copias de las providencias de la Junta Superior de Rhazdo Decretos de conformidad de los Exmos Señores Virreys, orn de Sor Comte Gral de Provs Ynts, Acuerdos con el Ayuntamiento de esta Villa Y Bando publicado el dos de Agosto del mismo año ser Junta Grandos por los Criadores”, August 27, 1795, Béxar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas.

⁷⁵ Croix to Cabello, August 16, 1779, Chihuahua, Bexar Archives.

allowed the United States to navigate the Mississippi River to the port of New Orleans and defined the boundaries between the United States and Spanish territory.

Spain profited from Pinckney's Treaty by defining the boundaries between the United States and Spanish territory at the Mississippi River. In October 1796, Commandant General Pedro de Nava informed the Governor of Texas Manuel Muñoz that the English were counterfeiting Spanish pesos in Birmingham, England and its introduction into the Spanish economy would bankrupt the nation.⁷⁶ During this year, Spain joined France in declaring war with England. Spain felt threatened by the United States because they did not honor Pinckney's Treaty. Various Indian tribes of Texas reported that Americans were entering Texas. Commandant General Nava wrote to Governor Munoz in 1795, "Especially exercise care to see that no foreigner go among the Indian nations who are our allies."⁷⁷ The Quasi War between France and the United States kept Spain on edge because of the previous alliance Spain had with France. Spain feared that the United States would attack the Spanish frontier. Continual settlement in Texas by Americans, such as Philip Nolan who entered Texas to capture mustangs and sell them in the United States, was the main reason why Spain revoked United States's right to travel through New Orleans in 1798.⁷⁸

In 1803, the Louisiana Purchase drastically changed the boundaries between Spain and the United States. Texas now served as a buffer zone between Spain and the United States.

⁷⁶ Cortéz to Muñoz, November 18, 1769, Bexar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Box 2S70, Roll 26, Frame 951.

⁷⁷ Nava to Elguézabal, November 20, 1799. Coahuila. Bexar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History.

⁷⁸ Donald Chipman and Harriett Denise Joseph, *Spanish Texas 1519-1821* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010) 228.

Spain sought to secure Texas quickly and consequently increased the number of Spanish soldiers in Texas. By 1805, a small contingent of troops from Coahuila – aided by seven hundred militiamen of Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas – marched to reinforce the much-needed Texas garrisons.⁷⁹ As the population in Texas steadily increased, so did the towns. By 1820, the Béxar garrison consisted of 170 men.⁸⁰

The Spanish crown outlawed trade with any country other than Spain. Spain was out-produced by France, England and the United States; therefore, their only recourse for economic prosperity was to forbid any purchases of non- Spanish imports. Texas was bound by the mercantilist system. As a result, Spain was forced to protect its manufacturers and discouraged manufacturing in its colonies. Spain only permitted commercial vessels to dock in a few key ports in New Spain. Nacogdoches, located in east Texas, near the Louisiana Territory which allowed illegal trade center between Texas and Louisiana.

Illegal trade with Louisiana was desired on the Texas frontier because these foreign goods were better and cheaper. Texas traded cattle and crops for finished goods such as furniture, clothing, and tools. Spanish-made products were more expensive than American-made goods. The long distance between Monclova and San Antonio made the trip difficult and dangerous.

In 1778, New Spain had two Caribbean ports only, Veracruz and Porto Bello. There was also an active western port in Acapulco, Guerrero, and México. In 1796, manufacturing in Spain

⁷⁹ Raul A. Ramos, *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 23.

⁸⁰ Jesús de la Teja and John Wheat, “Béxar: Profile of a Tejano Community, 1820-1832,” *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* Vol. 89, No. 1 (July, 1985), 7-34.

was disrupted by twelve years of war against England. The twelve-year war (1796-1808) severely reduced the Spanish's ability to conduct trade because of British maritime dominance. British supplies flooded New Spain, hurting Spanish manufacturers. Spain's economic system experienced a sharp decline due to the flood of American bullion which caused inflation and the flood of foreign goods that hurt the Spanish markets. A weak economy and poor manufacturing capabilities caused a shortage of goods in the colonies. This made Spanish-imported goods expensive forcing residents of New Spain to depend on goods imported from other countries.

Spain tried to protect its manufacturers by limiting trade and forbidding trade with other countries as well as limiting the ports in Texas in order to discourage smuggling and contraband. Ports in Texas were closed until the end of the Spanish colonial era. Spanish policies angered Texas residents such as Athanase de Mézières.

Furthermore, as a result of the strict Spanish caste system, Spanish citizens were drawn to Texas for social and economic opportunities. The Spanish social hierarchy based on race and place of birth put mixed blood citizens of New Spain at a disadvantage. Only *peninsulares* (European-born colonists) were allowed to reach the pinnacle of colonial society. The *criollos* (persons born in New Spain) could never be heads of government. A *mestizo*, a person born in New Spain with one white parent and one Indian parent, was at the lower end of the social ladder, with Negros and Indios being at the bottom. The Spanish caste system was rigid, complex, and extensive. There were twenty-four different classes of inhabitants of New Spain. The different groups consisted of Whites, Creoles (Spaniards born in New Spain), Amerinds (Indians), Negros, mestizos, mulattoes (Negro and white), zambos, coyotes (Negro and Indians),

and many more.⁸¹ This racist caste system was the Spanish response to miscegenation which was – in the eyes of the Spanish elite – a tainting of the Spanish bloodline. The Spanish caste system made ascending to a better way of life very difficult. This system ultimately created a dysfunctional and complicated social order. Therefore, *mestizos* and *criollos* moved to Texas in search of prosperity. Spanish Texas was populated in 1717 when its first missions and presidios were built.

During the Spanish era Tejanos developed a ranching culture which they profited from. Their Texas ranching system provided them with economic autonomy from Spain which united Tejanos. Spain Texas was isolated from the center of New Spain's society and life was difficult. The journey between San Antonio and México City, Saltillo, and Monclova involved days of hard, dangerous riding on horseback, wagon or carriage. This trip was treacherous as they had to ride through hostile Indian Territory without military escort. Nevertheless, *mestizos* and *criollos* serving as soldiers in the presidios could be promoted to officers. When they retired, they could purchase land and settle in Texas. Promotion was not easily attainable by soldiers of mixed blood in areas dominated by *peninsular* officials and officers. The mixed-blood soldiers were denied promotion. They chose to take the dangerous journey to Texas to have opportunities to own land and become ranchers or farmers.

México and Spain shared the same problems in relation to the long distance between the San Antonio and México City, Saltillo, and Monclova. This distance caused problems in the Tejano community. For example, the presidio soldiers were not paid, or restocked, judicial

⁸¹ Stanley J. Stein and Barbara H. Stein, *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America; Essays on Economic Dependence in Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 61.

decisions took weeks to be resolved by a judge in Saltillo. Texas lacked appropriately trained officials to govern the communities. These reasons caused Tejanos to become frustrated and laid the foundation for rebellion against Spain and later Mexico. This topic will be discussed in detail in chapter three “Tejanos and Early Anglo Colonists in Mexican Texas.

Life in Spanish Texas revolved around the missions and presidios. Constant attacks by the Lipan Apache Indians on Spanish supply convoys generated major problems in Spanish Texas. During the early years of Spanish Texas, the military system supplied the settlements of Texas with food and manufactured goods coming from México City merchants.⁸² Texas residents were forced to be self-sufficient. Spain was preoccupied with wars in Europe. To raise revenue to fill Spain’s war chest, Spain heavily taxed imported goods and continued to extract silver and gold from central México and South America. Texas was on the fringe of the Spanish empire and had no natural resources to exploit. Spain focused on areas that produced raw materials such as Querétaro, Guadalajara, and Zacatecas. While these places were densely populated and had established towns, Texas was sparsely populated and had small communities. Tejanos built irrigation systems and cleared native brush to plant vegetable gardens. Residents of Texas were small in number, consisting of a few dozen families of the presidio soldiers who chose to live close to the presidios for protection and to be near their loved ones. When the presidio soldiers retired, they lived in the growing town of Béxar. These soldier settlers worked the land for many years without any official land grants from the Spanish crown.

⁸² Gerald E. Poyo and Gilberto M. Hinojosa, *Tejano Origins in Eighteenth-Century San Antonio* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 34.

The prejudice that plagued New Spain found its way to Béxar when the sixteen Canary Islander families settled there in 1731. The Canary Islanders were Spanish citizens who immigrated from a Spanish-held chain of islands off the Spanish coast. The Spanish crown considered the Canary Islanders *peninsulares* (pure Spanish blood) which was why they were given so much power. Presidio Captain Pérez de Almazan distributed irrigated fields south of the presidio among the *isleños* (Canary Islanders). Preferential treatment towards the *isleños* caused much discord between the Béxareños and islanders. Furthermore, Captain Almazan excluded the townspeople from any participation in the creation of the town and distributed town lots only to islanders. Only islanders were allowed to be members of the town council, effectively excluding all non-islanders from participating in the local government.⁸³ Béxareños demonstrated their dissatisfaction by submitting formal petitions to the presidio captain, protesting the land grants and the irrigation rights. In 1732, four non-islander residents received lots from Governor Manuel de Sandoval and, in 1734, another three received town lot grants. No water rights were issued with the land grants that the Béxareños received.

The Canary Islanders found the land they were given would not turn a quick profit, so they sold the land with irrigation titles to three retired mestizo presidio soldiers. The inclusion of mixed-blood retired military officials water rights and land ownership dispelled the notion that only islanders were allowed to own land in Béxar. This purchase of land effectively broke the monopoly that islanders had on water rights and land grants in Béxar. Emboldened by the newly acquired land and water rights, the Béxareños petitioned the Spanish officials for more

⁸³ Poyo and Hinojosa, *Tejano Origins*, 36-37.

representation in local town government.⁸⁴ In 1741, the islanders surrendered to the pressures of the non-Canary Islanders (*pobladores*) and allowed *mestizos* and *criollos* to participate in local government. By 1745, the deaths of elder Canary Islanders and intermarriage between the *pobladores* and the Canary Islanders allowed for the *pobladores* to gain control over the flourishing Béxar town government.

Spain had problems with French encroachment into Spanish Texas through Louisiana. Spain founded the mission of San Saba to act as a buffer between its settlements and the Lipan Apache Indians. The Spanish wished to use the mission to convert the Apaches and use them as allies against the French. The Apaches had other plans; they used the Spanish fort and mission as a ruse to turn the Comanches (Spanish Indian allies) against them. The Apaches had convinced the Comanches that Spanish presidio soldiers were their enemies. Therefore, the Indian forces attacked the mission of San Saba, destroyed the mission, and killing these residing friars. In his deposition, Joseph Gutiérrez – who was a servant at the Mission of San Sabá – commented on the Comanche attack, stating, “When the Indians first arrived at the mission they spoke of peace, then they fired a volley with their muskets and set about stealing the horses of the missionaries and soldiers, and yet they pretended that they were not looking for a fight but only for peace and friendship with the Spanish.”⁸⁵ When the Spanish army sent a retaliatory army to pursue the Indians, the Spanish forces discovered an Indian fortification and a stronghold with a French flag.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Lesley Byrd Simpson ed. and Paul D. Nathan trans. *The San Saba Papers: A Documentary Account of the Founding and Destruction of San Saba Mission*, (San Francisco: John Howell-Books, 1959), 43.

A battle occurred at the encampment in 1759. The battle of Red River was a draw. Commander Ortiz Parrilla withdrew Spanish forces from the battlefield because the condition and supplies of his troops were so poor that he could not sustain another battle, forfeiting two artillery pieces in the retreat.⁸⁶ This is an example of the poor conditions of the soldiers stationed in Texas endured and the lack of reinforcements and adequate training of officers and enlisted men. New Spain made frontier defense a low priority. México inherited the same problems with the Texas frontier which caused conflict between the Tejanos and the Mexican Centralist government. In late 1762, at the end of the French and Indian War, the ownership of Louisiana was transferred to Spain.

When Spain gained Louisiana from France, their fears of French encroachment on Spanish Texas lessened. During the Bourbon Reforms, Spanish King Carlos III secured the defense of México and the northern limits of New Spain. King Carlos III appointed Marques de Rubí as inspector of frontier presidios and tasked him to remedy any abuses of power in the frontier. Marques de Rubí, was known, formally as Cayetano María Pignatelli Rubí Corbera y Saint Climente, Barón de Llinas and held the rank of Peninsular Lieutenant General of the Kingdom of Aragon.⁸⁷ De Rubí discovered what a previous inspection had uncovered thirty years ago, that the state of the frontier Presidios were in a dismal state of disrepair and corruption ran rampant among many of the presidios. Soldiers were only paid in goods for which they were overcharged and enlisted men in the Presidios were only relieved of service by death. Most of

⁸⁶ Donald E. Chipman and Harriett Denis Joseph, *Spanish Texas 1519-1821* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010), 166-167.

⁸⁷ Donald E. Chipman, "Rubi, Marques De," Handbook of Texas Online (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fru01>), accessed February 23, 2014. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

the soldiers serving in Texas presidios lived in poverty, experienced poor nutrition, and were required to labor on private land of the presidio captain.

While on his trip to Texas, Rubí inspected several presidios that dotted the state and found the presidios in the east Louisiana border decrepit.⁸⁸ The only two presidios that he deemed in favorable condition were Presidio B  xar and the Presidio La Bah  . He recommended that other presidios be abandoned and that the soldiers be transferred to the two functioning presidios to strengthen the number of soldiers in the presidio. Moreover, he suggested that the inhabitants of east Texas move to San Antonio and for that city to become the new capital of Texas.⁸⁹ Rubi wished to consolidate his strength to be on the defensive and make a stronger stance if that part of Texas would be attacked.

The failure of the Spanish crown to administer the frontier lead to corruption and poor condition of the soldiers and forced them to rely on the charity of the local town people who lived a substance level. Soldiers went without proper equipment and suffered constant raids by the better-equipped Apache, Indians who were furnished with French muskets and stolen Spanish horses. The Apaches had proved to be a stronger force than the Spanish garrison could defend against. The Spanish crown was slow to respond to the recommendations of Rub  . The sluggishness of the Spanish crown hindered the development of Texas and crippled the Texas economy and endangered the lives of the Tejanos who did not have adequate protection against Indian forays.

⁸⁸ Rubi's letter to Ocon  r, 23 September 1767, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Bexar Archives, University of Texas at Austin.

⁸⁹ Chipman and Joseph, *Spanish Texas*, 185.

Not until 1772 was a royal order was given for all Presidios to be abandoned in Texas except B exar and la Bah a. Spain used the de facto newly Spanish citizens of Louisiana (French), who were experienced in dealing with the local Indians, to work in the Spanish interest as Indian agents for Spanish Texas. Rub ı was correct in consolidating the soldier's strength into two presidios and transferring the population into the neighboring towns of B exar and La Bah a. This consolidation of strength created a better defense against the Apache attacks. Like a gangrenous appendage the outlying presidios had to be amputated for the body to survive.

The lack of aid and continual maintenance of the eastern presidios before they were abandoned is an example of the lack of administration and gross oversight of the Spanish frontier. Therefore, it was not until 1772 that the Spanish crown followed through with the recommendation of Rub ı and improved the condition of the Texas frontier as well as seeking peace with the Indians of Texas, most importantly the Apaches. The abandonment of the frontiers population is one of the reasons why Tejanos so easily rebelled against Spain during the Mexican War for Independence.

In August 22, 1776 Charles III appointed commandant general Teodoro de Croix as the head of *Provincias Internas* which an administrative position that oversees Texas, Coahuila, Nueva Vizcaya, New Mexico, Sinaloa, Sonora, Baja California, and Alta California. Hugo O' Connor relocated a dozen presidios on the recommendation of Marques de Rub ı from 1767 to 1773. Croix emphasized that O' Connor's reorganization did not improve the security of the frontier. Croix believed that Indian attacks were on the rise because the presidios were spaced too far apart and noted that the presidio soldiers lacked discipline and military skills. To remedy this situation, Croix requested 2,000 men to form a second defensive line fortifying the towns.

He took a strong stance on the Lipan Apache menace, advocating for the extermination of the Lipan Apache people.⁹⁰ Within four years, the Spanish crown promised change and prosperity to Texas but did not deliver.

Croix's comments about the presidio soldiers lacking discipline and military skills are a testament to the lack of Spanish military support in supplies and training for the presidio soldiers. As stated before, the crown abandoned the presidios soldiers in the Texas frontier without supplies or reinforcements. Croix, an outsider to the frontier, had no knowledge of the war that the Tejanos had waged with the Lipan Apaches since the creation of the Presidios and missions in Texas occurred more than forty years before. With the Spanish forces being so minuscule Spanish military officials were forced attempt to make alliances with Comanches, the sworn enemies of the Lipan Apaches. Historian Alfred B. Thomas noted the decimation of the Tejano community at the hands of Apaches raids, noting that between 1771 and 1776, 1,674 people were murdered, 116 haciendas and ranches were abandoned, and 68,266 livestock was stolen.⁹¹

By 1779, no alliance had been made with the Comanches and Spain had joined the American Revolution as allies of the French. These events severely hindered any military action against the Lipan Apaches and, once again, the Tejanos were left to fend for themselves. Croix continued to inspect and administer Texas. He was frustrated with the state of the Texas frontier and this was evident in his reports to his superiors. He wrote,

“A villa without order, two presidios, seven missions, and an errant population of scarcely 4,000 persons of both sexes and all ages that occupies an immense desert country

⁹⁰ Ibid, 199.

