

THE QUARTERLY

OF THE

TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Vol. VI.

APRIL, 1903.

No. 4.

The publication committee and the editor disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors to the Quarterly.

THE DISTURBANCES AT ANAHUAC IN 1832.

EDNA ROWE.

In her narrow prejudice, Mexico pursued a policy towards her colonists in Texas which finally led to open revolt. She first offered liberal encouragement to colonization by the national colonization laws of January 4, 1823, and August 18, 1824, which were followed up by the State of Coahuila and Texas in its colonization law of March 24, 1824. These laws led to a rapid influx of immigrants, especially from the United States. Realizing the advantage the acquisition of Texas would be to her, the United States government instructed its minister at Mexico, Mr. Poinsett, in 1825, in 1827, and in 1829 to make propositions to the Mexican government for the purchase of all or a part of Texas. A jealousy of the views of the United States and a fear of the growing strength of the colonists in Texas drove Mexico to pass the famous law of April 6, 1830.¹ The national colonization law of August 18, 1824, had provided, in Article 7, that "Until after the year 1840, the general congress shall not prohibit the entrance of any foreigner, as a colonist, unless circumstances shall require it, with respect to the individuals of a particular nation."² In 1830, the Mexican general

¹Henry Austin to Stephen F. Austin, July 2, 1830. Austin Papers.

²Holley, *Texas* (1833), 203.

congress took advantage of the reservation in the last clause of this article. Lucas Alamán, secretary of state, by his *iniciativa* influenced Congress to pass a decree against colonization from the United States. He gave a minute account of the policy of the United States in acquiring foreign territory. He called especial attention to their method of procedure¹—"They commenced by introducing themselves into the territory which they covet" upon various pretenses. Then "these colonies grow, set up rights, and bring forward ridiculous pretensions." "Their machinations in the country they wish to acquire are then brought to light by the appearance of explorers" who excite by degrees movements which disturb the political state of the country in dispute. Texas, he says, has reached this point. Next "the diplomatic management commences."

The complaint of Alamán indicates the Mexican standpoint so clearly that it deserves quoting at length. In regard to the affairs of Texas, he says, "If we now examine the present condition of Texas, brought about by the policy which I have unveiled at length, we will find that the majority of the population is composed of natives of the United States of the North; that they occupy the frontier posts on the coast and the mouths of rivers; that the number of Mexicans inhabiting that country is insignificant, when compared with the North Americans; that they come from all directions to settle upon the fertile lands, taking notice that most of them do so without previously complying with the requisites of our laws, or in violation of existing contracts. The Mexican population is, as it were, stationary; while theirs is increasing, particularly from the number of slaves introduced by them, and whom they retain, without manumitting them, as they should do, in conformity with the 2d article of the law of 13th of July, 1824.

"This numerical superiority, and the legal supremacy which they will acquire from the act of the Legislature declaring to be citizens all who have resided five years in the State, (in consequence of which, nearly all these foreigners will become so next year;) their having rendered themselves masters of the best points, and their having had it in their power to execute their policy with impunity, and without having been compelled to fulfil the con-

¹Filisola, *Memorias para la Historia de la Guerra de Tejas*, II 592-593. Translation in Executive Documents of 25th Congress, No. 351, pp. 313-316.

tracts entered into for their establishment, or refrained from locating themselves on the frontiers, and other parts, from which they were excluded by existing laws and orders; and, above all, the unrestrained introduction of adventurers: all this has given them a preponderance in Texas, which now hardly belongs in fact to the Mexican confederacy, since the orders of the Government are obeyed or not according to the choice of the colonists; and the moment seems to be near at hand when that territory will be taken from us and added to the United States of the North.

.....

“The violation of the colonization laws and of existing contracts has continued without any effect having been produced by the orders issued on the 15th July and 22d August, 1826, against the admission of colonists from the conterminous nations; by that of the 2d of June, 1827, restricting to those contracted for the number of families in the new settlements; or that of the 23d [of April], 1828, providing that the colonies formed on the lands adjoining the dividing line between the United Mexican States and the United States of the North should be composed of families not natives of the said United States of the North. These provisions, which, if faithfully executed, would have checked the execution of the North American policy, and neutralized their projects, have remained without effect; and the colonists coming from those States have located themselves wherever they thought fit, not only for their own interests, but also for that of their fellow-citizens generally; the colonization laws and their own stipulations remaining a dead letter. Hence we find that, besides this territory having been occupied by colonists who never ought to have been admitted into it, there is not one among them, in Texas, who is a Catholic: and this is a circumstance which has been attended to, in all the contracts which have been formed, as one of the leading articles. Another abuse which recommends itself to attention, is the introduction of slaves, and the number already there.”

Alamán then points out the remedies for these mistakes. The measures proposed by him were formulated and adopted in the decree of April 6, 1830. The fourth article of this law provided for a military occupation of Texas. It decreed that, “The executive shall have the power to take the lands it may consider desirable

for the purpose of fortifications or arsenals and for new colonies, crediting the states with their value on account of the State debt to the federation."¹ The most important of all the articles was the 11th. It prohibited the further introduction of Anglo-American colonists into Texas. "In the exercise of the privilege that the general congress retained in the 7th article of the law of August 18, 1824, the citizens of foreign conterminous territory are prohibited from colonizing in those states and territories of the federation bounded by their nations. In consequence the unfulfilled contracts which are contrary to this law shall be suspended."² In a letter to Stephen F. Austin, dated New Orleans, December 4, 1830, Mr. James Wm. Breedlove of the Mexican consulate in that city encloses a clipping from a Baltimore newspaper in which the Mexican minister, José M. Tornel, published the 11th article of the decree of April 6 and warns the citizens of the United States against violating it. He says, "Wherefore I declare in the name of the Mexican Government, that whatever contract shall have been made in violation of the said law, will be null and void, it being understood that colonization in the State of Coahuila and Texas, and the territory of New Mexico, by citizens of the United States, has been prohibited."³ Breedlove as well as Austin himself believed that this law did not extend to Austin's colony. The former said, "I feel very certain that Colonel Tornel did not mean this publication to extend to any grant which stood on the same grounds yours does, and so I have explained his meaning to all who have called on me." Austin's opinion was this: "The 10th article of that law declares that no variation shall be made in the colonies already established—my colony is established and no legal impediment can of course be interposed to the removal of emigrants to it."⁴

Alamán's report to congress called attention to the need of an adjustment of the trade relations with Texas. The 13th article of the decree was a fruitful source of discord in the colony later. It provided that "The free introduction of lumber for building and

¹Filisola, *Guerra de Tejas*, I 560. In the citations to follow this work will be referred to as Filisola.

²Filisola, I 651.

³J. W. Breedlove to Stephen F. Austin, Dec. 4, 1830. Austin Papers.