⁹¹ Ibid, 200.

stretching from the abandoned presidio of Los Adaes to San Antonio,... [that] does not deserve the name of the Province of Texas ... nor the concern entailed in its preservation.”⁹²

He had limited resources due to the newly indebted Spanish crown’s international obligations. Nevertheless, by 1783 Croix added more mobile patrols and strengthened the militia units which now totaled 4,686 men in the entire province of Texas. These Tejano militia units were the backbone the Texas military strength.⁹³ Tejanos relied on the Spanish soldiers during the infancy of Texas. Tejanos soon learned not to rely on Spanish military forces stationed in the presidios, forming militias to protect their communities.

With the end of the American Revolution and the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1783, an American nation was created. Spanish now had to contend with the American immigrants crossing the Appalachian Mountains and settling on the banks of the Mississippi river. By fall 1785 American merchants were using the port of New Orleans and slowly encroaching on the Texas-Louisiana border. From their bases in Natchez and New Orleans, Spain made alliances with trans-Appalachian Indians, the Spanish tried to use the Indian nations of Texas and Louisiana as a buffer themselves and between the Anglo encroachments. This Indian buffer failed the Spanish because the Americans defeated the trans–Appalachian Indians and continued their encroachment on Spanish Texas.

In October 1785, Spanish made a peace with the Comanches that lasted thirty five years. The treaty stipulated that no foreigners were allowed on Comanche land and that the Comanches

⁹² Donald E. Chipman and Harriett Denise Joseph, *Notable Men and Women of Spanish Texas*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999), 201.

⁹³ Chipman and Joseph, *Spanish Texas 1519-1821*, 201.

were free to pass through the province to make war on the Apaches. This was a monumental achievement in Indian relations for the Spanish because it protected Texas against the increasing American encroachment of east Texas.⁹⁴ The peace accord with the Comanches did not aid in the halting of American westward expansion. Spanish reforms in Texas came too late to assist Texas.

In April 1803, the Louisiana Territory was sold to the United States for fifteen million dollars. Spanish fears were realized as the United States now bordered Spanish Texas. A dispute arose at the Texas-Louisiana border. This boundary dispute dated back to 1763 when France owned Louisiana. By December of 1803, the Spanish governor of Texas, Juan Bautista Elguézabal, received requests from Spanish citizens in Louisiana to settle portions of Texas to escape the transfer of power from French to American hands. Spain had to contend with the massive influx of immigrants to Texas. The Spanish governor also had unexpected American military deserters and runaway slaves enter Texas illegally. President Jefferson sent a scientific expedition in 1804 and 1805 down the Red River which was halted and turned away by Spanish military forces. As a reaction to the activity along the Texas-Louisiana border, Commandant General Manuel María de Salcedo began to shift his troops from the Interior Provinces of Texas to the Texas- Louisiana border.⁹⁵

Spain neglected not only Texas but all of New Spain. Spain had retarded the growth of New Spain's economy due to the burdensome loans that Spain acquired fighting wars in Europe. The political partnership between the government and the church ensured that the *penisulares*

⁹⁴Ibid., 211.

⁹⁵ Odie B, Faulk, *The Last Years of Spanish Texas 1778-1821* (London: Mouton & Company, 1964), 122.

had a firm grip on New Spain's wealth and power. This led to corruption and poor governing. These problems, compounded commercial restrictions, created years of poor economic development, caused the Tejanos to suffer immensely. This is why Spain could never provide the colonies with factories and capital which was much needed for Texas to prosper. The Spanish Crown which was the center of corruption turned a blind eye to the corruption of New Spain and allowed the peninsulares to consolidate their power while ignoring the frontier and leaving majority of Tejanos to live in squalor. These factors lead to the Mexican War for Independence once the king of Spain was captured in 1808.

Tejanos had been at odds with Spain since the Bourbon Reforms in 1770, when Spanish Bourbon Kings imposed reforms to reinforce Spanish colonial control and ensure that the colonies served the mother country. Author Kirkwood Burton states it was the Bourbon Reforms that exposed the weakness in colonial infrastructure and pushed the colonies to independence.⁹⁶ Burton is correct in his assumption that Spanish institutions dominated by the military and church contributed to the disparity in wealth and racism that dominated the Mexican society of the eighteenth century. Mexican rebels found a pristine opportunity to plan their revolt when the crown's legitimacy was uncertain when Napoleon's army occupied Spain in 1808. In 1808 the French army invaded Spain and arrested King Charles IV. Following his arrest a junta assumed authority in the king's name.

Resentment and discontent of the colonists stemming from the Bourbon Reforms, compounded with the French invasion of Spain, was a catalyst for revolution. On September 16, 1810, Father Miguel Hidalgo Y Costilla, began the war for Mexican Independence with his *grito*

⁹⁶ Kirkwood Burton, et al., *The History of México* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000), 66.

or declaration of independence. The ripples of the Mexican War for Independence reached Texas. Even in Texas, which was the frontier of Mexico, Tejanos were discontent with the Spanish government's neglect of Texas. In 1810, Governor Manuel Salcedo and Assistant Governor Antonio Cordero introduced measures to regulate the town life and reduce contraband. The Texas presidio officers were conducting contraband trade with Louisiana while enforcing the trade law. Again, Tejanos were faced with the double standards of Spanish officials as with Commandant General Teodoro de Croix. This is an example of the neglect of royal officials in the gross oversight of colonial government. The hypocritical action of the presidio officers helped to hasten military action against the Spanish Crown in Texas.

The war reached Texas in 1811. On January 22, 1811, Juan Bautista de las Casas led a bloodless rebellion against the Spanish royal soldiers stationed in the Béxar presidio with the aid of members of the city's lower class and local ranchers. Members of the revolutionary group that aided de las Casas were poor ranchers who were alienated by policies enacted by the Bourbon Reforms. This coup lasted only thirty-nine days. Not all Béxareños (residents of the city of Béxar) supported de Las Casas's rebellion. The rebel forces were disorganized and loyalties of Béxar's elites were uncertain. A *junta* or meeting of counter- revolutionaries was held in late February 1811. At that meeting, counter- revolutionaries planned the attack on the rebel encampment. The leader of the counter- revolutionaries was Subdeacon Don Juan Manuel Zambrano, whose family was the wealthiest in Béxar. Prominent Tejanos sided with Zambrano's counter-revolution. These counter- revolutionaries were the elite of the Béxar

royalist community and included Don Erasmo Seguin, Don Juan José Zambrano, Don José Antonio Saucedo, Juan Veramendi, Francisco Ruiz and Angel Navarro.⁹⁷

On the night of March, 1, 1811, Zambrano with his supporters overtook the army barracks. Once the barracks were secured, many Bédareños joined the counter-revolutionary movement. The counter-revolutionaries took an oath of loyalty to King Fernando VII. Bédareños changed sides to protect themselves and their communities from whatever threat might arise.⁹⁸ Casas did not have the support of the Bédar social elite, which is why the revolt failed. Bédar remained a royalist stronghold until the spring of 1813 when José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara and Augustus W. Magee force took control of the Presidio in Bédar.

Tejanos were divided into two factions: those loyal to the Spanish King and those who wanted independence. An example of a Tejano whose loyalties were tested was José Antonio Saucedo, who had been a member of the ayuntamiento since 1806 and remained loyal to the Spanish. He was loyal to the crown but when Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara and Augustus Magee invaded Texas from Louisiana in August 1812, Saucedo changed his allegiances to support the rebels. The Gutiérrez de Lara / Magee forces were successful in capturing Nacogdoches, La Bahía, and Bédar. By spring 1813 they had driven all Royalist forces out of Texas. By June 1813 Spanish forces under the joint command of Coronel Ignacio Elizondo and General Joaquín de Arredondo led a campaign to recapture Texas from the rebel forces. On August 18, 1813 at

⁹⁷ J. Villasana Haggard, "The Counter-Revolution of Bédar, 1811," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 2 (Oct., 1939): 227.

⁹⁸ Gerald E. Poyo, ed. *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 25.

Texas historian Gerald B. Poyo summed up the rationale of Bédareños during the Mexican Independence movement by citing "Bédareños did not want to support a lost cause but, rather, hoped to preserve and protect their town's interest."

the battle of Median River, royalist forces defeated the rebel army. During this battle the B exarenos fought against each other dividing loyalties between the rebel forces and the royalist forces. Francisco Ruiz was among the insurgent combatants and Jos e Angel Navarro fought on the royalist side.⁹⁹ This divide between Tejano loyalties would occur again during the Texas Revolution.

As a result of the rebellion in Texas, Nacogdoches was completely abandoned. B exar and La Bahia were left unprotected from Indian attacks. Ranches were deserted and herds of cattle and horses were destroyed or taken to the interior of M exico. The majority of Tejanos had no hardened loyalty to Spain or the rebels. They choose to side with the victor. The presidio of San Antonio de Valero was small when De las Casa attacked with a large amount of rebel soldiers. The Spanish soldiers did not resist De las Casas's men.

The rebel forces were taken by surprise by a counter-revolutionary force. That is why the De las Casas rebellion was put down so quickly. When Ignacio Elizondo was encamped on the outskirts of B exar ready to retake the city from the Republican Army of the North, he noticed, "more than 300 soldiers, residents, women and children had escaped this camp shortly after his arrival."¹⁰⁰ The fleeing of the residents of B exar to the larger opposing army exemplifies the fickle loyalties of the Tejanos.

Due to the irregularity of Tejano loyalties it was difficult for royalist officials to differentiate between rebels and royalist Tejanos. Elizondo's victory over the Republican Army

⁹⁹ Jes s F. de la Teja ed., *Tejano Leadership in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas*, (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2010), 32.

¹⁰⁰ Poyo, *Tejano Journey*, 27.

of the North he reestablished the Spanish authority in Béxar. The royalist army searched for rebel sympathizers in the Tejanos communities and harassed many ranchos and townspeople. Arredondo brutally purged Texas of rebels. He executed hundreds of Tejanos and pardoned some members of the Tejano elite such as José Antonio Navarro. The Tejano elite who did not receive pardons were sought out for arrest and execution included Francisco Arocha, Francisco Ruiz, Juan Veramendi, and Vicente Travieso.¹⁰¹ Some Tejanos fled Texas in fear for their lives.

They all fled to Louisiana at the end of August 1813. By October 1813 General Arredondo issued a general pardon for amnesty of rebels in Louisiana who took part in the insurrection, except for Juan Martín de Veramendi and Francisco Ruiz.¹⁰² Arredondo had issued a 250 peso reward for anyone who killed Veramendi, Ruiz, or any other revolutionary and doubled the reward for any foreigner who killed them.¹⁰³ So strong was Arredondo's sentiment toward the rebels, that he said Ruiz and Veramendi were "unworthy of receiving any consideration whatever".¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, in March 1814, Veramendi managed to secure a pardon for himself and his brother with stipulations that they be under surveillance.¹⁰⁵

From 1815-1821, royalists controlled Texas, but Tejanos who stayed in Texas were still in fear of attacks from Indians, rebels, or the royalist soldiers. One Tejano family who escaped all the fighting in Texas was the de Leon family. Arriving in Texas in 1801, they established a ranch on the Nueces River. From that ranch, the de Leon family grew wealthy by selling cattle

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Joaquín de Arredondo to Christóbal Dominguez, 10 October 1813, Béxar Archives.

¹⁰³ Poyo, Tejano Journey, 32-33.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Antonio Saucedo, "List of Pardoned Insurgents", March 8, 1814, Béxar Archives.

in San Antonio. It is not known if the de Leon family supported the rebels or the royalist army. Nevertheless, the family fled from San Antonio to their ranch on the Nueces River, a two day ride south of la Bahia, in fear of General Arredondo's reprisals. The de Leon family returned to San Antonio in 1821 when México had obtained its independence from Spain.

José Antonio Navarro was only fifteen when the Mexican Independence began and was eighteen when Arredondo defeated the Republican Army of the North at the battle of Medina. Navarro fled Béxar with his family to Louisiana to escape Arredondo's vengeance. Arredondo was capturing and executing rebels; he purged Texas of rebels and confiscated their property. Tejanas also suffered from the reprisals of Arredondo.¹⁰⁶ In Béxar, more than 500 women who were suspected of aiding the rebels were imprisoned in La Quinta for four months. La Quinta was the plaza house located on the north side of the Main Plaza. The imprisoned women's task was to cook food and grind corn to make tortillas for the occupying soldiers.¹⁰⁷

Spain retained control of Texas for the remainder of the war. When Spain conceded to the newly-formed country of México, the Spanish garrison surrendered to Mexican forces and left for Spain or pledged allegiance to México. The prominent Tejano families in exile in Louisiana did not return until Mexico had gained its independence. Fifteen years later, they participated in the Texas war for independence against México. The Tejano elite remembered the repercussions from Arredondo and were hesitant to participate in a revolution against México. They continually chastised the Anglo colonists that caused trouble such as Hayden

¹⁰⁶ José Antonio Navarro, "Historical Commentaries of San Antonio de Béxar," *Western Texas* (San Antonio) 1853.

¹⁰⁷ José Antonio Navarro, David R. McDonald ed., David M. Matovina ed., *Defending Mexican Valor in Texas: José Antonio Navarro's Historical Writings, 1853-1857* (Austin: State House Press, 1995), 55.

Edwards and his Fredonia Revolt and they disassociated themselves from rabble-rousers such as Sam Houston.

The problems Tejanos faced under the administration of the Spanish government were repeated under the Mexican government. There are many similarities between the issues which Tejanos faced in the Spanish era and the Mexican era. For example, the Indian attacks never ceased and troop numbers were never increased to a sufficient amount to ward off Indian attacks. Tejano militia bore the brunt of frontier defense against Indian attacks. Texas still lacked infrastructure and the financial means to support manufacturing or trade. This is why the Tejanos placed so much faith in the Anglo empresarios supplying them both manufactured goods from America and much-needed capital to begin farming in a massive scale.

Small representation in the Coahuilan state government also hindered the passing of beneficial laws for Texas. Tejanos were given only one representative in the Coahuilan legislature. They tried to postpone war for as long as possible. Tejanos feared the chaos and destruction of war, remembering the wrath of Arredondo during the Mexican War for Independence. President Santa Anna's *Siete Leyes* (Seven Laws) enacted on December 5, 1835 stripped political autonomy from Mexican states and caused rebellions in multiple locations including Texas. Tejanos and Anglo colonists were convinced that war was the only way to free Texas from the oppressive yoke of the Centralist government rule. Ultimately, they had to choose sides after the battle of Gonzales.

CHAPTER III

TEJANOS AND EARLY ANGLO COLONISTS IN
MEXICAN TEXAS: TEJANO MEDIATED CONFLICTS
BETWEEN ANGLO COLONISTS AND MEXICAN GOVERNMENT

In early July 1821, the provisional Mexican government led by Agustín de Iturbide drew up the Plan de Iguala which unified México by enacting three guarantees: religion, independence, and union. Béxareños hesitated to support the Plan de Iguala because of high-ranking Spanish sympathizers, such as Governor Antonio Martínez and Commandant General Joaquín Arredondo. The memory of Arredondo's cruelty during the counter-revolution haunted Béxareños. Tejanos remembered the vengeance of Arredondo when he defeated the rebels at the battle of Medina.¹⁰⁸ Fear of reprisals contributed to the slow shift of allegiances. By July 19, 1821, Tejanos elites supported the plan. Men such as Governor Antonio Martínez, *Alcalde* (mayor) José Angel Navarro (brother to José Antonio Navarro), and other members of the *ayuntamiento* (town council) – accepted Iturbide as the nation's leader.

Once Tejanos agreed to the Plan de Casa Mata in late 1823, Tejano elites organized the governing junta. The leaders were Erasmo Seguí, Francisco Ruiz, José Antonio Saucedo, and

¹⁰⁸ Antonio Menchaca, *Memoirs* (San Antonio: Yanaguana Society, 1937), 18-20.

Juan Manuel Zambrano. Other men who represented Béxar included Baron de Bastrop and Juan de Castañeda. Austin's colonies, La Bahía, Nacogdoches, Colorado Colony, and Brazos Colony had their own representatives. They all agreed to hold civil militia and ecclesiastical power over Texas. The governing junta gained full control over the military. Due to the low militia numbers and limited number of munitions, Tejanos needed assistance from the state government. Indian attacks were on the rise in frontier Texas because presidial soldiers were relocated and reassigned to fight in the front lines. The Bèxar ayuntamiento requested that the state send three or four hundred cavalry troops to protect Texas from Indian assaults and foreigners. State officials denied the request.

As a result, Béxar militia replaced presidial soldiers tasked with defending Texas against Indian attacks; unfortunately, the rebels recalled them to aid in the war against Spain. Again, the actions of the Mexican government disrupted the affairs in Texas. In early 1823, the Tejano elite had shown an aversion to the Centralist government. In that same year, Felipe de la Garza, the Commander General of the State of Tamaulipas, opposed the Centralist government and Iturbide's regime. Tejano Federalists benefited from the support of a high-ranking Mexican official. The Federalist government passed The Regulations for Presidios of 1826, reorganizing the military structures of the militias. This greatly aided Tejanos in their defense of Texas. General Agustín de Iturbide, leader of the Mexican Army, along with Spanish Jefe Político Superior Juan O' Donojú signed the Treaty of Córdoba in August 24, 1821 and officially ended the Mexican war for independence. Mexican representatives then elected a six-member board to govern the newly-founded country. This board existed until 1822 when Agustín Iturbide took office as Emperor of México. Elite Mexicans chose to be ruled by a limited constitutional monarchy. By February 14, 1822, Spain rejected the treaty. In September 1822, Iturbide

ordered the closure of congress and declared himself as absolute monarch of México.¹⁰⁹ He squandered the Mexican treasury, spending half of the country's funds on the army. His policies retained church and military power. Desperate for money, the government taxed the population and church greatly. Unable to gain sufficient revenue from taxation, México borrowed heavily from English banks. Outraged, General José Antonio Echevarri issued the Plan de Casa Mata on February 1, 1823, to remove Iturbide from office.¹¹⁰ He was supported by Antonio López de Santa Anna.

Texas Governor José Félix Trespalacios and the Béxar ayuntamiento declined to endorse the Plan de Casa Mata. Béxareños, fearful that the Plan de Casa Mata would not succeed, withheld support. The La Bahía ayuntamiento swore allegiance to Iturbide citing, "Viva Agustín I."¹¹¹ Tejanos from La Bahía changed their minds regarding the Plan de Casa Mata, thereby rallying to support President Guadalupe Victoria. The division of Tejano support resurfaced during the Texas Revolution when loyalties split between Tejano patriots and Tejanos loyal to the Centralist Mexican government. When surrounding Mexican states adopted the Plan de Casa Mata, so did Tejanos.

After the Plan de Casa Mata, which deposed Emperor Iturbide, representatives met for a constitutional convention during November 1823. That same year, the Mexican congress created a republic and wrote the Mexican Constitution of 1824. At the constitutional convention, Mexican politicians split into two distinct factions, based on their Masonic order affiliations, the

¹⁰⁹ Catherine Andrews, "The Defense of Iturbide or the Defense of Federalism? Rebellion in Jalisco and the Conspiracy of Calle de Celaya, 1824," *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 23, no. 3 (2004), 320.

¹¹⁰ Andrés Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas Under the Mexican Flag 1821-1836* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1994), 95.

¹¹¹ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 95.

York (Yorkeneos) and Scottish Rites (Escocés). Members of the Scottish Rites were conservatives and favored a strong Centralist government where the church, army, and the central government controlled the power. York Rites associated with Federalists and opposed a strong central government and church control. Federalists opposed the church due to economic reasons. The church owned the largest share of land in México, wielding much power. This major social division destabilized the country. Constant friction between these two parties caused civil unrest in the country. After the enactment of the Constitution of 1824, Guadalupe Victoria became México's president. Victoria, a hero of the War of Independence identified himself as a liberal. His four-year tenure as president created peace between the two factions. After Victoria's presidency ended, México's political stability collapsed.

In the 1820s, the United States was reeling from the panic of 1819, an economic depression that caused Anglo Americans to seek land and economic prosperity elsewhere. Anglo-Americans were pushed out of the United States due to the bad economy and scarcity of inexpensive land. They were pulled to Texas because of México's vast land holdings and its liberal empresario system. Moses Austin took advantage of México's land policy being the first Anglo empresario in Texas. He died en route to recruit settlers, and his son, Stephen Fuller Austin, appropriated Moses's empresario contract.

Like Spain, México used Texas as a buffer zone with the United States. The Louisiana Purchase brought the United States border to the Mexican frontier. The Adams-Onís Treaty of 1819 established the boundary between Spain and the United States at the Sabine River. México inherited these boundaries when it gained its independence. United States officials continued to solicit México for acquisition of Texas. México constantly feared American encroachment on

her territory. This fear motivated Mexican officials to try to populate Texas. During Spanish reign, future Mexican officials observed American filibusters continually venturing into Texas. By 1806, two American scientific expeditions entered east Texas under the orders of Thomas Jefferson to explore the Louisiana Territory. Spain successfully repelled both. Finally, in 1819, James Long's filibuster army wanted control of Texas. However, Long's army was small. Spanish forces did not defeat Long's army until 1821.

On December 23, 1820, Moses Austin traveled to San Antonio, seeking permission from the Spanish government to settle colonists in Texas. Governor Antonio María Martínez, at first, refused Austin's request. Luckily, Austin had met Felipe Enrique Neri, a colonizer, legislator, and self-proclaimed Baron de Bastrop. Moses Austin had befriended Bastrop while in Louisiana. Baron de Bastrop's birth name was Philip Hendrik Nering Bögel. He was born in Paramaribo, a Dutch colony in South America. When Spain lost Louisiana to the United States in 1803, Bastrop applied to settle between the Trinity River and the San Antonio River. He established a lucrative freighting business which provided him with a political voice and aided in his political career. In 1823, Bastrop became commissioner of colonization for the Austin Colony; he issued land titles to colonists. Within a year, Bastrop gained the trust and favor of the colonists, who elected him to the state legislature to represent Texas.

Bastrop advocated in favor of Austin to Governor Martínez. The governor forwarded Austin's request to Commandant General Joaquín de Arredondo, the commander of the eastern provinces which oversaw Texas. Martínez recommended the approval of Austin's request. Arredondo's council debated Austin's request, delaying the decision for a year. Governor Martínez wrote to the council,

“This vast country contains only two settlements--those of Béxar and La Bahía [Goliad]--with a population of 2,516 souls...The population of this province is very backward and it is absolutely necessary for the nation to make some effort to people it. Admitting foreigners would be the easiest, least costly, and most expeditious method of enlarging the population.”¹¹²

While recruiting immigrants in the United States, Moses Austin died on June 10, 1821. His son, Stephen Fuller Austin, took charge of his father’s empresario contract. This first encounter between Anglo empresarios and Tejanos occurred when Don Erasmo Seguín escorted Austin from Natchitoches, Louisiana to Béxar in July 1821. Austin continued to have close ties with the Seguín family until his death. The bond between Austin and Seguín’s family flourished when Austin’s brother stayed at the Seguín home for a year to learn Spanish and Juan Nepomuceno Seguin, Erasmo’s son, stayed with Austin to learn English. The interactions between Anglo empresarios and Tejanos can be described as a symbiotic relationship in which both depended on each other. The success of Austin’s empresario contract was due to the support of the Baron de Bastrop, Governor Martínez, and the assistance of established local Tejanos such as the Seguín family. The following chapter will discuss how the relationship between Tejanos and Anglos caused tension between the Tejanos and the Mexican government.

In 1822, the Texas population grew due to Anglo empresarios, and Texas soon received more representation in 1834. Land grants to settle Texas were flooding the Mexican government offices. For instance, Felipe O’Reilly’s contract involved settling 10,000 Irish and Canary

¹¹² Eugene C. Barker, “Native Latin American Contribution to the Colonization of Independence of Texas,” *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 4, (April, 1943), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30237220> (Accessed: 19/11/2013, 16:16), 318.

Islanders in Texas.¹¹³ By 1827, Texas gained another representative. After 1830, a new Centralist government micromanaged the states and by 1831, Texas was divided into two districts. In 1834, Texas had three districts and three representatives in the state legislature. But this was a small number of representatives compared to the rest of the state. In the Spanish era, Tejanos had little say in their state government. Formal court systems and enforcement of laws were not officially established by the state until 1826 to 1827. The policing of the community rested with Tejanos, who adhered to the legal procedures that they followed during the Spanish colonial period. México shared difficulties in populating Texas similar to those Spain faced.

To maintain frontier integrity, Simón Tadeo de Ortiz de Ayala presented to Mexican Emperor Iturbide a report of the Mexican Empire including its geography, population, wealth, and internal and external problems. Ayala feared Spain might attempt to reconquer México and the proximity to the United States also concerned Ayala immensely. He was concerned about the vagueness of the Adams - Onís treaty's boundaries because there were no definable natural boundaries other than the Red River.

The Adam-Onís Treaty described the boundaries as:

“of the mouth of the Sabin River on the Gulf of México, continuing North, along the western bank of that river, to the 32 degree of Latitude, where it strikes the Rio Roxo, or Red River, then following the course of the Rio Roxo Westward to the degree of longitude, 100 West from London and 23 from Washington, then crossing the said Red River, and running thence by a line due North to the River Arkansas, thence, following the Course of the Southern Bank of the

¹¹³ Andrés Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 253-257.

Arkansas to its sources in Latitude 42 degrees North, and thence that parallel of latitude to the South- Sea (Pacific Ocean)”.¹¹⁴

Ayala feared the loss of the Mexican frontier to America; therefore, he recommended that the frontier be fortified and immediately colonized.¹¹⁵ Upon reviewing Ayala's report, the junta decided that the report's findings were most urgent and agreed that the threat to the northern territory came from Indians and Americans.¹¹⁶ The committee agreed to seek peace via trade with Indians.

Like Spain, México used the Spanish Colonization Law enacted in June 1821 to populate Texas, preventing American filibusters from entering Texas. México used this law only temporarily until the new country enacted its own colonization law. The junta denied military force for the protection of the vastly unpopulated frontier. They reasoned that only a large loyal population could prevent the loss of the frontier.¹¹⁷ The recommendations of the junta were unjust because it was hundreds of miles away from Texas and did not experience the Indian threat first-hand. This lack of first-hand knowledge of the frontier is directly related to the absence of Tejano representation in congress. For this reason, on April 15, 1822, José Antonio

¹¹⁴ Philip Coolidge Brooks, *Diplomacy and the Borderlands: The Adam Onís Treaty of 1819*, University of California Publication in History, no. 24 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939), 205-214.

¹¹⁵ Tadeo Ortiz de Ayala, *Resumen de la Estadística de Imperio Mexicano* (México: imprenta de doña Herculena de Villar y Socios, 1822), 7.

¹¹⁶ “Dictamen presentado a la soberana junta provisional gubernativa de imperio mexicano por la Comisión de Relaciones Exteriores, 29 de diciembre de año 1821, primero de la indecencia, Juan Francisco Azcarata y Lezama, Un Programa de política internacional”, Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano, Serie II, No. 37 (México: Publicaciones de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1932), 65-67.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 62-65.

Gutiérrez de Lara – deputy from Nuevo Santander – proposed that he needed five hundred well-equipped soldiers to safeguard the frontier of the Eastern Interior Provinces.¹¹⁸

Gutiérrez de Lara petitioned Iturbide for support in Texas because of the junta's slow response. Iturbide denied Gutiérrez de Lara's requests because Iturbide could not afford to send any of his soldiers to assist Texas.

With the War for Independence recently concluded the junta had major concerns in other areas of the nation which is why México neglected Texas. The lack of military support and political representation infuriated Tejanos. During a surge of Comanche attacks in 1825, Tejanos again asked for military aid. The minister of war specifically suggested that Tejanos attempt to win the Indians over with gifts and friendship.¹¹⁹ This cold response from a high-ranking Mexican official angered many Tejanos since their friends were dying and towns were being attacked by Indians. This is an example of the conditions that plagued Texas from the inception of the colonization of Texas, leading to conflict between Tejanos and the Mexican government.

On February 1, 1823, the Plan de Casa Mata deposed Iturbide, creating a vacuum of power in Mexico. This vacuum allowed the Béxar ayuntamiento to develop a sense of autonomy. Historian Nettie Lee Benson linked the Béxareños' autonomy to their endorsement of Federalist ideology. Benson considered, Tejanos' shift towards federalism "inevitable", and she

¹¹⁸ *Actas de Congreso Constitucional Mexicano*, 5 Vols. (México: En la Oficina de Alejandro Valdéz, 1822), 36-37.

¹¹⁹ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 109.

was right.¹²⁰ During this short period of autonomy junta members, such as José Antonio Saucedo, José María Zambrano, Ramón Músquiz, and others, avidly supported federalism. When the national congress officially gave Texas the ability to establish a provisional department, the Texas junta immediately ordered Governor Garcia to restore civil power to the junta members. Therefore, Texas became an autonomous state.

By May 1823, Commandant General Gaspar Lopez de la Garza, a pro-Iturbide official, became Commandant of the Eastern Interior Province, including Texas. De la Garza appointed General Luciano Garcia as governor, and Garcia gave the order to the Texas Provisional Governing junta to “cease its functions”.¹²¹ This is an example of how the government of México disrupted Texas local government. The state government’s policies impaired the future of Texas. Tejanos were advocates of federalism and appointed Erasmo Seguín as the deputy to México City. He supported a federal and republican government as well as established tax offices in Galveston, Matagorda, and Aransasu (Aransas) which were vital to Texas’s economy. Texas had a booming cattle trade and needed to import finished goods and export the abundant raw materials.

In 1824, Bédareños met at Jose Félix Trespalacios’s house to oversee civil, military, and ecclesiastical power over Texas. The junta assumed administrative control over *mestena* (mustang funds), local laws, customs, and commerce in Texas. In May of the same year, General Felipe de la Garza replaced General Gaspar Lopez as interim governor of Texas. Immediately, Governor de la Garza dismissed Trespalacios and ordered all governing functions

¹²⁰ Nettie Lee Benson, “The Plan of Casa Mata,” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 25, no. 1 (February, 1945): 45-56, Article DOI: 10.2301/2508385, Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25088385>.

¹²¹ Felipe de la Garza to Texas, “Junta Provisional Gubernativa”, June 16, 1823, Béxar Archives.

of the junta to “cease its functions”.¹²² Fortunately for the Bédareños, the national congress authorized Texas, Nuevo Leon, and Coahuila to establish permanent provisional deputations.¹²³

A provisional deputation are local governing bodies which assess taxes in provinces, control the expenditure of public funds, establish municipal councils, proposes government needed public works and in urgent cases oversees public works projects, education, agriculture, trade and industry. The provisional deputations were extremely important because it was the foundation of Mexican society.

México’s turbulent beginning created repercussions in frontier society. Texas became self-sufficient by forming government committees or *juntas* to self-govern. In these juntas, Tejanos were free to handle internal affairs. Texas now had a difficult decision to make, which was to choose between Texas remaining a territory or becoming part of a state. Tejanos fiercely opposed the union. Representative Erasmo Seguín fought to keep Texas separate from Coahuila. Choosing territorial status meant Texas would have forfeited ownership of public domain and pay for the cost of the Indians wars; Texas would lack sufficient revenues.¹²⁴ Seguín decided to support the union of Coahuila and Texas. In 1824, the unification of Texas with the state of Coahuila formed a new state, Coahuila y Tejas. As a lesser populated state, Texas was granted one representative in the state congress, making Tejanos the minority voice in congress.

Also in 1824, Erasmo Seguín became the first Tejano elected to the state legislature to represent Texas. While in congress, he petitioned for Texas to gain statehood. Miguel Ramos

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Erasmo Seguín to Texas Provincial Deputation, October 5, 1824.

Arizpe, a Coahuila political leader, quickly maneuvered to have Texas join Coahuila in a single state to bolster Coahuila's population and gain more representation. Coahuila had ten representatives and Texas only had one. Seguín protested but gave into the union of Texas and Coahuila. Even though he was wholly against the union, Seguín accepted it as being better than Texas remaining a territory. If Texas remained a territory, it would lack government recognition and beneficial government aid.

However, the creation of this new state did not affect Texas's local government. The transition from colonial status to a federal state brought official change in military protection which promised to add more soldiers to Texas presidios. The separation of civilian and military powers worked to the advantage of Tejanos because it gave them greater opportunity for self-rule. Tejanos were freed from military duties to focus on the local government.

The union of Coahuila and Texas caused changes in the respective states capitals. Monclova was the capital of Coahuila, and Béxar was the capitol of Texas. After joining of the two states, the new capital for both states became Saltillo. Also, a decree passed by the state government reduced Béxar's ayuntamiento by half. The state congress decreed that Béxar's population was too small to require an ayuntamiento so large.¹²⁵ The reduction created a shortage of elected officials to govern the local communities, weakening the city government. Béxareños saw the shifting of the ayuntamiento size as a direct political attack by Saltillo to limit the power of Béxar and Monclova. On August 15, 1824, Decree No. 8 abolished the position of political chief in Texas. All of these actions aimed at Texas effectively stripped all political

¹²⁵ Coahuila y Texas, "Actas del congreso constitucional de estado libre de Coahuila y Texas," August 10 and 27, and December 14, 1824, Benson Latin American Library, Austin, Texas.

autonomy from Texas. Saltillo's political maneuverings and constant disregard for Béxar's growing population caused the Bédareños to submit a *memoria* (report) demanding additional *alcaldes* (magistrates) in 1829.¹²⁶ Béxar lacked educated officials, judges, and lawyers to process and convict criminals as well as deal with the daily management of the city government.

Coahuila legislators successfully passed a bill which declared a cessation of the provincial department and ordered its documents to be transferred to Saltillo. The weakening of Texas's political power angered Bédareños and they almost turned to violence. Two ayuntamiento members threatened Political Chief José Antonio Saucedo for not doing more to help Texas. Alcalde Gaspar Flores pleaded for Juan de Castañeda, a founding member of the provisional governing junta of Texas and military commander of the Presidio of Valero, to prevent an overthrow of the ayuntamiento. Juan de Castañeda repressed the Bédareños and prevented a violent conflict without using soldiers, by easing tensions and compromising.¹²⁷

By 1825, the Baron de Bastrop took Seguín's place as legislator for Texas. Bastrop sponsored bills for Texas to gain better representation and their bills passed. By 1827, Texas had three representatives in the state legislature. He was instrumental in passing the Colonization Law of 1825 which brought Anglo colonists to Texas. Bastrop followed the advice of Tejanos pushing for pro-Anglo immigration policies, such as ten year tax exemption and the introduction of slavery into Texas.