⁴Stephen F. Austin to E. Ellis, June 16, 1830. Austin Papers.

of all kinds of foreign provisions is permitted in the ports of Galveston and Matagorda for a period of two years."¹ Article 1 allowed the introduction of cotton goods through the ports of the Republic until January 1, 1831, and through the ports of the Pacific until the end of June of the same year. Speaking of these articles Austin says, "No duty of any kind will be collected except tonnage duties until after the expiration of the law of 1823 excepting Texas from duties for seven years from its publication in the capital of Texas,—It expires November next."²

Some idea of the intense feeling aroused by these laws is obtained from a letter by T. J. Chambers calling Austin to San Felipe de Austin on account of the "most violent and fatal measures," taken by both the State and general governments in regard to the Americans. "The ebullition of public feeling in our quarter is fearful."³

The government was in earnest and promptly took measures to carry out the decree of April 6, 1830. General Mier y Terán,⁴ general commandant of the Eastern Internal States, requested and obtained from the federal government the authority to use half a million dollars in order to perform the duties that this law imposed on him and to carry out a project he had formed of introducing twenty poor families from each Mexican State to colonize the frontier, and, with the Mexican soldiers stationed at suitable places, to act as a counterpoise to the foreign population.⁵ His plan for introducing Mexican families failed on account of neglect on the part of the governors of the States.

In July, 1830, Terán was at Matamoros with two or three hundred men awaiting the arrival of larger forces to be used in the establishment of posts and custom-houses in Texas. Col. Davis Bradburn was already under orders for Galveston. It was reported that he was to leave for Texas on one of the two schooners which were expected from Tampico, to survey the coast of Texas and act as commissary for supplying the troops with provisions from New

¹Filisola, I 560.

²Stephen F. Austin to E. Ellis, June 16, 1830. Austin Papers.

³T. J. Chambers to Stephen F. Austin, May 12, 1830. Austin Papers.

⁴Usually written simply Terán.

⁵Filisola, I 162-164.

Orleans.¹ In the early part of 1831, General Terán gave the final order for Bradburn, with fifty militiamen from Pueblo-Viejo and the 12th regiment of regular infantry, to embark at Brazos de Santiago in a small vessel for Galveston. Thirty men from the presidial company of Espíritu Santo were to join these by land.² This force was stationed on Galveston Bay at a place which had formerly been known as Perry's Point and now received the name, Anahuac,³ given to the City of Mexico by the original inhabitants of that country.⁴ Another small detachment of infantry and cavalry was stationed at Arroyo de la Vaca. At Tenoxtitlan, where the road from San Antonio to Nacogdoches crossed the Brazos River, there were stationed the presidial company of the Alamo of Parras composed of seventy men and a like force from the presidial company of Bexar. Between Nacogdoches and Anahuac the general established Fort Terán and at the mouth of the Brazos River Fort Velasco was erected. One detachment was stationed at each of these forts. Mexican troops were also placed at Nacogdoches, Bexar, and San Felipe de Austin.

As the seven years had expired which were allowed by the law of 1823 for importation of goods into Texas free of duty, General Terán appointed officials for the custom-houses to be established at Galveston and Matagorda and the receiver's office at Velasco. The last two offices were provisional in character.

On the 18th of May, 1830, George Fisher undertook the duties of administrator of the custom-house of Galveston.⁵

¹Henry Austin to Stephen F. Austin, July 2, 1830. Austin Papers.

²Filisola, I 165.

³This name should be Anáhuac, but the Texas pronunciation has made it Anahuac. The accent is therefore omitted as misleading.

⁴*A Visit to Texas*, 78.

⁵George Fisher had led a rather checkered career. He was first a citizen of Belgrade in the province of Servia of the Ottoman Empire. His name was Ribon which in German is Fischer and by this name he was known when he was at school in Austria. In the United States it was anglicized into Fisher. At the age of seventeen he was involved in a revolt against the sultan, and on the failure of the rebellion he with others was driven across the Danube into Austria. The Austrian government, not liking the presence of so many revolutionists organized a Slavonic legion, and Fisher entered it. After a campaign in Italy the legion was disbanded in the

In conformity with the colonization laws, grants of land had been made in 1828 to the inhabitants living east of the San Jacinto River.¹ The population in this quarter increased rapidly, and it became necessary to provide for the issuance of land titles and the administration of law in the district. At the suggestion of Stephen F. Austin, a petition with seventy-two signatures was prepared for this purpose and sent to the governor of Coahuila and Texas. In 1830, the governor commissioned Francisco Madero, a citizen of Monclova, to issue titles to the people settled in that district.² In January, 1831, Madero arrived on the Trinity River. At a meeting of the people held at Atascosita, "Smith's Place" was selected as the county seat and the name of Liberty given to it.³ Madero installed the *ayuntamiento*, and with the assistance of his surveyor, José María Carbajal,⁴ he assigned the people their lands.

Bradburn immediately informed General Terán of Madero's arrival. Terán sent an order both to Bradburn and to Colonel Piedras at Nacogdoches for the arrest of Madero and his surveyor. The reason given by Bradburn for making the arrest was that it was by order of his superior. Terán gave as his reason, that Madero was violating the decree of April 6, 1830. At the opening of the congress of the State on January 2, 1832, the governor in his

interior of that country. Fisher worked his way back, after various experiences, along the Danube river into Turkey as far as Adrianople. He left Turkey again and found his way to Hamburg in Germany, where he embarked in 1815 for Philadelphia. He went west and wandered down to Mississippi, where, after a residence of five years, he became a citizen of the United States. After Mexico became independent in 1821, Fisher moved thither, and became a citizen of that country. In 1830 he accepted this position in Galveston which he held with frequent intermissions during 1830—1833. He returned to Mexico during the presidency of Santa Anna and set up a newspaper. He soon became so liberal in his views that he was asked to leave the country. He then came to Texas to live. (See John L. Stephens, *Yucatan*, 84.)

¹Proceedings of the *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe de Austin, July 26, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Ibid.

³*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 30.

⁴Carbajal was a native of Béjar, but was reared and educated in the United States. (See Filisola, I 167.)

message said, "The public tranquillity has not been disturbed in any manner in any place in the State, even though Col. Davis Bradburn assumed without the authority of the government the power of arresting a commissioner of the government itself for the distribution of lands"

The next illegal act committed by Bradburn was hindering an election for *alcalde* and members of the *ayuntamiento*,¹ ordered by the governor of the State, to be held at Liberty by the *alcalde* of that town, Hugh B. Johnson. Bradburn threatened to use military force for preventing the election. Filisola says that from the moment that the *ayuntamiento* was established, the *alcalde* and *regidores* began to oppose Colonel Davis and the collector of customs, Fisher. They even threatened the latter with pistols in his own house.²

"The general commandant without authority from the State took possession of and appropriated such lands as he deemed proper.³ Bradburn took the property of the colonists without their consent and without consideration."⁴

December 10, 1831, Bradburn, by order of General Terán, dissolved the *ayuntamiento* of Liberty, which had been established by Madero, though not up to that time confirmed by the State government. Without the authority of the State, Bradburn established a new *ayuntamiento* at Anahuac.

The establishment of custom-houses in Texas was followed by innumerable troubles. It has been stated that on May 18, 1830, George Fisher entered upon the office of collector of customs at Galveston. In a letter dated February 16, 1831, to José María Letona, Terán says he had learned of the establishment of the custom-house at Galveston by George Fisher under authority of the government. He also adds that the said establishment was sus-

¹Proceedings of the *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe de Austin, July 26, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Filisola, I 168.

³Proceedings of the *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe de Austin, July 26, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴Thrall, *Pictorial History of Texas*, 179; quoted from a pamphlet published by T. J. Chambers in 1832.

pended "because there is no place to locate a custom-house at present."