Finally, in 1834, Bédareños received relief when Monclova and Béxar received liberal reforms in the Decree No. 262, which allowed for the creation of more officials such as one

¹²⁶ "Béxar Ayuntamiento Special Committee," Report, November 18, 1827, Béxar Archives.

¹²⁷ Juan de Castañeda to Gaspar Flores, September 30, 1824, Béxar Archives.

alcalde (magistrate), two *regidores* (aldermen, city councilmen), and one *syndico procurador* (city attorney). These new positions greatly reduced the workload of Béxar officials. This new liberal policy was passed by the acting president of México, Valentin Gómez Farías. Just as Tejanos were obtaining beneficial laws, the Centralists took control of the state government and undid the actions of the Federalist government.

From its independence, México incurred a substantial debt to pay for its war against Spain. México's total war debt was forty-five million pesos. They borrowed money primarily from England, and when they reached their borrowing limit, México reverted to taxation, printing paper money, and reducing the salaries of public officials. As emperor of México Iturbide lived the lavish lifestyle of a monarch at the expense of the Mexican economy, borrowing money to pay for his expenses. Iturbide's actions created a dysfunctional economy which caused the Mexican government to suffer. Military leaders fought for the presidency. Once they took power, these leaders spent half of the country's budget on military spending.

After the ten year War for Independence México's infrastructure was destroyed, its economy in shambles and hundreds of thousands of Mexicans lost their lives. This is why government revenues were never adequate to meet the demand of the country. As author Timothy E. Anna put it, "Iturbide was literally forced to beg, borrow and steal."¹²⁸ The Mexican congress did not enact any new tax law while Iturbide was in office. Lack of revenue severely crippled the Mexican economy. Iturbide attempted to rectify México's financial problems by printing more paper money as well as cutting salaries, property taxes, and direct taxes, which were decreed by the *Junta Nacional Instituyente* after Iturbide closed congress. Printing of

¹²⁸ Timothy E. Anna, *The Independence of Mexico and the Creation of the New Nation*, ed. Jaime E. Rodríguez O. (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1989), 197.

money caused rampant inflation, and excessive taxes angered the population and incentivized the populous to remove Iturbide from power.

The war had decimated Texas towns and Tejanos fled to the interior of México or to Louisiana. Apaches and Comanches took advantage of the absence of colonists in Texas and moved into the abandoned areas of Texas. As Jean Louis Berlandier noted, “Ranches north of the Rio Grande were almost all deserted”.¹²⁹ Berlandier was a French naturalist who accompanied General Manuel Mier Y Terán to Texas in late 1827 to early 1828 to make a botanical collection of Texas. He was also tasked to report the conduct of the Anglo colonists and ascertain whether they are obeying Mexican laws. México’s internal difficulties diverted resources and attention from the frontier. The Bédareños adapted and persevered, making Tejanos angry and forced to seek financial support elsewhere. Tejanos supported Anglo empresarios which often put them at odds with the Centralist regime.

Slavery became an issue that would cause agitation between the Anglo colonists and the Mexican government. As author Randolph B. Campbell wrote in *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas*, “By the fall of 1825, sixty-nine of the families in Austin’s colony owned slaves, and the 443 bondsmen there were nearly 25 percent of the total population of 1,800.”¹³⁰ Although, early Anglo colonists brought with them few slaves in the mid 1820’s, however, the slave population grew to 2,000 by spring of 1834 when General Juan Nepomuceno

¹²⁹ Jean Louis Berlandier, Sheila M. Ohlendorf trans., Josette M. Bigelow trans., Mary M. Standifer, Trans., *Journey to Mexico During the Years 1826-1834* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1980), 542-44.

¹³⁰ Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution In Texas*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 19.

Almonte inspected Texas.¹³¹ The Mexican Constitution of 1829 abolished slavery, but Anglo colonists from the South continued to bring their slaves with them to Texas.

Planters came to Texas in hopes of extending the cotton industry to Texas. This new business venture had the potential to be very lucrative, which was the reason why the Tejanos so adamantly supported the slave trade and defended and obtained an exemption to the law. When the Mexican Congress threatened to revoke the exemption to the law, Miguel Arciniega created labor contracts and passed this amendment to a bill which México honored, forging labor contracts. This allowed southern colonists to import slaves under the status of indentured servants with a ninety-nine year contract, enforcing *de jure* slavery.¹³²

Due to the internal struggle in the capital of Texas, presidios were left to decay. Once again, Tejanos were abandoned by the Mexican government, mirroring the Spanish system. The economic policies of Texas changed from the brutal mercantile system under the Spanish government to a command economic system. Command economic system is a system in which the government controlled means of economic production and established monopolies. Anglo planters who wanted to plant tobacco were prohibited from doing so because the Mexican government had a monopoly on the tobacco industry. However, Texas cattle and mustang industry was not affected by this form of economy because of the long distance. Tejano ranchers found a profitable market in Louisiana selling mustangs and cattle to the United States. This trade bolstered Texas's economy. Proximity was the major reason for the trade between Texas

¹³¹ Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery*, 31.

¹³² Ibid, 23.

and Louisiana. Travel to Louisiana was less than one hundred leagues away from San Felipe. By contrast Saltillo was 150 leagues away, and Monterrey was 200 leagues away.

The changing loyalty was a well-established pattern of behavior exhibited by Tejanos. As stated in the previous chapter, it began with the De Las Casas Revolt, continued with the counter revolt of Don Zambrano, the Gutiérrez de Lara/Magee Revolt, and temporarily ended with the defeat of the Republican Army of the North by Cornel Ignacio Elizondo. Tejanos supported the victors, and when insurmountable forces threatened the victory, Tejanos sided with the stronger force. To side with the stronger force in the face of total obliteration was a survival instinct. During the Texas Revolution, Tejanos were outnumbered and had few resources to sustain a long military campaign. Tejanos aided the Anglo volunteer army in Texas by providing light cavalry units made known as the *Compañía Volante*. They served as scouts and supplied the Texas army with cattle and horses. The bulk of the revolutionary forces consisted of Anglo Texans and American volunteers seeking adventure.

State of Coahuila soldiers did not reappear in Texas until a Centralist Congress passed the Law of April 6, 1830. General Manuel Mier Y Teran was sent to inspect Texas after the Fredonia Revolt; he discovered that México was in danger of losing Texas to the Anglo colonists. Under the advice of Teran, reinforcements were sent to the port of Anahuac. These soldiers were supposed to secure the borders from Americans illegally entering Texas, also were to establish custom houses. Unfortunately, these troops were ill equipped, under paid, and – in some cases – never paid at all.¹³³ The problem of underfunding , undermanned, and ill equipping

¹³³ “A Trip to Texas in 1828”, José María Sánchez and Carlos E. Castañeda, *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.jstore.org/stable/30234949>. Accessed: 01/03/14 17:22, Vol. 29, No. 4 (April 1926), 258.

presidial soldiers would never be resolved, and this caused many problems for the Tejano community. Like the Spanish presidial soldiers, they relied on the charity of Tejanos. In the absence of local charity, presidial soldiers turned to criminal behavior such as stealing Tejano livestock. During military coups, presidial soldiers abandoned their posts in Texas. This lack of discipline of the soldiers and lack of government control over their own soldiers left Tejanos with an uneasy feeling in the frontier. Not only did Tejanos have to contend with Indian attacks, but they were also concerned about the soldiers' affiliation with a specific political faction. The failure of the presidial system led to the populating of Texas with Anglo empresarios.

An 1826 law required Texas to have a garrison of one hundred and seven soldiers and officers in San Antonio and Goliad, but in 1825, the combined strength of San Antonio and Goliad presidios amounted to only fifty-nine men. By 1832, the total number of troops in Texas amounted to one-hundred and forty with only seventy men under arms.¹³⁴ Insufficient support offered to Texas was directly linked to corrupt military officials from Coahuila and the México City. These officials stole the money allocated to Texas's defense, leading to the underpayment and demoralization of presidio soldiers as well as causing mass desertion. Consequently, presidio commanders were forced to seek replacement soldiers by conscripting criminals, Indians, and homeless men.

As author David J. Weber mentioned in his book *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico*, "Under Spain, frontier troops had been exploited by their own officers and by merchants, but government reforms had improved the situation by late

¹³⁴ *Representación Dirigida por el Ilustre Ayuntamiento de la Ciudad de Béxar*. Congreso de estado (Brazoria, 1833), 4.

eighteenth century. In the Mexican era, however, the situation apparently deteriorated.”¹³⁵

Spain and México had similar problems with Texas, such as Indian attacks, American encroachment, and under population. While Spain managed Texas’s affairs more diligently, México never recovered from the war for independence. The war had bankrupted the nation and destabilized its political structure. As previously mentioned, a series of military coups continuously placed new presidents into power.

The government again neglected Tejanos. Texas residents suffered the same problems under Spanish rule. Indian attacks, a small military presence, weak financial infrastructure, transportation, and most importantly, a lack of manufacturing capacity kept the majority of Tejanos living at a subsistence level. México populate the frontier because of continual encroachment by Americans and attacks from hostile Indian tribes. México continued to use the Spanish system of presidios and missions to protect their frontier. The presidio system failed to protect Spanish Texas and failed Mexican Texas. Neither Spain nor México could adequately supply, pay, and keep sufficient numbers of presidio soldiers on staff to protect Texas from Indian attacks.

México’s political instability and its weak economy compounded its failure in Texas. The Mexican government tried to entice Mexican citizens to move to the frontier but was unsuccessful. Mexican citizens saw the frontier as harsh and dangerous; hence, they were not inclined to attempt settling in Texas. Another hindrance to Mexican citizens settling Texas was the hacienda system that bound people to the land, making it impossible to leave. México

¹³⁵ David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 112.

preferred the presidio system over Anglo immigration because Mexican officials did not trust Anglo-American colonists. Tejanos petitioned the state government and successfully gained empresario contracts for Anglo-American colonists. Tejanos saw Anglo-American colonists as stimulating the growth of Texas by bringing much needed capital for investment in Texas agriculture, primarily in the cotton industry. Anglo colonists also bolstered the local Texas militia numbers and assisted in the defense of local communities. Anglo Americans had a long history of being experienced Indian fighters. Tejanos also saw the Anglo colonists as adding to the population and giving Texas more political power over Coahuila. The fledgling Mexican nation was in political and economic turmoil and was never able to properly supply Texas with sufficient support.

México lacked military resources to adequately protect Tejanos from Indian attacks.¹³⁶ Texas lacked governmental support to establish manufacturing industries due to monopolies in central México. Lack of monetary support to Texas was due to corrupt officials, a crippled Mexican economy, and the low priority that the Centralist government assigned to the northernmost territories. As a result, the country became unable to pay its soldiers in Texas. Because of non-payment, soldiers in Texas resorted to criminal acts to gain sustenance.¹³⁷ They had to forage and steal. Local communities kept the soldiers fed at the towns' expense. Tejanos were living on a subsistence level, and the continual aid to the soldiers of Texas hurt the economies of the Tejano communities.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Jesús F. de la Teja, ed., *Tejano Leadership in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2010), 2.

¹³⁷ De la Teja, *Tejano Leadership*, 3.

¹³⁸ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 3.

In conclusion, México's political, economic, and military instability explains why Tejanos advocated for Anglo immigration which later resulted in separation. México's government was in turmoil with presidents ascending and descending from power with the help of military leaders who staged coups. The population was decimated and could not recoup its productivity. Its economy was in shambles after the war for independence. Thus, México borrowed heavily from Britain. The national government did not adequately support Tejanos, so they saw Anglo colonization as a way to improve their situations and the condition of Texas. This caused Tejanos to be the cultural brokers between Anglo colonists and the Mexican government, bringing them at odds with both Anglos and the Centralist Mexican officials. When Santa Anna and his Centralist regime took control of the government and brutally quelled the rebellion in Zacatecas, Tejanos saw that Santa Anna was beyond negotiation and decided to rebel against México.

CHAPTER IV

TENSIONS RISE: ANGLOS, TEJANOS, AND MÉXICO

Stephen F. Austin was the first successful Anglo empresario in Texas. He settled three hundred families in his colony, San Felipe de Austin. Instantly, Austin struck a friendship with Don Erasmo Seguín. This friendship would benefit Austin in his economic endeavors. Similarly, Moses Austin's friendship with the Baron de Bastrop gained him access to an empresario contract. Anglos and Tejanos had one common interest, which was to make Texas prosper. Tejanos sought to diversify their business interests. Texas had abundant fertile land, but Tejanos lacked the labor resources to cultivate it. Tejanos also lacked the ability to produce finished goods or process raw materials. Anglos were able to provide Tejanos with machinery brought from the United States as well as finished goods.

Tejanos assisted Anglo colonists in obtaining land contracts in Texas because they believed that Anglo immigration would improve Texas both economically and politically. The relationship between Anglo colonists and Tejanos began in 1821 when Erasmo Seguín escorted Stephen F. Austin from Nacogdoches to Béxar. Helping Anglo colonists obtain land ownership was fundamentally sound to the Tejanos' plan to change Texas for the better. Tejanos, such as José Antonio Navarro, gained favorable legislation to promote Anglo colonization; later, when he was land commissioner, he granted land contracts in the Green DeWitt's colony. In 1828, Political Chief Ramón Músquiz became the de facto governor, serving from 1828 until 1834. He

supported Anglo colonization and the importation of slaves into Texas. Other Tejanos who aided Anglo colonists were Miguel Arciniega and Gaspar Flores who both were land commissioners for the Austin colony. Gaspar Flores also served as land commissioner in 1828. Miguel Arciniega, the commissioner for Austin's colony and state legislator in 1828, lobbied in favor of slavery by honored labor contracts for immigrants.¹³⁹ As mentioned before, Baron de Bastrop was not a Tejano; rather, he was a Mexican Federalist who assisted with the promotion of Anglo colonization. Tejanos, Mexican Federalists, and early Anglo colonists had the same goals which was to gain economic prosperity by using Texas's abundant resources in order to strengthen Texas both financially and politically.

Tejanos promoted Anglo colonization of Texas because they knew that Anglos would bring with them much needed capital to stimulate Texas' s economy. Many of the Anglo colonists were from the South and brought with them their knowledge and willingness to cultivate crops for sale. Anglos would also bring much needed finished products and manufacturing technology from Louisiana, which Tejanos so desperately needed. Tejanos lived by sustenance farming because they lacked the technology to produce crops on a large scale as well as lacked protection from Indian raids that México failed to provide. Therefore, Tejanos saw the Anglos as providing both added numbers to aid in the protection from Indian attacks as well as create an agrarian economy and bring in much needed materials such as gunpowder, coffee, and clothing from Louisiana. An example of how Tejanos benefited from Anglo colonists

¹³⁹ Arciniega to Austin, Saltillo, May 17, 1828, Stephen F. Austin, Eugene C. Barker, ed. *The Austin Papers*, vol. 2, pt 2 (Austin: University of Austin Press, 1919), 41-42.

is when on February 27, 1827, Austin obtained *tres arrobas* (seventy-five pounds) of coffee and gunpowder for José Antonio Navarro who paid one hundred and thirty dollars.¹⁴⁰

Anglo empresarios brought with them machinery, such as the cotton gin and saw mills, which they used to produce finished goods sold to Béxar, La Bahía, and Nacogdoches.¹⁴¹ On his inspection of Texas, General Manuel de Mier Y Terán noted, "Industry in this colony [San Felipe de Austin] is outstanding, not only in the cultivation of the land for the harvesting of cotton and other cereals except wheat, and for raising cattle, but also in artisanry. They make wool and cotton textiles for fair quality; they have machines to gin cotton and to saw lumber to make planks."¹⁴²

Anglo colonists boosted the lives of Tejanos by establishing small manufacturing bases and bringing in goods from Louisiana. During the Spanish era, Tejanos lacked many essential items such as clothing and blankets. Under the Mexican government, Tejanos suffered the same lack of necessities until Anglo colonists settled Texas.

When Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla declared independence from Spain, in 1810 he also created an emancipation decree. The mixed race population of México was bound by the rigid caste system which created a commonality between Negro slaves.¹⁴³ Tejanos did not suffer from the rigid caste system; thus, they could not sympathize with the mestizos and other castes

¹⁴⁰ Stephen F. Austin, Eugene C. Barker, ed. *The Austin Papers*, vol. 2, pt 2 (Austin: University of Austin Press, 1919), 1,609-1,610.

¹⁴¹ Jack Jackson, ed. and John Wheat, trans. *Texas by Teran: The Diary Kept by General Manuel de Mier Y Terán on his 1828 Inspection of Texas* (University of Texas Press: Austin, 2000), 34.