The seizure of the schooner *Cañon* with its contraband goods by George Fisher just before the suspension of the custom-house at Galveston gave rise to an attack on that official by the *Texas Gazette*. To vindicate himself, Fisher had Terán's official statement in regard to the affair published in an extra of the "*Guia del Pueblo*" as given below:

"GUIA DEL PUEBLO.¹

"ALCANCE AL NUM. 37.

"Manuel de Mier y Teran, Gen. of Division of the army of the Mexican Republic, commandant in chief of that of the operations, and Gen. and Inspector of the Eastern Internal States.

"I certify: that in the office of secretary to the general commandancy of these states under my charge, there are proofs, that the schooner, *Cañon* and her captain have been surprised at the Bar of Rio Brasos de Dios, with a contraband of 160 quintals of tobacco, and in consequence of the fine of 25 dollars for each arroba of said article which the particular law of the state of Coahuila and Texas imposes, the said vessel was seized by citizen George Fisher Administrator of the maritime custom-house of Galveston, in compliance to the said law; and by means of suitable requisites. In this state of the matter, the administration of said maritime custom-house was suspended; for reasons very different from the acts of said Administrator Fisher, and the cognizance of the contraband was remitted to the commissary at Bexar, remaining Fisher in my opinion exempt from all responsibility, by having surrendered said vessel in quality of seized, to the civil authority of the town of Austin.

"In testimony of which I give the present in Matamoras, this third day of May, one thousand eight hundred and thirty one.

Manuel de Mier y Teran.

NOTE.

"From the foregoing certificate of His Excellency the commandant general, it is evident that the administration of the Maritime cus-

¹Printed in English and in Spanish. Bad as the English is, I have thought best to use it rather than a better translation here. The number from which the extract is taken is in the Bexar Archives.

tom-house of Galveston which was under my charge in Texas, has not been suspended on account of *my acts*; but *for reasons very different*, from them; and that the calumny published by order of the ayuntamiento of the town of Austin in the *Texas Gazette* No. 45 of the 23 of Oct: 1830; criticized and corroborated in its editorial paragraph; and that, propagated afterwards by Edward L. Pettitt, captain of schooner *Cañon*; are *in part* refuted and proved to be infamous slanders; prompted by a spirit of vengeance and persecution which I have suffered, for having supported the rights of the nation and of the people of the colonies in Texas; shall appear in course of time, according to my former binding promises.

George Fisher.”

In a letter of the 16th of February, 1831, to Governor Letona Terán says, “Fisher informed me of the acts and the communications of the municipality of Austin, and I saw that they were very illegal and violent, and to the letter relating to them which that corporation sent me, I answered that the review of the said acts was not one of my functions but that it devolved on the political governor of the State.” Terán complains to the governor “that it appears that in the villa of Austin the decrees and orders of the government do not circulate when they are contrary to the interests of the enterprise of colonization, some which Fisher desired to publish being kept from the knowledge of the community.”

Even before the trouble just mentioned in collecting duties at Galveston, contraband goods were being seized at other points of Texas. Erasmo Seguin, at Bexar, reported June 2, 1830, that “In the inspection that I have just made of the goods presented by the citizen Don Juan Sol, I have found forty pairs of men’s shoes of foreign manufacture, which I have held back on account of the provision forbidding their introduction in the last law concerning the maritime custom-house and frontier.” Two months later a report was received by Gaspar Flores at Bexar, from José M. Salinas, notifying him of the seizure of eight sacks of ammunition of foreign manufacture which had been introduced from New Orleans, through the custom-house of Matagorda, though their entry was prohibited.¹

¹This letter and the report of Seguin already referred to are in the Bexar Archives.

In the first part of November, 1831, Terán and George Fisher arrived at Anahuac to reestablish the custom-house, which had been located at Galveston.¹ During the interval of its suspension, George Fisher's correspondence shows him to have been at Matamoros. After a visit of twelve or fifteen days, Terán left Anahuac and reached Brazos de Santiago in the middle of December, 1831. George Fisher was hardly installed in his office again when he began to cause trouble by his regulations. Stephen F. Austin wrote to Terán, February 5, 1832, from the mouth of the Trinity River while on his return from a visit to Colonel Bradburn, a letter in which, while he reported that all was then tranquil, he complained of the troubles caused by a very impracticable rule made by Fisher on November 24, 1831, in regard to the commerce in the river Brazos. Austin thought that the trouble could have been avoided if, instead of this measure, Fisher had made provision for the trade of the Brazos River to be attended to at the mouth of the river, until the custom-house on Galveston Island should be reestablished. He asked Terán for "the removal of Fisher from the office of administrator of Galveston."²

Bradburn's administration of the customs soon developed into an absolute tyranny, which began with an order, in the fall of 1831, closing all the ports of Texas except Galveston. December 16, 1831, a meeting of citizens was held at Brazoria to consider the conduct of the Mexican government and to ascertain public sentiment in the colony relating to the order.³ The committee was persistent and Bradburn was forced to grant its request.

A few days later, Bradburn proclaimed "the whole country, lying within ten leagues of the coast, to be under *martial law*, and threatened the civil authorities with exemplary punishment if they should dare to assert a rival jurisdiction."⁴

In the meantime the law closing the ports had been resisted by force at Velasco. At this time there were several vessels, the Nelson, the Williams, the Ticson,⁵ and the Sabine, engaged in

¹Stephen F. Austin to James F. Perry, Nov. 15, 1831. Austin Papers.

²Stephen F. Austin to Terán, Feb. 5, 1832. Austin Papers.

³Yoakum, *History of Texas*, 281-282; Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, II 13.

⁴Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, II 15-16.

⁵This name is given by Filisola. It is probably a corruption of Texan—
EDITOR QUARTERLY.

trade between Velasco and New Orleans. The Mexican authorities had not been very strict in collecting duties at Velasco, but learning that the trade was becoming very profitable the commander at Fort Velasco sent word to the captain of the Sabine, Jerry Brown, that he must pay a certain duty and get permission from the commander at Anahuac before his vessel could leave.¹ As there was no easy means of communicating with Anahuac except by water, and the schooner was now prohibited from sailing, its owner, Edwin Waller, went to the commander and offered to pay a duty of fifty dollars, but this was refused, and the sum of one hundred dollars demanded. Waller declined to pay this amount and withdrew. He persuaded Captain Brown to "run the blockade," and with the assistance of William H. Wharton the vessel was untied and started down the river on the 15th of December, 1831. It was fired on by the Mexican guards, but was well protected with bales of cotton and escaped all injury except in its rigging. Another vessel lying farther up the river followed the example of the Sabine. Wharton and Waller were arrested, but through the influence of the former they escaped punishment.² The captain of the Sabine was instructed to buy two cannon with the proceeds from the sale of his cargo and return with them to Velasco.

The receiver at Velasco reported to Terán that the merchants testified that these offenses were due to the hardships imposed on the captains of the vessels and on the trade, since they had to unload at the mouth of the river, where there was no building to shelter the goods from the weather, and after that to go as far as Anahuac, thirty leagues distant, to present their reports.³ The receiver's office was therefore transferred from Velasco to Brazoria and the Ensign Juan Pacho was sent to take charge of it. He arrived on the night of the 22d of January, 1832. His attention was attracted by a crowd of excited colonists on the shore, and he sent an orderly to investigate the cause of the disturbance. As the soldier refused to answer their questions the mob knocked him

¹Filisola, I 179.

²THE QUARTERLY, IV 34-36.

³Filisola, I 186.

down. This incident so frightened Pacho that he fled to the interior to a place of safety.¹

While things were in this condition, the schooner Sabine returned with the two cannon on board and cast anchor at Brazoria, January 39, 1832.

When Terán heard of the departure of the Sabine, in defiance of the Mexican authorities, he dispatched Col. Domingo Ugartechea to act as second in command to Bradburn and to go with troops and public employees to establish a custom-house at the mouth of the Brazos River. As soon as Colonel Ugartechea reached Anahuac with the troops furnished him by Terán to reinforce that place, he was sent by Bradburn on April 2, 1832, with one hundred and ten men and an eight pounder, to establish a fort at the mouth of the Brazos. Bradburn had previously received a reinforcement of one hundred and thirteen men under Añorga, on February 27, 1832.²

A letter from Samuel Williams to Stephen F. Austin, dated April 12, 1832, contains an interesting report from the custom-house at Anahuac, which runs as follows:³ "It is to be observed that although the account that was received bearing the date of the 31st of last December includes all the amount that I have collected, nevertheless there must be in the hands of the officers of the federation, other amounts that belong to the State. Their collection is difficult to make on account of the great distance from this villa to Anahuac where the administrator of the custom-house of Galveston is. The net total from the funds in my power belonging to this department is as is shown by the account, 315 *pesos*, 7 *reales*, 11 *granos*, of which account you may dispose according as it seems best to you."

On the 19th of June, 1832, Stephen F. Austin wrote to D. Domingo Ugartechea from Matamoras, claiming that some indulgence ought to be shown at the custom-house in allowing necessities to pass free, on account of the newness of the country and its small resources. He said that the new law had extended the time for free introduction of some things, but said nothing about iron

¹Filisola, I 186.

²Ibid. I 173.

³Translation.

tools, iron, steel, and coarse bagging for cotton. Thus it had been put in the power of the custom-house officials to make or mar the country.

A few words should be said in regard to the character of the troops and officers stationed in Texas.

Bradburn¹ was said to be naturally of an overbearing disposition. The odium which he had incurred from the colonists and soldiers led Piedras to believe that the troubles at Anahuac to be detailed further on were personal matters.² His unwise and tyrannical measures soon brought Texas, as well as himself, into trouble.

The Mexican law of September 29, 1826, provided for the enlistment of convicts as soldiers, and a large number of the soldiers sent to the garrisons of Texas were of this character. On one occasion, an emigrant at Anahuac so violently wounded his wife in a fit of passion, that she died a few days later. He fled but was captured. He was afterwards offered a reprieve provided he would enlist in the Mexican army, and he consented. One of the soldiers at Anahuac was notorious for having killed not less than eleven persons.³ But in spite of their criminal character, these soldiers were abject cowards.

The Mexican officers varied greatly in their sympathies and conduct towards the Texans. Some of them were exiles on account of their political views. Mexico was in a turmoil at this time owing to the contest between Santa Anna and Bustamante. In February, 1832, Terán sent the four leaders of a revolt in Mata-

¹Colonel Bradburn was a Kentuckian in the Mexican service. He accompanied General Mina on his ill-fated expedition to Soto La Marina in 1817. (Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, 14.) Some act of daring in the battle of Igula secured his promotion in the Mexican army. In the early part of 1830 he was sent out by the Mexican government to New Orleans, very likely for the purpose of ascertaining the object of the United States in establishing a post on the Sabine River and learning something of the views entertained by the colonists. On his return he reported that the troops were stationed near the frontier to prevent smuggling and that the colonists were quiet and well disposed except some new comers and idle, disorderly young men, and that no measure was necessary except to support Colonel Austin with sufficient authority to control this class of people. In a short time after his return he was ordered to Galveston. (See letter of Henry Austin to Stephen F. Austin, July 2, 1830, in the Austin Papers).

²Report of Piedras to Terán, July 12, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

³A *Visit to Texas*, 82-84.

moras which he had quelled to different points in Texas.¹ Such men as these, because of their liberal tendencies, must have felt rather sympathetic towards the Anglo-Americans. In their dealings with the colonists, Piedras and Ugartechea were courteous, considerate, and full of tact.² Ramón Musquiz, political chief at Bexar, was a friend much respected by the colonists. General Terán, however, made himself very unpopular among them by his arbitrary acts.³

Another cause of friction lay in the fact that the suspicion of the Mexicans was aroused by rumors from New York and New Orleans which were brought to the officials that the colonists were only waiting for a pretext for open revolt against the Mexican government. Reports were received that toasts were being offered in New Orleans to the independence of Texas. There was also a large increase in immigration in December, 1831, and in the spring of 1832. In the early part of 1832 this suspicion led Terán to order that the two cannon which he knew were in the possession of private parties in Brazoria be brought and placed in the battery at the mouth of the Brazos or taken to Anahuac.⁴ His object, of course, was to get them out of the hands of the colonists. As later events show, the order was never carried out.

To make things worse, Bradburn, at various times, arbitrarily arrested certain colonists who expressed their views of his conduct.⁵

Among the immigrants who settled in Anahuac in the spring of 1832 were William B. Travis and Patrick C. Jack. They came in order to learn Spanish and to practice law. On May 1, 1832, a meeting was held at Anahuac and arrangements made to organize a company ostensibly for protection against the Indians, but really to resist the arbitrary exactions of Bradburn. Patrick C. Jack was elected captain. When Bradburn heard of these pro-

¹Filisola, I 176-177.

²*Old Times in Texas*, by Guy M. Bryan in the *Fort Worth Gazette* for Dec. 25, 1889.

³Henry Austin to Stephen F. Austin, July 2, 1830. Austin Papers.

⁴Filisola, I 178.

⁵Stephen F. Austin to José Mariano Guerro, July 10, 1832; report of *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe de Austin, July 26, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

ceedings he arrested Jack, but before long released him, and Jack then resumed his command.¹

It seems that there were seven citizens thrown into jail by Bradburn later in May, and that an attempt was made to arrest George M. Patrick and James Linsley, who, however, succeeded in escaping to Austin's colony.² Among those actually arrested were William B. Travis, Patrick C. Jack, Monroe Edwards, and Samuel T. Adams.³

As to the cause of the arrests, the evidence is so conflicting that it seems better to present both sides. The Mexican account is as follows: In the early part of May, 1832, some of Bradburn's convicts made an attack upon a woman,⁴ and an American living in the neighborhood failed to respond to her cries and come to her assistance. Bradburn refused to punish the convict soldier on the demands of the colonists. They therefore gathered in a mob and seized the American. He was tarred and feathered and driven through the town with so much noise that a lieutenant, accompanied by a corporal and four men, came out from the post to ascertain the cause of the disturbance. The soldiers were driven off with blows and pistol shots; but on the appearance of a larger force the mob abandoned their victim and dispersed. Travis, Jack, and two others who took part in the affair were seized and thrown in prison. Some of the official reports mention that in all there were five colonists in prison.⁵

Dr. N. D. Labadie gives an entirely different account of the arrest of Travis and his companions. According to his version of the story, Bradburn offered freedom to all the slaves who presented themselves to him. In consequence of this offer three runaway slaves from Louisiana claimed his protection. When William M. Logan, the owner of the slaves, demanded them, Bradburn refused to turn them over to him unless he presented proof of his owner-

¹*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 30; Stephen F. Austin to José M. Guerro, July 10, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Proceedings of the *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe, July 26, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

³Yoakum, *History of Texas*, I 291; *Texas Almanac*, 1859, pp. 36-40.