¹⁴² *Ibid*, 34

¹⁴³ Andrés Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas Under the Mexican Flag: 1821-1836* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1994), 109-110.

of México. It is important to note that the issue of slavery was not mentioned in Austin's Colonization Contract of 1823. The Mexican congress discussed emancipation in 1824. Erasmo Seguín, Austin's close friend, was a legislator in México City in 1824. Seguín mentioned to Austin that he would speak against emancipation but promised nothing. In July, Decree No. 412 prohibited the commerce and traffic of slaves into México. All of the slaves were free once setting foot on Mexican soil.¹⁴⁴

This new law discouraged many Anglo colonists from settling Texas. Most Anglo settlers were from the south and brought their slaves with them into Texas, violating Mexican law. Stephen F. Austin petitioned the national government to repeal the emancipation law. He wrote, "It will be considered by all as an act of bad faith by the gov't."¹⁴⁵ Seguín agreed with Austin that slavery would help Texas achieve prosperity, yet the Mexican congress thought otherwise. In a letter to Austin, Seguín wrote, "In my congress they did not even want to hear solicitations of that nature [slavery], to the contrary at the mention of slavery the entire congress became electrified at the consideration of the state of unhappiness of that part of humanity."¹⁴⁶

In 1826, state legislature considered adding article thirteen to the state constitution which read, "The state prohibits slavery absolutely and forever in all its territory, and slaves now in it shall be free from the day the constitution is published in this capital."¹⁴⁷ Austin had other Tejano allies aside from Erasmo Seguín and Baron de Bastrop. José Antonio Saucedo saw the

¹⁴⁴ Barker, Austin Papers, vol. 1, pt. 1, 723.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 1,406.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Béxar Archives, Juan José Zambrano to José Antonio Saucedo, August 24, 1826. Coahuila y Texas, "Actas de Congreso," September 2, 1829.

disadvantage of the forced marriage with Coahuila and - like Erasmo - saw the benefit of slavery in Texas. He sarcastically said, "So we begin to see the advantages which the union with Coahuila gives us."¹⁴⁸ The entire Béxar ayuntamiento protested the idea of emancipation in Texas. The protection of slavery concerned both Anglos and Tejanos.

A large majority of empresarios had emigrated from southern United States, and they brought their slaves to Texas. In 1824, the Mexican Constitution prohibited foreign and domestic slave trade. Moreover, under the Constitution of 1824, territorial government fell under the direct control of congress.¹⁴⁹ Texas lost its political autonomy. Congress left the responsibility of drawing up plans for the internal government to the state. On March 3 of that year, José Rafael Gonzalez was appointed provisional commandant general of Texas, Coahuila, and Nuevo León.¹⁵⁰ Gonzalez was sympathetic to the Tejanos' and Anglos' causes. He approved the State Colonization Law on March 14, 1825. Stephen F. Austin's brother, James, befriended Gonzalez and said, "It will be fortunate for the Colony if he can be re-elected and what little aid the colony can render him should be done with pleasure."¹⁵¹

Tejanos agreed that slavery was a necessary evil, so they advocated for the allowance of slavery in Texas. For example, Bexareño José Antonio Navarro, a state legislator, found a loophole in the law forbidding slavery in Texas. He wrote to Austin, "Assure our compatriots

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 27.

¹⁵⁰ Vito Alessio Robles, *Coahuila Y Texas desde la con-sumación de la indecencia hasta el tratado de paz de Guadalupe Hidalgo*, (Editorial Porrúa, Guadalupe, Hidalgo) (Vol. 2; México City).

¹⁵¹ San Carlos, October 31, 1826, in *The Austin Papers*, VOL. I. (Hereafter cited as AP)

that my heart goes out to them...all our wishes and efforts are and will be used for the benefit of this Department."¹⁵² Tejanos, such as Ramon Músquiz, aided in the enforcement of slavery by posting wanted signs of runaway slaves in Béxar and La Bahía.¹⁵³ Tejano legislators, including Baron de Bastrop and Erasmo Según, petitioned for Texas to be exempt from the slavery law. The threat to Texas slaveholders loomed when the state of Coahuila and Texas outlawed slavery in 1827.¹⁵⁴

Músquiz staunchly supported Anglo colonists and their right to bring slaves into Texas by stating "that never have they [Austin's colonists] ignored the law or disobeyed the authorities for the country they have adopted as their nation."¹⁵⁵ Tejano legislators successfully gained endorsement of slavery in Texas six months after the publication of the Constitution of Coahuila y Tejas 1827.¹⁵⁶ Moreover, Músquiz protected the property rights of all Texas residents. He said, that they had been guaranteed their property rights by federal and state colonization laws. That slavery was necessary and that Texas could no develop "without the aid of the robust and almost indefatigable arms of that race of human species which is called Negros, and who, to their misfortune, suffer slavery."¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² Navarro to Austin, Saltillo, May 17, 1828 AP, 2:41.

¹⁵³ Músquiz, June 12, 1828, Bexar Archive, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas. (hereafter cited as BA)

¹⁵⁴ Randolph B. Campbell, *The Laws of Slavery in Texas: Historical Documents and Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010), 14.

¹⁵⁵ Músquiz to governor, Béxar, July 4, 1830, BA.

¹⁵⁶ Memoria de Hacienda 1870, 142, 151-54.

¹⁵⁷ Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 25.

In his book *Tejanos and Texas Under the Mexican Flag: 1821-1836*, Andrés Tijerina wrote: "But their [Tejano] protective attitude toward Anglo Americans led Tejanos into direct conflict with the more conservative Centralists of México and eventually alienated them from the growing Centralist government in Mexico City."¹⁵⁸ Tijerina's statement is correct. Tejanos' defense of Anglo-American affairs alienated Tejanos from the Centralist government. Tijerina insinuated that Tejanos were loyal to the ruling government whether Centralist or Federalist. Tejanos were loyal Mexican citizens but were Federalists, an ideology that was the complete opposite to that of Centralists. This created conflict between Tejanos and the Centralist government. The only time relations between Tejanos and the Mexican government were harmonious was when the Federalists were in control. When President Santa Anna turned over control of the country to Vice President Gómez-Farías, his liberal Federalist government passed bills that benefited Tejanos.¹⁵⁹ Tejanos were loyal citizens of México but preferred autonomy rather than serve under the yoke of Centralist power.

These Tejano elite became the cultural brokers between Anglo colonists and Tejanos. They were the intermediaries between Mexican officials and Anglo colonists. Tejanos shared similar economic goals and social status for Texas. The bond that grew between early Anglo colonists and Tejanos was formed by commerce. Author Andrés Reséndez wrote that Ramón Músquiz and the Seguín family "not only had developed extensive trading networks comparable to those of their Anglo counterparts...but also dominated politically and were very influential in

¹⁵⁸ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 113.

¹⁵⁹ David J. Weber, *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 247.

matters of land distribution."¹⁶⁰ Tejanos knew that the foundation of power in Texas was land ownership. That concept of land ownership and prosperity was shared by both Anglo colonists and the Tejano elite. These similarities and their agreement on slavery, compounded with the promotion of cotton production, in Texas bound the two groups in their desire for prosperity. Tejanos acted as intermediaries, or, as author Raúl A. Ramos mentioned, culture brokers - not of necessity - but for their own benefit.

The Anglo community of San Felipe de Austin and the DeWitt colony; the Tejano community was located at Béxar and included the De León Colony. In October 1824, Martín de León's established his colony, which was the only predominantly Mexican colony in Texas. Due to the distance between Tejanos, the Anglo community acted as a safety valve to cool off tempers. Early Anglo-American colonists shared similarities with Tejanos. They both bonded in surviving in the harsh Texas frontier. Both groups shared similar food and living conditions. They equally faced the danger of Indian attacks and the harsh Texas climate. Slowly, a wedge was driven between the two communities. The driving force of the disunity between Tejanos and Anglo colonists was Santa Anna, the Centralist ideology, and the American filibusters entering Texas illegally.

Terán's report described examples of loyal Anglo colonists. On April 23, 1828, Terán came upon Benjamin Beeson's home. Beeson's family obtained a league of land west of the Colorado River on August 7, 1828.¹⁶¹ Terán noted that the family grew plants such as lettuce, onion, and corn. The mother and daughter spoke Spanish well enough to understand Spanish

¹⁶⁰ Andrés Reséndez, *Changing National Identities at the Frontier: Texas and New México, 1800-1850* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 100.

¹⁶¹ Jackson and Wheat, *Texas by Terán*, 216.

conversations. Terán commented, "They seem happy. According to their reports, that [the land] produces wheat, sugarcane, flax, cotton, corn, beans, sweet potatoes, and good tobacco."¹⁶² He also noted that the colonists had forgone planting tobacco because of the prohibition; however, they had access to wild tobacco for their own consumption.¹⁶³ This is an example of Anglo colonists obeying Mexican law and being good loyal citizens of México, which was contrary to Centralists' belief, who thought Anglo Americans could not be trusted. Early Anglo empresarios who obtained land contracts from the Mexican government were loyal citizens.

Tejano elites and early Anglo colonists retained a great working relationship. They had similar status of wealth based on land ownership. Southern planters attributed their wealth to slave labor and Tejano elites to the peonage system of labor. As mentioned before, Tejanos were not opposed to slavery, as some Tejanos were slave owners. Tejanos' slave ownership ceased after 1821. Their brief experience with slavery familiarized them with the profitability potential. Raúl A. Ramos stated in his book *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861*, "But its presence and practice provided a critical connection point between Anglo-American immigrants and their Tejano supporters."¹⁶⁴

Under the Federalist and Centralist government systems, Mexico's economy still relied on foreign loans. As historian Barbara A. Tenenbaum wrote in her book *The Politics of Penury: Debts and Taxes in Mexico, 1821-1856*, "Borrowing became an inevitable necessity, a way of

¹⁶² Ibid, 53.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Raúl A. Ramos, *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 92.

life."¹⁶⁵ México's economy never recovered from war; hence, it turned to taxation. On February 7, 1823 México obtained an 8,000,000 peso loan from England, followed by a second loan a year later of 11,992,910¹⁶⁶. In total, México's total loans received in cash were 17,019,455 but had agreed to pay 32,000,000 plus interest.¹⁶⁷ México found it difficult to raise enough tax revenue from port tax, mint, gun powder, tobacco, salt, post office, lottery, national property, alcabala (gambling tax), gold, silver, government taxes, pulque (liquor tax), cockfighting, and taxes on jobs to pay for general operating expenses and the repayment of the loans. Therefore, México was on a continuous cycle of debt, constantly finding new ways to raise revenue to pay for outstanding loans while incurring new debt.

In May 22, 1829, Lorenzo de Zavala, México's National Treasury Minister from Yucatán, placed a tax burden on the wealthy in exchange for the cancellation of the tobacco monopoly. This taxation included a five percent tax on yearly incomes exceeding one thousand pesos, ten percent tax on incomes over ten thousand pesos, a business tax on capital investments, and a five percent surcharge on property owned by any non-residents of México.¹⁶⁸ Wealthy citizens were outraged, and in six weeks, Zavala was forced to resign and the laws were repealed. Replacing Zavala's ultra-liberal laws were forced monthly state contributions of \$265,000 and a ten percent tax on rents, a six-*peso* tax on carriages, six percent *consumo* tax on foreign products, and a ten percent liquor tax.

¹⁶⁵ Barbara A. Tenenbaum, *The Politics of Penury: Debts and Taxes in Mexico, 1821-1856* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986), 56-57.

¹⁶⁶ Frank G Dawson, *The First Latin American Debt Crisis: the City of London and the 1822-1825 Loan Bubble* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 70-71.

¹⁶⁷ Jaime E. Rodríguez O., *The Emergence of Spanish America: Vicente Rocafructe and Spanish Americanism 1808-1832* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 108-112.

¹⁶⁸ Jamie E. Rodríguez O, ed., *The Divine Charter: Constitutionalism and Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Mexico* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 342-343.

On August 1829, congress reduced the salaries and pensions of all civil and military employees and demanded forced loans wealthy states. All of these taxes were repealed on February 9, 1831.¹⁶⁹ México's economic instability fed its political instability because of the taxes on the wealthy. They supported General Anastasio Bustamante, who led a successful coup on December 4, 1831. Under Bustamante's presidency, income increased from the collection of customs from \$4,986,575 in 1829 to 1830 to \$8,483,006 in 1830 to 1831.¹⁷⁰ However, exports fell. México failed to find a balance between profiting from imports and exports. To please his supporters, who were the clergy and the wealthy, Bustamante did not raise taxes. Instead, he taxed the working class and enlisted military soldiers. In order to keep his military supporters, Bustamante paid them well and purchased new equipment as well as improved recruitment and organization. He spent \$10,450,251 solely on the army.¹⁷¹

His actions angered the people of México as did his policy of beating and occasionally executing opponants. In 1832, General Antonio López de Santa Anna seized Veracruz and declared a revolt. By June 1832, Santa Anna was successful in his coup. He pledged support for the federal Constitution of 1824. His vice president was Valentín Gómez Farías, whom Santa Anna left in charge of the country. Gómez Farías responded to the \$11,244,567 debt that México had incurred by instituting Bourbon-style anticlericalism. During Spanish rule, Bourbon-style government stabilized the country. He planned to sell land owned by the church to raise cash for

¹⁶⁹ *Memoria de Hacienda 1870*, 102-103; Tenenbaum, *The Politics of Penury*, 34-35.

¹⁷⁰ Tenenbaum, *The Politics of Penury*, 37.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

the treasury.¹⁷² Farías's idea never came to fruition; powerful groups who supported the church were wealthy land owners. They petitioned Santa Anna, and in April 29, 1834, he ended Farías's reforms.

Tejanos and Anglo colonists, knowing the potential profitability of tobacco, petitioned the government for permission to plant tobacco in Texas. México had a profitable tobacco monopoly in Veracruz and denied Texas's request to grow tobacco. Failing to gain government concessions on tobacco cultivation, Texas legislators managed to obtain tax-exempt status for cotton growers and stock raisers. Tobacco was still a monopoly of Veracruz, which angered Anglo colonists. Many Anglo colonists were experienced tobacco farmers from the southern United States and hoped to plant tobacco on their lands. Anglo colonists planted tobacco for personal use but did not grow enough to take to market due to Mexican policy. In the long run, tobacco was never profitable for the Mexican government. The state and federal governments never purchased substantial quantities of tobacco from local farmers; therefore, tobacco was sold to other countries. The industry declined because international competition brought cheaper tobacco into México.

Tejanos were successful in obtaining tax-exemption for cotton, foreign imports, and domestic items for colonists and Tejanos. As mentioned before, Tejanos were hopeful that Anglo Americans would assist in stimulating Texas's economy by bringing the manufacturing industry and investing in Texas. Examples of the introduction of the manufacturing industry included James Bowie's acquisition of a textile mill concession and Leon R. Almy's seven-year concession

¹⁷² Michael P. Costeloe, *La Primera República Federal de México: 1824-1835* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1975), 290-91.

of "a machine to extract water from the depths."¹⁷³ Anglo Americans also brought cotton gins, ferries, and steamboats to Texas.¹⁷⁴ There was no indication that México was going to furnish funds to aid Texas. Anglo Americans immediately began to benefit in Texas by bringing in much needed industries and capital into Texas to begin businesses. This was why Tejanos adamantly defended Anglo concessions in state and national congress.

In 1831, Tejanos still supported Anglo-American interests, as Austin noticed when he stayed at Don Victor Blanco's home in Monclova. Blanco, José Antonio Tijerina, and other deputies of Monclova supported Anglo-American immigration. Later, Austin stated in a letter to his secretary of the San Felipe Colony, Samuel M. Williams that the success of the colonies stood "very high" in the state government.¹⁷⁵ The vast majority of Monclova's statesmen were Federalists, allies of Tejanos and of Anglo-American colonization. Legislators from Monclova supported Tejanos' pro-slavery views because they wanted to cultivate cotton and knew that a large labor force was needed. For instance, Victor Blanco aspired to create a cotton kingdom in Coahuila y Tejas.¹⁷⁶ He had cotton ginning concessions in Coahuila y Tejas and was a slave owner since 1820. The B́exar ayuntamiento certified his legal purchase of slaves. Members of the ayuntamiento included Juan Mart́n Veramendi, Vicente Zambrano, Erasmo Seguín, José

¹⁷³ Margaret Swett Henson, *Lorenzo de Zavala: The Pragmatic Idealist* (Texas Christian University Press: Fort Worth, 1996), xii.

¹⁷⁴ Archivo General de la Nación. México, D. F., México. Legajo 37, Expd. 13. Coahuila Y Tejas, "Actas del congreso," October 16, 1827, 86.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 767.

¹⁷⁶ Barker, *Austin Papers*, Vol. 2, 582.

Flores, and José María Zambrano.¹⁷⁷ The certification of the purchase of slaves by Tejano elites is strong evidence that Tejanos supported the slave trade in Texas.

The cotton industry was equated with financial prosperity. What drove Americans to settle and bring their cotton plantations to Texas, was the United States tariff of 1828; (known as the Tariff of Abominations) the South feared that the high imports on English goods would alienate the southern planters.¹⁷⁸ The only hindrance to the Texas cotton trade was Article 13 of the state constitution. Like Tejanos, Austin saw slavery as essential to the prosperity of Texas. Aid came to the pro-slavery cause when, in 1827, Miguel Arciniega and José Antonio Navarro were elected to congress. Miguel Arciniega was born and raised in Valero and owned slaves; therefore, he was sympathetic to the slavery issue. Navarro was a well-respected Tejano who was pro-slavery and pro-Anglo colonization. They both had an uphill battle in the state congress because both Federalists and Centralists opposed slavery.