⁴Filisola, I 189; Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, II 20-23.

⁵Ramón Musquiz to Col. Antonio Elosua, June 19, 1832; Ramón Musquiz to Governor of State, June 18, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

ship. Logan went back to Louisiana to obtain the necessary evidence, and in a short time presented himself again to Bradburn, who made an appointment on the following day for an examination of the documents. At the proper time Logan appeared, but Bradburn said that the three negroes had asked for the protection of the Mexican flag, and therefore he refused to surrender them. One dark rainy night, soon after this, a tall man wrapped in a cloak appeared before a sentinel and handed him a letter, directed to Bradburn. The letter was signed "Billow." It contained a friendly warning "that a magistrate on the Sabine was organizing a company of one hundred men to cross the river" and forcibly take the three negroes. This letter alarmed Bradburn and caused a great commotion in the Mexican garrison. Scouts were sent out in every direction, but after a week's absence they returned and reported that they had discovered nothing. Bradburn believed that this was a trick played on him by Travis. A few days after this occurrence a guard of soldiers appeared at the office of Travis and Jack and arrested both.¹

Sometime after these arrests, an anonymous letter was discovered in a bundle of the prisoners' clothes as they were being sent out to wash. The letter was addressed to "O. P. Q." Labadie says it was a notice "to have a horse in readiness at a certain hour on Thursday night." In a letter to Bradburn, Juan María Pacho, speaking of the letter, says, "*in this they invite the men of Austin's colony to come to rescue them from the clutches of thirty convict soldiers under sentence who guard this point.*"²

This letter caused Bradburn some uneasiness about the safety of the prisoners. For better security an old brick kiln was repaired and furnished with a cannon, and the prisoners were confined in it. There was great excitement throughout the colony. Judge William H. Jack came over to Anahuac to intercede for his brother and Travis, but Bradburn refused to turn the prisoners over to the civil authorities to be tried. When Judge Jack went away he promised to return soon with assistance. In the meantime it seems that the case of Patrick Jack and Travis was being tried at Anahuac by military law. In a report, "Juan María Pacho, prosecutor," in the

¹*Texas Almanac*, 1859, pp. 31-32.

²Francisco Medina to Elosua, June 25, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.
2-Q

case of Patrick C. Jack, Travis, and others, on the 10th of May, says, "the case which I represent against Travis, Jack and associates, plainly reveals that either an expedition of adventurers from North America is upon us, or the two individuals referred to have a private plan to separate this territory from the supreme authority of the State and federation. I am still making investigations into the matter." Pacho advises Bradburn to communicate this state of affairs to the general commandant in order that he might do what he could to reinforce that point. On the 25th of May Bradburn sent Pacho's letter to Terán, and on June 25, 1832, he sent a copy of it to Francisco Medina in his petition for aid.¹

When William H. Jack returned home, to San Felipe, he appealed to the people of Austin's colony. They adopted the plan of sending committees to all parts of the colony to stir up the colonists to resist the tyranny of Bradburn. Col. William Pettus and William H. Jack went to the settlements of Fort Bend, Brazoria, etc.; Robert M. Williamson was sent to the settlements of Mill Creek, Cole's and Washington; and Benj. Tennell and Francis W. Johnson went to the settlements on Spring Creek, Buffalo Bayou, San Jacinto, and Trinity River.²

The colonists soon began to gather and organize at Minchey's, near Liberty. Francis W. Johnson was elected first, Warren D. C. Hall second, and Thomas H. Bradley third in command. William H. Jack succeeded in collecting about ninety men in Brazoria, including John Austin, Capt. Wily Martin, Henry S. Brown, W. J. Russell, Geo. B. McKinstry, and others. On the fourth of June this force set out from Brazoria under the command of John Austin.³

When they passed by Velasco, Ugartechea came out and tried to dissuade them from their bold undertaking.⁴ Then Austin agreed

¹Francisco Medina to Elosua, June 25, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²*Texas Almanac*, 1859, 36-40.

³John Austin was a native of Connecticut. When a boy, he ran away from home and went to sea as a common sailor. On one of his voyages, he entered a port of Mexico and found his way to the capital. There he met Stephen F. Austin and came to Texas with him (Edward, *History of Texas*, 185).

⁴Filisola, I 190.

to ask for the release of the prisoners in "terms of a petition and friendship."¹ At the request of John Austin, Ugartechea also wrote a petition for their release and sent his adjutant, D. N. Dominguez, with Austin. A force of forty men joined Austin from the neighborhood of Liberty.² Forces continued to arrive through the whole of June.

On the 9th of June, 1832, Bradburn learned of the proximity of these troops.³ The forces took up their march from Liberty towards Turtle Bayou with an advance guard of sixteen men under Robert M. Williamson. When they had marched about half the distance they came upon a reconnoitering force of eighteen Mexican soldiers under Lieutenant Nieto.⁴ Miguel Arciniega reported to Ramón Musquiz that on their way to Anahuac the Americans captured five soldiers and an American, who they said was the confidant of Bradburn.⁵ The party was surprised and captured at La Verdura by the colonists without a shot.

The Texans marched on with their prisoners and encamped on Turtle Bayou at White's crossing. Next day, June 10, at 8 o'clock a. m., they continued their march to Anahuac, which they reached the same morning. A committee composed of Austin, G. B. McKinstry, H. B. Johnson, H. K. Lewis, and Francis W. Johnson was appointed to visit Bradburn. As the force of the Texans was constantly increasing by late arrivals, it is difficult to learn the exact number that reached Anahuac. June 19, 1832, the commandant of Fort Terán, Gavino Aranjo, reported to Col. José de las Piedras that a soldier, Julio Esparsa, had just arrived from Anahuac with information in regard to the revolt in that quarter. He added that he had sent this same Esparsa to Piedras so that he might question him in regard to the events in Anahuac. Piedras seems to have gained the desired information from Esparsa, for in a letter to Col. Antonio Elosua he says: "The annexed copy will notify you of the letter that the commandant of the military detachment of Terán

¹Filisola, I 190.

²*Texas Almanac*, 1859, pp. 36-40.

³Filisola, I 191.

⁴*Texas Almanac*, 1859, pp. 36-40.

⁵Miguel Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

gave me. The bearer of the memorial which pertained to the affair of Anahuac, has shown me that he has been detained on seeking to enter said place by a party of about one hundred and sixty Americans who were besieging it."¹

All the accounts agree in the main in regard to the attack and the parleys with Bradburn. John Austin took by far the most important part in these troubles; indeed, the Mexican authorities claim that he was captain of the Texans.²

When the committee visited Bradburn, Austin presented the recommendation of Ugartechea. Bradburn made various evasive replies—that Colonel Subarán, who had arrived a day or so previous on the schooner *Martha* from Matamoras, was commander of the garrison,³ and that he had to put the question to a vote of his officers.⁴ The question was put to the officers, and their answer was that the prisoners ought to be tried "by military jurisdiction according to article 26 and various others of title 10 subject 8 of the general laws of the army, and that they ought not to be given up on any account. The Texans withdrew and quietly occupied the plaza called *La Malinche*, and the Mexican soldiers retired to the fort.⁵ Bradburn ordered the colonists to leave the settlement and make their demands from without. Another committee waited on Bradburn, but to the same demands they received the same reply. The committee retired, and a light skirmish was kept up between the troops all that day and the following.

On the 11th of June John A. Williams, for the colonists, solicited an interview with Subarán. This was granted by Bradburn, and a committee composed of Subarán, Juan Cortina, Juan María Pacho, and Juan Hurtado met with him. It was agreed that the Texans were to deliver up the Mexican prisoners in their possession and retire six mile from Anahuac, and, on the other hand, the Mexicans agreed to surrender their prisoners in twenty hours after

¹Report of Piedras to Elosua, June 19, 1832; report of Piedras to Terán, July 12, 1832; Francisco Ruiz to Elosua, June 25, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Filisola, I 190; Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

³*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 38.

⁴Filisola, I 192.

⁵Ibid.

the Texans left Anahuac.¹ The colonists refused to keep the agreement made by Williams, and on the 12th they demanded another meeting of commissioners, which Bradburn granted. To this meeting he sent the same committee that served before, but the colonists sent John Austin, Hugh B. Johnson, Wily Martin, and others. The same terms were agreed on as before, and the Mexican soldiers were turned over to Bradburn. The colonists then marched to Turtle Bayou to wait for the prisoners and commissioners to return. A small party of the Texans, fifteen to thirty in number, who lived in Anahuac, remained there with the commissioners.²

During the night Bradburn prepared to defend himself by taking possession of a large quantity of ammunition that was stored in the town, and by sending couriers to every military post in Texas for assistance.³ The general commandant, José Mariano Guerro, had given orders, on May 31, 1832, to Piedras at Nacogdoches to proceed at once to Anahuac and adopt measures to put an end to the disturbances at that place.⁴ In a letter dated Bexar, June 19, 1832, Ramón Musquiz says that "In answer to entreaties and on account of the condition of affairs his presence is necessary, and that by the next day at 12 o'clock he will set out with an escort of ten men in charge of an officer, a secretary, and a clerk to go as far as Anahuac if necessary." Another letter from him⁵ dated Villa de Austin (San Felipe), June 26, 1832, states that he started from Bexar on the 20th of June and arrived at Villa de Austin on the 24th day of June. He immediately began to collect information concerning the trouble at Anahuac.

Francisco Ruiz, in command at Tenoxtitlan, reported to Elosua on the 23d day of June, that he received a letter from Piedras on the 19th of June saying that he intended to start that day for Anahuac and he hoped soon to receive aid from Tenoxtitlan. Ruiz wrote that it was impossible for him to give assistance owing to a practice that was resorted to by commanders on the frontier of allowing all who could, among the troops, to go out in the country

¹Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832; *Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 38.

²*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 39.

³*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 39; Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832.

⁴Filisola, I 190, 212.

⁵Both letters are in the Nacogdoches Archives.

and seek means of livelihood. This was done because of the scant provision made for the frontier troops. He said that he allowed eighteen men to go out on the 12th day of June, and, as they had not returned, he was almost defenseless.¹ On the 20th of June Ruiz received an order from Guerro to send at once twenty-five men and an officer to Brazoria to reinforce Ugartechea. Ruiz reported his absolute inability to comply with the order.² June 25 Bradburn called on Francisco Medina at Nacogdoches for assistance. Medina was unable to help him, and sent the letter to Elosua. Piedras wrote to Elosua for assistance on the eve of his departure for Anahuac.³ According to a report made by Angel Navarro of the troops located at Bexar, Dec. 31, 1832,⁴ the whole force at that point amounted to only eighty-eight men.

The most contrary accounts exist in regard to the forces that Col. Davis Bradburn had available. The American historians estimate the number at one hundred and fifty. Bradburn himself said he was reduced to eighty soldiers after reinforcing Ugartechea.⁵ Filisola⁶ estimates the garrison at forty-one. A pay roll in the Bexar Archives shows the force to have been one hundred and sixty-two soldiers and four officers, May 31, 1832. Another of May 3, 1832, gives a total of one hundred and sixty-two soldiers and three officers.

The morning after the withdrawal of the colonists to Turtle Bayou, when Bradburn had secured himself and sent for aid, the men of the garrison in Anahuac noticed that some of the houses remained closed up unusually long.⁷ They suspected the colonists of breaking the agreement. Bradburn sent word to Austin "that it was already time, that he was well fortified, and that he might come and receive the prisoners."⁸ Preparations were then made for

¹Ruiz to Elosua, June 25, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Ruiz to Guerro, July 3, 1832. Bexar Archives.

³The two letters last mentioned are in the Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴In the Bexar Archives.

⁵Medina to Elosua, June 25, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁶I 193.

⁷Filisola, I 196.

⁸Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

an attack on the Texans. Lieutenant Colonel Subarán was to make a sally with a force of about forty-five men carrying a four pound gun.¹

On receiving the notice from Bradburn that he did not intend keeping the agreement, Austin reported it to the small party who remained with the commissioners. An express was sent at once to the main body of the troops, encamped on Turtle Bayou. In the meantime the Mexicans advanced and a short engagement took place in which five Mexican soldiers and one American were killed.² As soon as the messenger arrived at Turtle Bayou to report Bradburn's perfidy, the company set out immediately for Anahuac to reinforce the party with the commissioners.³ Soon after leaving their camp, they met the party from Anahuac. The whole force then returned to Turtle Bayou in order to enlist reinforcements and to formulate some plan of action.⁴

While the colonists were reassembled at Turtle Bayou, a meeting was held and their grievances considered. Reports had already reached them of the revolution in progress in Mexico, and of the pronunciamiento in favor of Santa Anna and the constitution of 1824. A committee was appointed "to draw up a preamble and resolutions declaratory of the wrongs and abuses committed by the chief magistrate of the nation and his minions of the army; and also of the determination of Texas to repel further aggressions by the military, and to maintain their rights under the constitution of 1824."⁵ The resolutions were unanimously adopted, June 13, 1832. They are as follows:

Resolved, That we view with feelings of deepest regret, the manner in which the government of the republic of Mexico is administered by the present dynasty; the repeated violations of the constitution; the total disregard of the law; the entire prostration of

¹Filisola, I 197.

²Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives. Harry Moore wrote to James F. Perry on his return from Brazoria, where he saw John Austin, and said that Austin learned that "at the time the Americans were before Anahuac there were four Mexicans killed and four wounded." (H. Moore to James F. Perry, Aug. 5, 1832. Austin Papers).

³Arciniega to Ramón Musquiz, June 17, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 39.

⁵Ibid.

the civil authority and the substitution in its stead of a military despotism, are grievances of such a character as to arouse the feelings of every freeman, and impel him to resistance.

"Resolved, That we view with feelings of deepest interest and solicitude, the firm and manly resistance which is made by the highly talented and distinguished chieftain, Gen. Santa Anna, to the numberless encroachments and infractions which have been made by the present administration upon the constitution and laws of our adopted and beloved country.