In mid-1828, José Antonio Navarro introduced bill No. 56, which allowed for indentured servants. Centralists saw no threat in the bill since México had a long history of indentured servitude (peonage). The bill passed on May 5, 1828. The bill explicitly stated that México would honor contracts of servitude made in foreign countries as long as they did not violate state laws. This was a major victory for Tejanos and Anglo colonists. A setback occurred the following year when President Vicente Guerrero abolished slavery in México. Immediately, Tejanos were upset. Governor José María Viesca protested Guerrero's declaration. Political

¹⁷⁷ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 115.

¹⁷⁸ Mark Thornton and Robert B. Ekelund, Jr., *Tariffs, Blockades, and Inflation :the Economics of the Civil War* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources) 2004, 21.

Chief Ramón Músquiz suspended action on the decree.¹⁷⁹ José María Viesca wrote a letter to President Guerrero explaining that the decree would be destructive to Texas's economy. Moreover, "The advancement of Coahuila was so dependent on that of Texas."¹⁸⁰ Viesca's pleas were successful. Texas was exempt from the decree.

Navarro passed another decree. Decree Number 70 benefited Anglo colonists. This decree would:

Article 1. The land acquired by virtue of colonization law, whether general laws of the Republic or private laws of the state, by native or foreign colonists and by empresarios shall not be subject to payment of debts contracted previous to the acquisition of said land from whatever source the debts originate or proceed.

Article 2. Until after the expiration of twelve years from having held legal possession, the colonists and empresarios cannot be sued or incommoded by the judges on account of said debts.

Article 3. After the expiration of the term prefixed in the forgoing article, although they shall not be obligated to pay them in land, implements or husbandry, or tools of their trade or machines, but expressly in fruits or money in a manner not to affect their attention to their families, to their husbandry or art they possess.¹⁸¹ These articles resemble homestead and bankruptcy laws which benefited Anglo colonists greatly. Navarro sought to protect the financial stability of Anglo farmers so that they could invest into Texas's economy by producing crops.

¹⁷⁹ BA, B́exar Ayuntamiento, Bill of Sale, May 5, 1820.

¹⁸⁰ Barker, *Austin Papers*, Vol. 2, 272-275.

¹⁸¹ Barker, *Austin Papers*, Vol. 2, 286-288.

The relationship between Anglo colonists and Tejanos was not always stable. So why is it that Tejanos sided with Anglo colonists during the Texas Revolution? Why did they continue to support Anglos? The first conflict between Anglo colonists and Tejanos was in 1825 between Green DeWitt and Martín De León. A mistake in land distribution included Victoria and Goliad and surrounding ranches in DeWitt's land grant. This gross oversight was not resolved quickly, and by March 1826, Martín De León sued Anglo colonists over livestock. The political chief Ramón Músquiz kept the peace between Tejanos and Anglo colonists. In October, Músquiz out of necessity ordered De León to confiscate contraband goods hidden in DeWitt's colony. With a small contingent of armed soldiers, De León entered the DeWitt colony. Upon hearing that De León was marching to their town with armed men, DeWitt's residents were on alert and armed themselves. This was a recipe for violence, but Austin negotiated peace. Austin was the only Anglo colonist who Tejanos trusted without a doubt. Austin exemplified the model colonist; he learned Spanish and obeyed Mexican laws. Not all Anglo colonists followed Austin's example, especially Anglo Americans who entered Texas illegally and squatted on vacant land.

Both Tejanos and Anglo colonists struggled to make a life, suffering from the harsh Texas weather, Indian attacks, and lack of essential goods, which were imported at high costs. It was the subsequent Anglo colonists, which caused problems with Tejanos, including empresario such as Hayden Edwards, Green DeWitt. They were disgruntled by the sluggish response to their problems and the Mexican empresario system. Other than Austin, Green DeWitt was the most successful empresario in Texas. He was from Kentucky and was given permission to settle four hundred families southwest of Austin's colony. Green DeWitt was granted an empresario contract in 1825, which encompassed Tejanos' lands in Victoria and Goliad. Martín de Leon was granted an empresario contract in 1824; he founded the town of Victoria. Both empresarios

appealed to the governor who sided with de Leon and ordered DeWitt's colonists to move to González, which was DeWitt's first colony.

Another mistake made by the state government was granting land to James Powers and James Hewetson, Irish empresarios. They were given land tracts within ten leagues of the coast. The land within ten leagues of the coast was reserved for and was not to be given out. Moreover, Powers's and Hewetson's tracts overlapped Tejanos' ranch land later named San Patricio.¹⁸² These clerical oversights caused much conflict and distrust between Tejanos and the empresarios. Tejanos only trusted Austin because he was the patriarch of the empresarios and had proved to Tejanos that he was a loyal Mexican citizen by learning the language, adopting the Mexican culture, and following Mexican laws. Austin interceded in disputes between Tejanos and colonists because he was bilingual.

In 1825, Hayden Edwards received his land grant to settle eight families in east Texas. His contract included land in Nacogdoches. While he was in Nacogdoches, Edwards required all individuals under his land grant to show proof of land titles or be exiled. Edwards's actions caused conflict between Tejanos whose families had lived in Nacogdoches for generations who had no official land titles. Communities – such as Béxar, San Felipe de Austin, Saltillo, and even México City – became alarmed by Edwards's actions. By 1826, Political Chief Antonio Saucedo condemned Edwards. The governor of Coahuila and Texas, with the support of President Guadalupe Victoria, nullified Edwards's contract and banished him from México. With a group of supporters, Edwards captured Nacogdoches and declared it the Republic of Fredonia.

¹⁸² Poyo, *Tejano Journey*, 44.

Edwards's group tried to enlist the help of Cherokee tribes who were disgruntled about México denying their requests for land concessions.

Loyal Anglo colonists headed by Stephen F. Austin, Tejanos, and local Mexican officials removed Edwards from Nacogdoches. Because of Hayden Edwards, many Tejanos became suspicious of newcomers. Austin and José Antonio Navarro communicated with each other, denouncing the Fredonian Rebellion and supporting México. Navarro wrote a letter to Tejano residents of Nacogdoches and Austin wrote a similar letter to Anglo residents of Nacogdoches, easing fears of the Mexican army sent to quell the rebellion.¹⁸³ Both Anglo colonists and Tejanos feared what the Mexican army might do to their communities. The Tejano community feared the army because of the memories of the brutality of Mexican retribution during the Mexican War for Independence. Anglo colonists feared the army because they were unsure of what the army might do to them and their community. This is one example of the conflict that arose between the Mexican government and Anglos in which Tejanos were caught in-between.

The Fredonian Rebellion caught the attention of the Mexican government which hesitantly allowed Anglo colonists to continue settling Texas. Fearful that other Anglo agitators were in Texas, President Victoria sent General Manuel Mier Y Terán to inspect the frontier's boundaries and keep an eye on Anglo colonists. What Terán saw appalled him; ignorant,

¹⁸³ John Sayles and Henry Sayles, A. H. Willie, ill. *Early Laws of Texas: General Laws from 1836 to 1879, Relating to Public Lands, Colonial Contracts, Headrights, Pre-Emptions, Grants of Land to Railroads and other Corporations, Conveyances, Descent, Distribution, Marital Rights, Registration of Wills, Laws Relating to the Jurisdiction, Powers, and Procedure of Courts, And all other Laws of General Interests. Also Laws of 1731 to 1835, as found in laws and Decrees of Spain Relating to Land in Mexico, and of Mexico Relating to Colonization; Laws of Coahuila and Texas; Laws of Tamaulipas; Colonial Contracts; Spanish Civil Law; Orders and Decrees of the Provisional Government of Texas. In Three Volumes*, Second Edition (St. Louis: The Gilbert Book Company, 1891), 77.

backward Mexicans and Anglos carried on their lives as they were living in the United States.¹⁸⁴ In Tejanos' defense, they had no choice when it came to clothing and culture affiliations. Texas was in close proximity to Louisiana which made it cost-effective and easier to trade with Americans than with México. This constant trading led to a syncretism of cultures and dress. There was also a change in language. Tejanos spoke a different dialect of Spanish as they do today (Tex-Mex) due to their geographic location. Terán came from an elitist background and frame of mind. Terán's rationale is trivial at best, his accounts are exaggerated, and his recommendations are overreaching.¹⁸⁵

On his inspection of Texas, Terán and his assistant Jean Louis Berlandier – a naturalist born in Switzerland who served as a botanist in Terán's inspection of Texas – noticed the poor condition of the presidio soldiers, stating that:

"...the presidial companies are not paid in silver, money is extremely rare in the area. It is to the bad financial administration of Mexico that one should attribute the audacity of the indigenes; because the soldiers are badly paid and frequently without horses, or else very badly mounted, the indigenes are sure that after they have committed a theft or a crime the soldiers will find themselves unable to go in pursuit. The military have been without pay or clothing not only for months but even years."¹⁸⁶

He noted that Tejanos lacked sufficient labor to properly harvest the fields, bringing support to their slavery requests. Berlandier wrote, "...[P]roprietors...often lack field hands at

¹⁸⁴ Jackson and Wheat, *Texas by Terán*, 95-101.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid*, 8.

¹⁸⁶ Jackson and Wheat, *Texas by Terán*, 16.

harvest time, even if paying good wages. At the time for cutting the sugarcane, I have seen a piastre paid to each worker, and even so there was difficulty in finding a sufficient number."¹⁸⁷

Berlandier also noticed that B exare nos lacked the proper equipment to farm.

In a letter to President Guadalupe Victoria, Ter n wrote about San Felipe de Austin, stating, "Industry in this colony is outstanding, not only in the cultivation of the land for the harvesting of cotton and other cereals except wheat, and for raising cattle, but also in artisanry. They make wool and cotton textiles of fair quality; they have machines to gin cotton and to saw lumber to make planks. They sell their products in B jar, La Bah a, and Nacodoches [Nacogdoches]."¹⁸⁸ Because he did not see B xar as organized and productive as the San Felipe Colony, he called Tejanos lazy since they bought goods from the Anglo empresarios who were planting crops in great numbers to sell. Ter n even noted that Anglos had good-quality wagons with sturdy harnesses to plow crops.

Ter n's recommendations to the president inspired the infamous Law of April 6, 1830 which closed Texas's borders, canceled all unfulfilled empresario contracts, created forts, and required taxes to be paid. This law united Anglos and Tejanos in protest and they appealed. Similar laws and situations united Anglos and Tejanos. Ter n sent President Guadalupe Victoria four recommendations for the improvement of Texas. His first recommendation was to reinforce B xar, suggesting that General Bustamante personally command a cavalry company. The second recommendation was to suspend settlement of North Americans (Anglo Americans). Anglo colonists with land grants could stay, but no more immigration from the north was permissible.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, 18.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, 34.

Slavery was unavoidable. Terán personally saw the abundance of crop production that the soil produced, and he knew slavery was needed for harvest. Terán noted that if Anglo colonists were permitted to own slaves, then Tejanos should also be permitted to own slaves.¹⁸⁹ Thirdly, the overwhelming numbers of Anglo colonists alarmed Terán, and his plan was to introduce Mexican settlers to Texas from Yucatán and San Luis Potosí. Lastly, presidio troops or federal troops should establish a colony within close proximity to the Anglo colonies. His recommendations were taken to heart, and congress passed the Law of April 6, 1830, which infuriated Anglos and Tejanos alike. The Mexican government was slow to implement Terán's recommendations. More soldiers were stationed at presidios and a customhouse on Point Bolivar on Galveston Bay was established. Ships ignored this customhouse. The only effective suggestion was to cancel all unfinished empresario contracts, thereby refusing to admit settlers from the United States.

Tejanos and Anglos reacted negatively to the Law of April 6. Its passage caused agitation and notions of independence within the Anglo community. Anglos and Tejanos called for the residents of the colonies to be patient. Mexican troops reinforced the garrisons in San Antonio de Béxar, La Bahía, Nacogdoches, and Velasco. New presidios were established in Anáhuac on Galveston Bay, Tenoxtilán on the Brazos River, Lipantitlán on the Nueces, and Lavaca on the Lavaca River.¹⁹⁰ México was never able to increase coastal trade.

Anglo-American agitators were driving a wedge between Anglo-American colonists and the Mexican government. As mentioned before, Hayden Edwards was one example of an Anglo who stirred up trouble in Texas. Another Anglo was William Barret Travis, who left his pregnant

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 38.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 18.

wife and young son behind in Alabama to begin a new life in Texas. He entered Texas illegally in 1831 and obtained a land grant from Stephen F. Austin in San Felipe. The blatant disregard for the Law of April 6, 1830 cast doubt about Austin's loyalty to the Mexican government. Travis later established a law practice at Anahuac. He quickly associated himself with Anglo colonists who were against the Law of April 6, and who became the War Party.

In 1828, the Mexican government decided to give official land titles to Americans squatting on Mexican land. The land contracts were delayed until José Francisco Madero was given the task to distribute land titles in 1830. The timing was horrendous because the Law of April 6, 1830 forbid American colonists from receiving land grants. Bradburn ordered Madero to desist. Madero ignored Bradburn's orders, and his surveyors, José María Jesús Carvajal, continued to survey and distribute land grants. Bradburn arrested the two Tejanos. John David Bradburn, born in Virginia, he lived in Kentucky, and was part of the failed Gutiérrez-Magee expedition. He stayed in Texas and assisted the rebel forces fighting the Spanish, joining Vicente Ramón Guerrero's army. Bradburn remained in the Mexican army and was appointed Lieutenant Coronel. He was appointed Commandant General and was stationed at Anahuac.

Another conflict occurred between Bradburn and Anglo colonists. The Anahuac Disturbance began in August of 1831 when he granted asylum to two runaway slaves.¹⁹¹ Bradburn practice of granting asylum to slaves encouraged slaves to run away and seek his protection. He used slave labor to construct public works without paying slave owner. This angered William M. Logan of Louisiana who in 1832, obtained Travis's services to obtain the release of a runaway slave. Logan retreated to Louisiana to retrieve his ownership documents

¹⁹¹ Margaret Swett Henson, *Juan Davis Bradburn: A Reappraisal of the Mexican Commander of Anahuac* (College Station: Texas A & M Press, 1983), 95.

and threatened Bradburn if his slave was not returned. He would return with help. Travis took this message to Bradburn; thinking the message was a hoax, the comandante imprisoned Travis.

192

Anglo colonists received word that Travis was jailed and gathered, demanding Travis's release. A force of one hundred and sixty men marched to free Travis from jail. A bloody conflict would have resulted if it were not for Santa Anna's Plan de Veracruz in which he deposed the sitting Centralist president. Anglo colonists drafted the Turtle Bayou Resolution declaring loyalty to the Constitution of 1824 and denouncing the Centralist government. Tensions rose between the colonists and the Mexican soldiers. The Anglo forces that demanded Travis's release outnumbered the forces of Colonel José de las Piedras and Bradburn's.¹⁹³ Colonel Piedras interceded and released Travis to prevent bloodshed. Bradburn's replacement, Colonel Félix Surbarán, proclaimed support for Santa Anna and abandoned Anahuac. The removal of troops appeased Anglo colonists.¹⁹⁴

In November 1832, Anglo colonists met in San Felipe de Austin colony to write a list of grievances against the Mexican government. They signed a petition swearing loyalty to the Mexican constitution of 1824. Since the Law of April 6, 1830, Anglo agitators sought separate statehood. They felt that if they were a separate state they would be granted laws in their favor. Tejanos, on the other hand, continued to work within the Mexican system to gain favorable political concessions in Texas. Tejanos met in December of that same year in Béxar to discuss

¹⁹² Archie P. McDonald, *William Barrett Travis A Biography* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1995), 79.

¹⁹³ Vigness and Joe Nerlinger, ill., *The Saga of Texas*, 115-118.

¹⁹⁴ David M. Vigness and Joe Nerlinger, ill., *The Saga of Texas, 1810-1836: The Revolutionary Decades* (Austin: Stech-Vaughn Company, 1965), 109.

the Anglo petition and write one of their own. Their petition mirrored the Anglo colonist's petition except for one important issue. The Tejanos did not want to seek separate statehood.

Later in 1834, when the Anglo "War Party" was the majority voice within the Anglo community, they sought independence from México. Tejanos opposed the idea and moved for separate statehood. Monclova revolted when Santa Ann disbanded the state government. Tejanos did not participate in the Monclovan revolt but many other Coahuilans aided Monclova in the revolt. They asked Texas for help but Tejanos refused. Only after Santa Anna brutally put down the Monclova rebellion and Zacatecas rebellion that Tejanos saw the cruelty that there would be subjugated if they remained loyal to Santa Anna. One major point of conflict between Santa Anna and Zacatecas was the reduction of the state militia. Zacatecas had the largest militia in the country. The Zacatecos were Federalists and their large militia posed a threat to Santa Anna's Centralist power grab, as did other state militias.