"Resolved, That as *freemen* devoted to a correct interpretation and enforcement of the constitution and laws, according to their true spirit, we pledge our lives and fortunes in support of the same, and of the distinguished leader, who is now so gallantly fighting in defense of civil liberty.

"Resolved, That the people of Texas be invited to co-operate with us in support of the principles incorporated in the foregoing resolutions."¹

It was then decided that John Austin, George B. McKinstry, Henry S. Brown, Wm. J. Russell and others should go to Brazoria for men and three cannon that were in the hands of private citizens living in Brazoria. Col. Wm. Pettus and Robert M. Williamson were sent to San Felipe to collect men. The colonists were joined by Capt. Abner Kuykendall from Austin's colony with from forty to sixty men.² Parties were arriving daily.³ Another attack was not to be made until the arrival of the cannon from Brazoria.

A meeting of citizens was held at Brazoria to decide whether they should take part in the war against the Mexicans. After much debate upon the subject, the matter was left in the hands of a committee: Edwin Waller, W. J. Russell, Thomas Westall, J. W. Cloud, and P. D. McNeil. Although there was some disagreement, the committee at last reported a unanimous vote for war.⁴ Forces

¹Holley, *Texas* (1833), 150-151.

²*Texas Almanac*, 1859, p. 39.

³T. J. Pilgrim to Samuel M. Williams, June 30, 1830. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴THE QUARTERLY, IV 36. This was not the first time that a plan for an attack on Velasco had been offered to the colonists of Brazoria. At a meeting on May 11th, 1832, such a motion was made and lost by only one vote. Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, II 19.

were rapidly gathered and placed under the command of John Austin. In the following letter John Austin acknowledges the offer of a kind service by Father Muldoon, an Irish priest, very popular among the early Texans:

“*Rev. M. Muldoon.*

“MY DEAR SIR:

“In answer to your note of this date offering yourself as a hostage for the liberty, etc., of the persons imprisoned at Anahuac, I have only to say that it is not in my power at this time to prevent the march of the citizens, they have declared in favor of the constitution and General Santa Anna and I consider all opposed to said declaration as enemies to their cause, but I assure you so long as I may have any influence there shall be no injury done to any private individual, either to their person or property, and beg leave to assure you that wherever you may be, you will always have a warm friend and protector, as far as his abilities may extend, in your

devoted parishoner,

JOHN AUSTIN.”

“Brazoria, June 21, 1832.”¹

The colonists started from Brazoria one hundred and twenty strong to attack Ugartechea at Velasco.² The number who attacked Velasco is put at one hundred and fifty by Ramón Musquiz and this number is accepted by the *ayuntamiento* of San Felipe de Austin in a communication to Musquiz, June 30, 1832. The Mexican force under Ugartechea was composed of ninety-one men.³

Father Muldoon made another effort to prevent bloodshed. While visiting Ugartechea on private business he tried to make an adjustment of the difficulties, but failed.⁴

On the 3d of June, four of the revolutionists appeared at the fort and called on Ugartechea to proclaim his adhesion to the plan of Vera Cruz, and to allow the Brazoria with the cannon from the town of that name to pass. The Brazoria had been dislodged from a

¹See Diplomatic Correspondence, Department of State.

²THE QUARTERLY, IV 36.

³Ramón Musquiz to Captain Ortega, July 2, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives

⁴Brown, *History of Texas*, I 182.

sand-bank in the Brazos River a few miles above its mouth, and floated down in the charge of Capt. William J. Russell and forty colonists. Ugartechea of course refused the demand of the colonists, knowing that the force intended to attack Anahuac. During the next few days the revolutionists were arriving and making ready for an attack. On the night of the 26th of June, the schooner was seen approaching the fort under full sail. At the same time the revolutionists approached by land.¹ The attack was made a little before midnight of the same day. Austin's force advanced in three divisions from three different directions. An incessant fire was kept up on both sides until half an hour after sunrise on the 27th. One of the hardest showers that had ever been experienced in that neighborhood put a stop to the fighting, and the colonists were compelled to retreat. The schooner *Brazoria*, however, remained in position, about one hundred and fifty yards from the fort, well supplied with ammunition and ready to renew the attack. In the intermission, James B. Baily was sent out to raise a reinforcement of fifteen or more men to resume the attack.² Ugartechea spent the interval in replenishing and renovating his scant store of ammunition.

On the 28th a conference was held between Ugartechea and John Austin. The revolutionists then offered that, if Ugartechea would evacuate the fort and surrender his arms, he might set out with his troops wherever he chose, and they would supply the necessary assistance. Ugartechea, however, refused to surrender on any other consideration than that he might retire with all his forces, all their arms, ammunition, and equipments, and with honors of war. The colonists would not agree to let him go without surrendering his arms. The conference broke up, and Ugartechea returned to the fort to prepare to meet another attack. That night a committee waited on Ugartechea at the fort and announced that the colonists had come to an agreement and that another conference would be held the next day.

On the 29th the commissioners appointed by Ugartechea, Lieutenant Moret and Ensigo Rincón, met those of the colonists, W. H.

¹Filisola, I 201.

²James B. Baily to David Shelby, June 27, 1830. Nacogdoches Archives.

Wharton and W. J. Russell, and signed an agreement which was approved by John Austin and Ugartechea.¹ They agreed that,

“First—The garrison will be permitted to march out with all the honours of war, that is to say, with their arms, ammunition and baggage.

“Second—There shall be a vessel made ready for their embarkation to Matamoras, they paying to the captain of the same, 600 dollars for the voyage.

“Third—If the collector, Don Francisco Duclor, should wish to embark, he may do so, the Sargt. Ignatus Lopez, and two soldiers, who remain with the former, shall be suffered to come and incorporate themselves.

“Fourth—All the wounded military of the garrison who can march, shall carry arms, and those who cannot, must remain to be cured, receive good treatment and hospitality, being supplied with food, which will be satisfied by the nation.

“Fifth—The 600 dollars, which the captain of the vessel is to receive, shall be free of duties, and the troops shall be disembarked outside the bar of the Brazos Santiago.

“Sixth—Lieut. Col. citizen Domingo Ugartechea, the two officers who sign, and the ensign Don Emanuel Pintardo, remain by this treaty, obliged not to return to take arms, against the expressed plan above cited—formed under the orders of General Antonia Lopez de Santa Anna, and by the garrison of Vera Cruz.

“Seventh—This day at 11 o'clock in the morning, will be ready, the schooner, Brazoria, in which the garrison of the fort is to embark, but previous to her going to sea, the schooner Elizabeth should arrive at this point, the garrison shall be put on board the latter.

“Eighth—The cannon of eight, and the swivel gun, shall remain at Fort Velasco, with all the public stores, supernumerary guns and ammunition.

“Ninth—All sorts of provisions, after the garrison shall have taken what may be necessary for its march, are to remain in the fort, at the disposal of the owners, given the corresponding promissory notes, that their pay may be satisfactorily made to the captain

¹Filisola, I 208; Holley, *Texas* (1833), 158-159.

of the transporting vessel, who shall carry the power of the owners for the recovery of their import."¹

The Brazoria was found to be so badly damaged by the fire from the fort that it could not be readily repaired, nor could another vessel be obtained. Thus the Mexican troops were compelled to go by land to Matamoras.² All the other provisions of the treaty were carried out.