Because of the Anahuac Disturbance, Colonel Juan Nepomuceno Almonte was dispatched to Texas by President Gómez Farías to specifically root out agitators. He inspected Texas from late 1833 to November 1834. Farías gave Almonte specific instructions, including hearing and reporting Texas's grievances to the federal government informing the colonists that the executive branch opened an initiative with congress asking for "Tejas" to be established as a territory, and admitting that they neglected Texas's welfare. Almonte was trusted with reconciling with the colonists.¹⁹⁵ He was also given confidential instructions which included examining the number of inhabitants and their opinions, resources, weapons, and support – both

¹⁹⁵ Jack Jackson, ed. and John Wheat, trans., *Almonte's Texas: Juan N. Almonte's 1834 Inspection, Secret Report & Role in the 1836 Campaign* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2003), 38-39.

local and outside – to find out which colonists were in the War Party and which were in the Peace Party. México granted asylum to all runaway slaves and informed all nomadic tribes that the government of México was prepared to admit them as an integral part of the federation.¹⁹⁶

A second set of confidential instructions were given to Almonte with an entirely different agenda. He was to visit all colonies and determine if their residents were members of the war or peace parties, report which one of these would present the most resistance if force had to be used, report the number of fighters the colonies might muster, report the quantity of arms and munitions they had, determine who were the leaders of the War Party, and in towns such as Béxar, Nacogdoches, and Goliad to assess their population and number of forces they could muster for defense if need be. Almonte was authorized to offer special concessions to colonists who were loyal, promising further extension of their land.¹⁹⁷

So Almonte was given two very distinct instructions. On one hand, he was to reconcile colonists and reassure them that México was willing to give support them while enforcing the Law of April 6, 1830. Secretly, he was to inspect the security of Texas and the strengths of Anglo agitators. The liberal Mexican government offered Native Americans land and an opportunity to settle in Texas, which was what they had asked from Terán years ago. Almonte was also instructed to enforce the part of the Law of April 6, 1830 pertaining to slavery. Almonte was to emancipate slaves without labor contracts. One can argue that México was using Native

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, 40.

¹⁹⁷ Helen Willits Harris, "Almonte's Inspection of Texas in 1834," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (January 1938), under "Texas State Historical Association," 195-211, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30235773> (accessed March 21, 2014).

Americans and freed slaves to populate Texas and act as a buffer between Anglo agitators and Mexican forces.

Native Americans and freed slaves could be allies of the Mexican government if war was ever to occur. As seen before in the Anahuac Disturbance, Mexican soldiers were outnumbered by Anglo colonists; therefore, the Mexican government sought aid in defending Texas against Anglo agitators. These allegiances never materialized because Almonte was called back to México to assist Santa Anna in defeating the rebellion which began in México. Also, the Mexican legal system was slow to process land grants to Native Americans. In the case of the freed slaves, Almonte did not have the manpower to inspect the plantations for valid labor contracts. Both Anglo agitators and Mexican officials were at an impasse. They both were preparing for a conflict and Tejanos were caught in the middle of both groups.

At the end of his inspection, Almonte concluded that Texas's colonists were prospering economically. Native Americans were pleased that the Mexican government granted them land.¹⁹⁸ However, Almonte recognized the dangers of the War Party. Almonte saw that Anglo Americans in Texas outnumbered Tejanos. The majority of colonists in Texas were content with their lives because of the sweeping reforms instituted by the Federalist state government. Almonte opposed slavery but recognized that it was an institution embedded into the culture of the colonists which would be difficult to eradicate.¹⁹⁹ Almonte recommended increasing the number of soldiers in Texas to safeguard it, moving the capitol from Monclova to Béxar, as well as improving and reorganizing the state government. Almonte's concerns about the welfare of

¹⁹⁸ Reséndez, *Changing National Identities*, 151.

¹⁹⁹ Jack Jackson and John Wheat, *Almonte's Texas*, 289.

Texas paralleled Terán's. Nonetheless, he did not fear México would lose Texas to Anglos as did Terán. Similar recommendations included ceasing land grants to North Americans, granting land grants to Native Americans, capping immigration, moving the capitol from Monclova to Béxar, reorganizing local government to make it more efficient, and increasing military presence in Texas. Almonte's report was not as pessimistic as Terán's.

In addition the events previously discussed other events took place on 1834, Austin was arrested in December. Austin's arrest caused great concern with in the Texas community because Austin was Tejano's chief ally and intermediary between the Anglo and Tejano communities. Monclova rebelled in June; Santa Anna became dictator and disbanded the state congress in April; and Zacatecas rebelled. The institution of the *Siete Leyes* was enacted in 1835, and the Battle of Gonzalez took place on October 2, 1835. The Battle of Gonzalez was the first battle of the Texas Revolution. This battle occurred because colonists of Gonzalez refused to return a cannon that the Mexican Army lent to them for protection against Indian attacks. Tejanos were caught in the middle of the conflict and were forced to choose a side. They opposed the independence from México and were constantly trying to work within the political system, but when war broke out, they decided to support Anglo colonists. Tejanos were Federalists and opposed the Centralist government. Santa Anna's dismissal of the national congress and closure of the state congress as well as the brutal suppression of Zacatecas and other states resulted in rebellion.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION: TEJANOS' REASONS FOR REVOLUTION

Mexico's neglect of Texas took its toll on Anglo colonists and Tejanos. Stephen F. Austin and Tejano elites assisted in quelling the Fredonian rebellion and kept Anglo colonists from other violent conflicts until the Law of April 6, 1830, ignited revolts. After the law was passed, violent conflicts occurred in Anahuac. On October 1-6, 1832, Anglo representatives from sixteen districts met at San Felipe to petition the state government to remedy the abysmal situation in Texas.²⁰⁰ One significant request was the separation of Coahuila and Texas. Stephen F. Austin knew that Mexico City would not honor the San Felipe petition unless they had the approval and consensus of Tejanos.

Numerous events between 1826 and 1835 built to a crescendo, which resulted in war with México. This began with the Fredonian revolt, which brought unwanted attention to the Anglo colonists. General Manuel Mier y Teran came to inspect Texas. His recommendations were included in the Law of April 6, 1830. This law strained relations between the Anglo colonists and the Mexican government. The law called for soldiers to be stationed in Béxar, Nacogdoches, and San Felipe de Austin. The law also stipulated that custom houses would be put in place in Galveston, Velasco, and Matagorda because the seven year duty free- law which was enacted in

²⁰⁰ David J. Weber, ed. and trans., and Conchita Hassell Winn, trans., *Troubles in Texas, 1832: A Tejano Viewpoint from San Antonio with A Translation and Facsimile* (Dallas: Wind River Press for the Degolyer Library of the Southern Methodist University, 1983), 2.

1823 was set to expire.²⁰¹ Custom houses caused an initial disturbance at Anahuac in 1832, which was the first violent conflict between Anglo colonists and Mexican soldiers.

These new actions by the Mexican government caused reactions from the Anglo and Tejano communities. They both wrote petitions to the state government listing their grievances. In 1835, another Anahuac disturbance occurred between William B. Travis and Juan David Bradburn.²⁰² That same year, Santa Anna, following the suggestions of the Centralist leaders (clerical and military), removed Vice President Gomez Farias and other liberal leaders under the Plan de Cuernavaca (May 1834).²⁰³ He supported “*Religión y Fueros*” (religion, military, and clergy).²⁰⁴ Mexican Congress then replaced the constitution of 1824 with the Constitución de las Siete Leyes (Constitution of Seven Laws), which removed all political and economic autonomy from the states and reverted them into departments.²⁰⁵ These sets of laws effectively dismantled the Federalist legislations that were passed under Gomez Farias’s administration and the Constitution of 1824. The Siete Leyes was the work of Manuel Sánchez de Tagle, Lucas Alamán, and Carlos María de Bustamante. By this time Santa Anna, was in the conservative camp and agreed to the new Centralist change.

²⁰¹ Edna Rowe, “The Disturbances at Anahuac in 1832”, *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (April, 1903) Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27784935>. (accessed 3/25/14), 270.

²⁰² Travis was accused for giving false information to Juan David Bradburn. A force of two-hundred men skirmished with Bradburns forces. This was resolved by the Turtle Bayou Resolution.

²⁰³ Michael P. Coasteloe, “Federalism to Centralism in Mexico: The Conservative Case for Change, 1834-1835,” *The Americas*, vol. 45, no. 2 (October, 1988) Academy of American *Franciscans* History, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1006783>, 174.

²⁰⁴ Jesús F. de la Teja ed., *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondence of Juan N. Seguín* (Austin: State House Press, 1991), 21.

²⁰⁵ Timothy E. Anna, *Forging Mexico 1821-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1998), 261.

As a result of these changes in government, Coahuila y Tejas, San Luis Potosí, Querétaro, Durango, Guanajuato, Michoacán, Yucatán, Jalisco, Nuevo León, Tamaulipas and Zacatecas rebelled against this act of despotism of Santa Anna and the conservatives. Tejanos were caught off guard by the battle of Gonzalez on October 2, 1835.²⁰⁶ They previously refused to take up arms against Santa Anna; they now were forced to choose a side. Texas residents witnessed Santa Anna's cruelty during the Rape of Zacatecas, three days of pillaging and raping. After that, they and other Tejanos choose to fight against Santa Anna. Before the revolution began when the Centralists stripped autonomy from the states, Tejanos knew they had lost their ability to negotiate. Tejanos tried to mediate between these two groups.

The Tejano elite had much to lose in the war. Juan Seguín, a Tejano leader, alcalde, and jefe politico commanded a cavalry company and his men served as scouts and foragers to feed the Texas army. The small units of Tejano cavalry, commanded by Juan Seguín and Placido Benavides, were composed of their ranch hands. Placido Benavides disbanded his cavalry unit after he realized that Anglos and Tejanos were seeking independence from México. Benavides was fighting against Santa Anna's tyranny and for the restoration of the Constitution of 1824. He disbanded his cavalry unit and fled to his ranch for the remainder of the war. However, Seguín's company did fight in the battle of San Jacinto.

Other prominent Tejanos, such as José Francisco Ruiz, José Antonio Navarro and Federalist Mexican Lorenzo de Zavala assisted in creating the Texas Constitution. They were the only Tejanos who signed the constitution. The majorities of Tejano townspeople chose to flee to ranches outside of populated areas fearing the coming war or hid in their homes until the

²⁰⁶ The Battle of Gonzalez in October 2, 1835 was the first battle of the Texas Revolution.

fighting was over. They had done the same during the Mexican War for Independence, when Béxar was occupied by Spanish forces. Tejanos were experienced in warfare. They had fought the Comanche tribes for many years and had developed a light cavalry militia to do so. As mentioned before, many were veterans of the War for Independence. Tejanos assisted the Texas Army with foraging and scouting. Many Tejano ranchers assisted the Texas Army by donating cattle and crops to feed the weary Texan soldiers.

Tejanos had opposed the union of Coahuila and Texas because they wanted more control over their economic and immigration policies. México never established ports in Texas, therefore, Tejanos created makeshift ports in Galveston when Mexican officials installed a customs office, which failed. The issue of slavery was another source of conflict between the Mexican officials and Anglo colonists, which led to the Anahuac disturbance in 1832. Tejanos constantly tried to work within the Mexican political systems. Before the war with México, Texas only had three delegates in the state congress while Coahuila had ten. Tejanos were never militant and they tried to work within the political system to obtain desired legislation.

They knew Anglo colonists were the key to growing the stagnant Texas economy. The passage of the Colonization Law of 1825 of Coahuila y Tejas was the first successful legislation which benefited Tejanos and Anglos. New problems arose between the Mexican government and the first groups of Anglo colonists. The issue of slavery was a persistent problem with which Tejanos contended. On September 15, 1829, President Vicente Guerrero's decree emancipated all slaves in Mexico. Tejanos knew for Texas to prosper, they and Anglo colonists needed slave labor for the cotton industry to grow in Texas. Tejanos did have experience with slavery during the Spanish period; they also had a peonage system which was similar to slavery.

Therefore, they petitioned the state government to exempt Texas from the abolition of slavery. When President Bustamante revoked Texas's exemption on slavery, it was Tejano legislature that passed a bill honoring labor contracts from other countries. Southern planters brought their slaves to Texas under the guise of indentured servants with contracts of 90-99 years.

Tejanos developed a good working relationship with Stephen F. Austin, who was the model Anglo empresario. Austin spoke Spanish and was a law abiding citizen of Mexico. He was everything that the Anglo agitators were not. Austin worked closely with elite Tejanos such as Erasmo Seguín and Baron de Bastrop to ensure success of his San Felipe de Austin colony. Tejanos wanted to be included in tobacco industry which Mexico heavily regulated.²⁰⁷

The Law of April 6, 1830 caused tension in the Anglo community. In October 1-6, 1832 fifty-eight delegates from sixteen Texas districts met in San Felipe de Austin to petition state. Their argument was that the union of Coahuila y Tejas was detrimental to Texas. They listed the need for political stability in Mexico City included and the need to end of Indian depredations. They sought repeal of article eleven of the Law of April 6, 1830, and they sought exemptions from import duties for manufactured goods to be used locally, as well as improved public education, better local government, legalization of land titles for Anglo Americans and for Cherokees, Shawnees, and members of other tribes who had moved from the United States to settle in Texas.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁷ Susan Deans-Smith, "The Case of the Tobacco Monopoly 1765-1850," in *The Political Economy of Spanish America in the Age of Revolution, 1750-1850*, ed. Kenneth J. Adrien and Lyman L. Johnson (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 64.

²⁰⁸ Hans Peter Mareus Neilsen Gammel, *The Laws of Texas: 1822-1897 Vol 1, 1898*; digital images, (<http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaphth5872/>; accessed March 25, 2014), University of North Texas

Following the San Felipe meeting, *jefe político* Ramon Músquiz informed the Anglo colonists that the meeting was illegal. Anglo colonists had no authority to meet and create a declaration. Ramón Músquiz had been the *jefe político* (political chief) of Texas since 1827; he blamed some of the trouble in Texas on immigrants from the United States and praised the *ayuntamiento* of Béxar for not supporting the *Plan de Veracruz* (a plan to overthrow Anastasio Bustamante current president of México who was a Centralist)²⁰⁹. Tejanos refusal to support the *Plan de Veracruz* showed great resolution on their part. Músquiz was bitter about the illegal convention and professed “I am a citizen of Texas, and have the greatest interest in every betterment that can advance the welfare of the country and its inhabitants.”²¹⁰ He thought the requests for separate statehood should come from the *ayuntamientos* rather than the convention.

Comanches have been a continual problem of Texas residents since the Spanish era. Both Spain and México failed to adequately protect Texas. Tejanos were forced to create militia cavalry units to protect Texas. The Mexican government sent ill-equipped and underpaid soldiers to Texas to protect the inhabitants from Comanche attacks. A massive desertion rate resulted from the neglect of the soldiers. The government then resorted to sending prisoners, homeless, and conscripted troops to Texas. To keep the soldiers from deserting, the Tejanos had to support by providing them with food and money. Tejanos implored the state government for help against a new Comanche uprising, noting that the troops have received one tenth part of their salary. There were only seventy men at arms when the petition was written.

Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, <http://texashistory.unt.edu>; crediting University of North Texas Libraries, Denton Texas.

²⁰⁹ Weber, *Troubles in Texas*, 5.

²¹⁰ Eugene C. Barker, *Life of Stephen F. Austin 1793-1836: A Chapter in the Westward Movement of Anglo-American People* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1826), 408.

Another complaint of the Tejanos was the meager municipal funds and lack of schools and trained teachers. By 1832, Texas had four representatives in state congress. Another issue was the low number of trained judges and notaries in Texas had more work than they could manage. This hindered criminal and civil administration as judicial officials. The ayuntamiento suggested these causes be heard by juries to ease the workload of the Texas judicial system.²¹¹

Tejanos were under represented in congress which continually shifted from Centralist to Federalist control. They were Federalists that urgently supported the Mexican constitution of 1824. From the creation of the Mexican nation, Texas had seen favorable legalization passed only in 1834 when Gomez Farias was in power and Santa Anna affiliated with Federalists. This period of political support was short lived because in late 1834 Santa Anna became a Centralist. He disbanded the state and federal congress and strongly supported the military, and the church. This angered Tejanos and other Mexican states giving them reason to rebel against México.

It was Santa Anna's brutality and the passing of the *Siete Leyes* that convinced the Tejanos to support independence from Mexico. The Tejanos had no choice. The state and federal congresses were closed, and a purging of Federal officials would ensure that the Centralists would control Mexican government. Santa Anna was marching his army to Texas. Tejanos had experience with a vindictive general during Mexican Independence, so they knew that they had to choose a side or risk losing everything. Santa Anna was a brutal and despotic ruler. Tejanos would not have a way of progressing under Santa Anna's Centralist regime. His government was against Anglo immigration and would destroy everything that Tejanos and

²¹¹ Joseph W. McKnight, "Tracings of Texas Legal History: Breaking Ties and Borrowing Traditions," *Centennial History of the Texas Bar, 1882-1982* (Burnet: Eakin Press, 1981) 262-263.

Anglos had worked so hard to create. Tejanos petitioned the government and refused to become involved in violent conflicts occurring within México. By 1835, the Tejanos community was displaced. Tejanos such as Benavides, as previously mentioned chose to join the Mexican Army. Some Tejanos fled to their ranchos in the country to escape the war, and some Tejanos such as Juan N. Seguin chose to fight against Mexico. Tejanos fought against Santa Anna's Centralist controlled government, against tyranny, to gain absolute autonomy in Texas.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

“Año de 1795. Copias de las providencias de la Junta Superior de Rhazdo Decretos de conformidad de los Exmos Señores Virreys, orn de Sor Comte Gral de Provs Ynts, Acuerdos con el Ayuntamiento de esta Villa Y Bando publicado el dos de Agosto del mismo año ser Junta Grandos por los Criadores,” Béxar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

“Béxar Ayuntamiento Special Committee,” Report, November 18, 1827, Béxar Archives. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History.

Actas de Congreso Constitucional Mexicano, 5 Vols. (México: En la Oficina de Alejandro Valdéz, 1822.

Almonte, Juan Nepomuceno, *Noticias estadística sobre Tejas*.
Archivo General de la Nación. México, D. F., México. Legajo 37, Expd. 13. Coahuila Y Tejas, "Actas del congreso," October 16, 1827.

Arciniega to Austin, Saltillo, May 17, 1828, AP, 2:41-42.

Ayuntamiento de Béxar, *Representación dirigida por el ilustre ayuntamiento de la ciudad de Béxar Al honorable congreso del estado, Manifestando los males que aflijen los pueblos de Texas, y los agravios que han sufrido desde la reunión de estos con Coahuila* (Brazoria, 1833)

Ayuntamiento to Varela, Bexar, February 1, 1816, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin Texas.

Béxar ayuntamiento, Bill of Sale, May 5, 1820. Béxar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX..

Béxar Archives, Juan José Zambrano to José Antonio Saucedo, August 24, 1826. Coahuila y Texas, "Actas de Congreso," September 2, 1829.

Coahuila y Texas, “Actas del congreso constitucional de estado libre de Coahuila y Texas,” August 10 and 27, December 14, 1824, Benson Latín American Library, Austin, Texas.

Constitution of Coahuila and Texas, March 11, 1827, Article 13, México City D.F., México.

- Cortéz to Muñoz, November 18, 1769. Letter. Bexar Archives. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Croix to Cabello, August 16, 1779. Letter. Béxar Archive (hereafter cited as BA) Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Croix to Ripperdá, January 11, 1778, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Croix to Ripperda, January 9. 1778, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- “Derrotero de la Jornada que hizo el General Alonzo de León para el descubrimiento de la Bahía de Espíritu Santo y Población de Franceses,” in Documentos para la Historia Eclesiástica y Civil de la Provincia de Texas. Archivo General de la Nación, México, Vol. XXVII.
- “Dictamen presentado a la soberana junta provisional gubernativa de imperio mexicano por la Comisión de Relaciones Exteriores, 29 de diciembre de año 1821, primero de la indecencia, Juan Francisco Azcarata y Lezama, un programa de política internacional”, Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano, Serie II, No. 37. México: Publicaciones de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1932. Edward, David B. *The History of Texas or, The Emigrant's Guide to the Character, Climate, Soil and Productions of That Country: Geographically Arranged from Personal Observation and Experience*, Cincinnati: J. A. James & CO., 1836.
- Erasmus Seguín to Texas Provincial Deputation, October 5, 1824.
- Felipe de la Garza to Béxar ayuntamiento, September 27, 1823.
- Felipe de la Garza to Béxar ayuntamiento, “Junta Provisional Gubernativa”, June 16, 1823. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas.
- Foote, Henry Stewart, *Texas and the Texans: Or, Advance of the Anglo-Americans to the South-West; Including a History of Leading Events in México, from the Conquest by Fernando Cortes to the Termination of the Texan Revolution*. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwaite & Co., 1841.
- Joaquín de Arredondo to Christóbal Dominguez, 10 October 1813, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Austin, Texas.
- Joutel, Henri, *Joutel's Journal of La Salle's Last Voyage*, Chicago: The Caxon Club, 1769.
- Juan de Castañeda to Gaspar Flores, September 30, 1824, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.
- Kennedy, William, *Texas: The Rise, Progress, and Prospects of Texas of the Republic of Texas in One Volume*. London: R. Hastings, 1841.

Kimball, John P., *Laws and Decrees of the State of Coahuila and Texas, in Spanish and English: to Which is Added the Constitution of Said State: also, the Colonization law of the State of Tamaulipas, and Naturalization Law of the General Congress*. Houston, Telegraph Powers Press, 1839.

Lundy, Benjamin. *The War in Texas: A Review of Facts and Circumstances Showing that the Contests is a Crusade Against México*. Philadelphia: Merrihew and Gunn, 1837.

———. *The Life, Travels and Opinions of Benjamin Lundy, Including His Journeys to Texas and Mexico; with A Sketch of Contemporary Events, and A Notice of the Revolution in Hayti*. Philadelphia, Merrhew and Thompson, 1847.

Secretaria de Hacienda, Memoria de hacienda y credito public, correspondiente al cuadragésimoquinto año económico Presentada por el secretario de hacienda al Congreso de la unión El 16 de Setiembre 1970. Mexico. Mexico, Imprenta de gobierno, 1870.

Millard, Nicholas, Doran, *The History of the Republic of Texas From the Discovery of the Country to the Present Time: and the Cause of Her Separation from the Republic of México*. London: Smith, Elder, and CO, 1842.

Músquiz to governor, Béxar, July 4, 1830, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Músquiz, June 12, 1828, Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Nacogdoches to ayuntamiento of Béxar, February 2, 1833, Letter. BA. The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Nava to Elguézabal, November 20, 1799. Letter. BA. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Navarro to Austin, May 17, 1828. Letter. Austin Papers. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas.

Ortiz de Ayala, Tadeo. *Resumen de la Estadística de Imperio Mexicano*. México: imprenta de doña Herculena de Villar y Socios, 1822.

Representación Dirigida por el Ilustre ayuntamiento de la Ciudad de Béxar. Congreso de estado (Brazoria, 1833)

Rubi's letter to Oconór, 23 September 1767, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, Bexar Archives, University of Texas at Austin.

San Carlos, October 31, 1826, in The Austin Papers, VOL. I. (hereafter cited as AP)

Saucedo, Antonio, "List of Pardoned Insurgents", March 8, 1814, BA.

Sayles, John and Henry Sayles, A. H. Willie, ill. *Early Laws of Texas: General Laws from 1836 to 1879, Relating to Public Lands , Colonial Contracts, Headrights, Pre-Emptions, Grants of Land to Railroads and other Corporations, Conveyances, Descent, Distribution, Marital Rights, Registration of Wills, Laws Relating to the Jurisdiction, Powers, and Procedure of Courts, And all other Laws of General Interests. Also Laws of 1731 to 1835, as found in laws and Decrees of Spain Relating to Land in Mexico, and of Mexico Relating to Colonization; Laws of Coahuila and Texas; Laws of Tamaulipas; Colonial Contracts; Spanish Civil Law; Orders and Decrees of the Provisional Government of Texas. In Three Volumes*, Second Edition. St. Louis: The Gilbert Book Company, 1891.

Von Humboldt, Baron Alexander. *Ensayo político sobre Nueva España*. Paris, 1836.

Yoakum, Henderson K., *History of Texas: From Its First Settlement in 1685 to Its Annexation to the United States in 1846*. New York: Redfield, 1856.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Almaraz, Felix D., *Knight without Amour: Carlos Eduardo Castaneda 1896-1958*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1999.
- Andrews, Catherine, "The Defense of Iturbide or the Defense of Federalism? Rebellion in Jalisco and the Conspiracy of Calle de Celaya, 1824." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 23, no. 3 (2004): 319-388.
- Jaime E. Rodríguez O ed., *The Independence of Mexico and the Creation of the New Nation*, Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1989.
- Anna, Timothy E., *Forging Mexico 1821-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1998.
- Austin, Stephen F., Eugene C. Barker, ed. *The Austin Papers*, vol. 2, pt 2. Austin: University of Austin Press, 1919.
- Badger, Emily, "The Extraordinary 30-Year Growth of the U.S. Hispanic Population," *The Atlantic Cities*, Last modified August 30, 2014. 2013. <http://www.theatlanticcities.com/neighborhoods/2013/08/extraordinary-growth-americas-hispanic-population/6733/>.
- Barker ,Eugene C., *México and Texas 1821-1835*. Dallas: Turner Publishing Co.1928.
- . *The Life of Stephen F. Austin: Founder of Texas, 1793-1836: A Chapter in the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People*. Dallas: Cokesbury Press, 1929.
- . "Native Latin American Contribution to the Colonization of Independence of Texas," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 46, no. 4, (1943), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30237220>.
- Benson, Nettie Lee, "The Plan of Casa Mata," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 25, no. 1 (1945) Accessed March 17, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25088385>.
- Berlandier, Jean Louis, Et al., *Journey to México During the Years 1826 to 1834*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1980.
- Binkley, William C., *The Texas Revolution*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952.
- Brooks, Philip Coolidge, *Diplomacy and the Borderlands: The Adam Onis Treaty of 1819*, *University of California Publication in History*, no. 24. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939.
- Buenger, Walter L., and Robert A. Calvert. *Texas Through Time: Evolving Interpretations*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1991.

- Burton, Kirkwood, et al., *The History of México*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Campbell, Randolph B., *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas 1821-1865*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- Castañeda, Carlos E., *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas 1519-1936*. Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., 1939.
- Benson Latin American Collection. Castañeda, Carlos E. Papers. University of Texas at Austin, Tx. accessed September 26, 2013, <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utlac/00087/lac-00087.html>.
- Céliz, Fray Francisco, Trans, and Fritz Leo Hoffmann. *Diary of The Alacón Expedition into Texas, 1718-1719*. Los Angeles: The Quivira Society, 1935.
- Chipman, Donald E. and Harriett Denis Joseph. *Spanish Texas 1519-1821*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.
- . “Rubi, Marques De,” Handbook of Texas Online. Last modified on June 15, 2010. <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fru01>.
- Coasteloe, Michael P., “Federalism to Centralism in Mexico: The Conservative Case for Change, 1834-1835,” *The Americas*, 45, no. 2 (October, 1988), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1006783.173-185>.
- . *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846: Hombres de Bien in the Age of Santa Anna*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *La Primera República Federal de México: 1824-1835*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1975.
- de la Teja, Jesús and John Wheat, “Béxar: Profile of a Tejano Community, 1820-1832.” *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (July, 1985): 7-34.
- de la Teja, Jesús F. ed. *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondence of Juan N. Seguín*. Austin: State House Press, 1991.
- , ed. *Tejano Leadership in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2010.
- Deans-Smith, Susan, “The Case of the Tobacco Monopoly 1765-1850,” in *The Political Economy of Spanish America in the Age of Revolution, 1750-1850*, Editors, Kenneth J. Adrien and Lyman L. Johnson. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994.
- Faulk, Odie B. *The Last Years of Spanish Texas 1778-1821*. London: Mouton & Company, 1964.

- Filisola, Vincent, Wallace Woolsey ed. *Memoirs for the History of the War in Texas*. Austin, Eakin Press, 1987.
- Fisher, Lillian Estelle, *The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1971.
- Gammel, Hans Peter Marcus Neilsen, *The Laws of Texas: 1822-1897 Vol 1, 1898*; digital images, (<http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph5872/>; accessed March 25, 2014), University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, <http://texashistory.unt.edu>; crediting University of North Texas Libraries, Denton Texas.
- Hardin, Stephen L., "EDWARD, DAVID BARNETT," *Handbook of Texas Online* (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fed01>), accessed November 04, 2013. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.
- Harris, Helen Willits, "Almonte's Inspection of Texas in 1834," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 3 (January 1938), under "Texas State Historical Association," 195-211, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30235773> (accessed March 21, 2014).
- Henson, Margaret Swett, *Lorenzo de Zavala: The Pragmatic Idealist*. Texas Christian University Press: Fort Worth, 1996.
- Herbert, Eugene Bolton, ed. *Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana - Texas Frontier 1768-1780: Documents published for the first time, from the original Spanish and French Manuscripts, Chiefly in the Archives of México and Spain, Athanase de Mézières to Teodoro de Croix*. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1914.
- J. Villasana Haggard, "The Counter-Revolution of Béxar, 1811." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 2 (Oct 1939).
- Jackson, Jack, ed. and John Wheat, trans. *Almonte's Texas: Juan N. Almonte's 1834 Inspection, Secret Report & Role in the 1836 Campaign*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2003.
- . *Texas by Teran: The Diary Kept by General Manuel de Mier Y Terán on his 1828 Inspection of Texas*. University of Texas Press: Austin, 2000.
- Jackson, Jack, *Los Mesteños: Spanish Ranching in Texas, 1721-1821*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1986.
- Berlandier, Ohlendorf trans., and others, *Journey to Mexico During the Years 1826-1834*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1980.
- Jenkins, John H. ed., *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*. Austin: Presidial Press, 1973.
- José María Sánchez and Carlos E. Castañeda, "A Trip to Texas in 1828", *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 29, No. 4 (April 1926) : <http://www.jstore.org/stable/30234949>.

- Lack, Paul D. *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1992.
- Lang, James, *Conquest and Commerce: Spain and England in the America*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Leclerc, Frederic, "Le Texas et sa Revolution", *La Revue des Deux-Mondes* (March 1 and April 15, 1840)
- McDonald, Archie P. *William Barrett Travis A Biography*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1995.
- Menchaca, Antonio, *Memoirs*. San Antonio: Yanaguana Society, 1937.
- Muir, Andrew Forest, "MAILLARD, NICHOLAS DORAN P., Handbook of Texas Online (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fma17>), accessed November 5, 2013. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.
- Navarro, Jose Antonio, David R. McDonald ed. Timothy M. Matovina ed. *Defending Mexican Valor in Texas: Jose Antonio Navarro's Historical Writings, 1853-1857*. Austin: State House Press, 1995.
- Newell, Chester. *History of the Revolution in Texas Particularly of the War of 1835 & 1836*. Austin: The Steck Company, 1838.
- Poyo, Gerald E. and Gilberto M. Hinojosa, *Tejano Origins in Eighteenth-Century San Antonio*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
- Poyo, Gerald E., ed. *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.
- Ramos, Raúl A. *Beyond the Alamo: Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Reséndez, Andrés, *Changing National Identities at the Frontier: Texas and New México, 1800-1850*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Robles, Vito Alessio, *Coahuila Y Texas desde la con-sumación de la indecencia hasta el tratado de paz de Guadalupe Hidalgo*. Editorial Porrúa, Guadalupe, Hidalgo, Vol. 2; México City.
- Rodríguez O, Jaime E. *The Emergence of Spanish America: Vicente Rocafuerte and Spanish Americanism 1808-1832*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Rowe, Edna, "The Disturbances at Anahuac in 1832", *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (April, 1903) Texas State Historical Association, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27784935>. (accessed 3/25/14).

- Simpson, Lesley Byrd ed. and Paul D. Nathan trans. *The San Saba Papers: A Documentary Account of the Founding and Destruction of San Saba Mission*. San Francisco: John Howell-Books, 1959.
- Stein, Stanley J. and Barbara H. Stein, *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America; Essays on Economic Dependence in Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Tenenbaum, Barbara A. *The Politics of Penury: Debits and Taxes in Mexico, 1821-1856*. University of New Mexico Press: Albuquerque, 1986.
- Thornton, Mark and Robert B. Ekelund, Jr., *Tariffs, Blockades, and Inflation: the Economics of the Civil War*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2004.
- Tijerina, Andrés, *Tejanos and Texas Under the Mexican Flag 1821-1836*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1994.
- Vigness, David M. and Joe Nerlinger, ill., *The Saga of Texas, 1810-1836: The Revolutionary Decades*. Austin: Stech-Vaughn Company, 1965.
- Weber, David J. ed. and trans, and Conchita Hassell Winn. trans., *Troubles in Texas, 1832: A Tejano Viewpoint from San Antonio with A Translation and Facsimile* (Dallas. Wind River Press for the Degolyer Library of the Southern Methodist University, 1983).
- Weber, David J. *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest Under Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

BÉXAR POPULATION 1777-1809

Béxar Population: 1777-1809	
1777	3,103
1790	3,190
1804	3,605
1809	3,122

“Bexar: Profile of a Tejano Community, 1820-1832” by Jesús F. de la Teja and John Wheat

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Michael Marino was born in Brownsville, Texas on September 22, 1983. He struggled with dyslexia his whole life. Nonetheless, with help from teachers and family he was able to succeed in school. Struggling in high school with depression he dropped out of high school and enrolled in a charter school. In the accelerated charter school Michael struggled with math and Spanish when a on a Thanksgiving night he came across his future wife Cynthia B. Sosa at the movie theater. She was enrolled at the University of Texas at Brownsville and agreed to tutor him in the subjects he was struggling in. With the help of Cynthia, Michael graduated from Eagle Academy Charter School in 2003. Cynthia encouraged Michael to enroll in UTB after one year he transferred to UTPA.

Michael majored in English again with the help of Cynthia, (his now wife) graduating in 2008. After a life threatening accident in 2008, and unsure of his future, he enrolled in 2009 in the Masters in Fine Arts degrees in Creative Writing. He became disinterested with the program and taught for one year at McAllen High School. With the encouragement and assistance of Cynthia he enrolled in the Masters of History program and was able to finish his master's degree in history. Michael Marino plans on becoming a public school educator teaching seventh grade Texas history and enlightening children about the rich Rio Grande Valley history and how the Valley is historical significant.