The reports of the battle show that the Mexicans lost five killed and sixteen wounded, while the Americans lost seven killed and fourteen wounded.³ Foote⁴ and Yoakum⁵ say that seven Texans were killed and twenty-seven wounded, while there were thirty-five Mexicans killed and fifteen wounded. The number of killed and wounded on both sides is very much exaggerated by other Texas historians.⁶

While these events were taking place at Velasco, Piedras was advancing to the aid of Bradburn. On the 19th of June, Piedras received an account of the affairs at Anahuac through a messenger from the commander of Fort Terán. Piedras's whole force at Nacogdoches did not exceed three hundred men. As he had received repeated accounts of a rising among the Ayish Bayou colonists to join the insurgents, he hesitated to go to Anahuac. He, however, wrote to Elosua for assistance, telling him of the condition of affairs at Ayish Bayou. At the same time he said, "I am not able to count upon ten dollars in silver for the expenses of this expedition, and I hope that you may procure some aid of this kind for me, without which I shall find myself in danger." He went on to say that he had sent Colonel Bean to enlist the support of the Indians, and that he would set out immediately with two companies of the 12th battalion and some civilians, leaving Medina in command at Nacogdoches.⁷ In a later report⁸ he said that he had started on

¹Holley, *Texas* (1833), 158-159.

²Filisola, I 209.

³Ramón Musquiz to Ortega, July 2, 1832; T. J. Pilgrim to S. M. Williams, June 30, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴*Texas and the Texans*, II 22-32.

⁵*History of Texas*, I 295.

⁶Brown, *History of Texas*, I 187; Thrall, *Pictorial History of Texas*, 182.

⁷Piedras to Elosua, June 19, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁸In the Nacogdoches Archives.

June 19th with sixty infantry and fifty cavalry. He stopped at Fort Terán where he received a reinforcement of cavalry.¹ Here he was informed that the object of the colonists was not only to reclaim the prisoners, but also to have the plan of Vera Cruz adopted.² He marched on to "Chere's House," where an advance of twenty colonists had been stationed, but they withdrew on his approach. A little beyond this place he stopped for a time in order that he might not be too far from Nacogdoches to give assistance in case there should be a rising there. He delayed several days to gather information about the object of the colonists in revolting. Having been informed that meetings had been held in the Ayish Bayou settlement, and that fifty men had gone from the Sabine and from Bevil to join the insurgents, and also that there was a gathering of forces at Brazoria to make an attack on Velasco, he began to fear that a similar rising would take place at Nacogdoches, and he was anxious to get home. In order to make some arrangement for the suspension of hostilities, he sent an officer and a civilian to ascertain the wishes of the colonists. He was informed of the grievances due to Bradburn's repeated breaches of faith. The colonists requested an interview with Piedras on the following day. Instead, he sent a commission with an agreement ratified by himself to treat with a similar commission from the colonists. The commissioners agreed upon the treaty which follows:

"Second adjutant D. Gavino Arango, National Ensign Juan Lasarin, and Mr. George Pollitt, as representatives of the citizen Col. José de las Piedras, met at the Atascosito Creek Frank W. Johnson, James Lindsay,³ and Randall Jones elected by the citizens of that district—all empowered to make and agree to some treaty that would put an end to the existing disturbances and free the country from the sad consequences of civil war—and after deliberating they agreed to the following articles:

"1. The prisoners that Colonel Bradburn has at Anahuac, who are not soldiers and on whose account the disturbances have arisen, shall be given up to the jurisdiction of the civil authorities of the villa of Liberty, who shall try them according to the laws of the

¹Communication of *ayuntamiento* of Nacogdoches to political chief, Aug. 14, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

²Report of Piedras, July 12, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

³Probably identical with "James Linsley" named on p. 280.

country. Colonel Piedras shall appoint a committee to carry out this article.

“2. When the chief of the department shall order the establishment of the *ayuntamiento* of the villa of Liberty, it shall be established from the moment these articles are ratified by Colonel Piedras.

“3. Colonel Piedras shall request Señor Bradburn to surrender the command of Anahuac to an officer whom he may choose from that or another garrison, and in case Bradburn refuses he shall lay before the commandant of the department the causes which the inhabitants have had for being displeased with him; for which purpose Colonel Piedras shall be furnished with an account of the acts of which Bradburn is accused.

“4. The inhabitants are at liberty to present a remonstrance to the superior authorities against said Colonel Bradburn for the injuries which they declare he has caused them, or for the errors he may have committed in the execution of the laws.

“5. The property and business interests which Bradburn has appropriated for the use of the garrison at Anahuac shall be indemnified after having been determined by law.

“6. As soon as these articles are ratified by Señor Piedras, the force of the inhabitants, which has collected, shall disperse to their homes to busy themselves with their private occupations, and none shall continue hostilities.

“7. The *alcalde* of Liberty, or two persons that he may name from the members of his *ayuntamiento*, shall go to Anahuac to receive the prisoners, which the committee of Señor Piedras shall deliver to them.

“And having agreed to the above articles, both committees signed them on the said Atascosito Creek on the 28th day of June, 1832. Gavino Aranjó, Juan Lasarin, George Pollitt, James Lindsay, Frank W. Johnson, Randall Jones. I ratify these articles this 29th day of June, 1832. José de las Piedras.”¹

Piedras's excuse for giving such favorable terms was that it was merely a truce to give time for help to arrive from the interior.

In writing to Ramón Musquiz of the condition of affairs after the treaty of peace, Hugh B. Johnson says: “I have the satisfaction of informing you that your fatherly advice together with the inter-

¹Translation of copy in Nacogdoches Archives.

position of Col. José de las Piedras, has restored peace and tranquillity among the inhabitants, and upon a basis not likely soon again to be disturbed. Colonel Piedras has re-established the *ayuntamiento* of Liberty in the exercise of the functions of three officers. I am now on the eve of going with the Colonel to the garrison of Anahuac for the purpose of receiving the prisoners there detained by the commandant of the post."¹

Piedras proceeded at once to Anahuac accompanied by the *alcalde* and first *regidor* of the *ayuntamiento* of Liberty, which had met on the day previous. They reached Anahuac on July 1, 1832. During the night a party of six men, who belonged to a company of volunteers—tories from the neighborhood who had joined Bradburn—went to a house where the *alcalde*, *regidor*, and William Hardin were spending the night and tried to sieze them. The three succeeded in making their escape through a window.² Piedras had guaranteed the safety of these men when they came with him, and was uneasy lest the affair be misunderstood. A party was sent out to look for them, but only the *alcalde* was found. He returned, but the other two fled to the Texas camp.

The Texan prisoners were turned over to the *alcalde*, who had them placed in confinement in the town of Liberty to await their trial. Very soon after this they were released.³

Piedras sought to collect some evidence in support of the accusations made against Bradburn. In his report, Piedras says, "I acknowledge that wisdom and prudence have not been exercised in that place. I do not find him guilty of as many abuses as are imputed to him, and the only blame that it is possible to attach to him, is that he permitted himself to be guided by a rascally *presidario*, who acted as his secretary and was called Ugarte, a very criminal, wicked, intriguing, and seditious man."⁴ Bradburn relinquished his command, though he remained in the service, and Piedras placed Second Adjutant Juan Cortina in charge, admonishing him to "act with much tact in order to avoid a rupture."⁵ He ordered

¹Hugh B. Johnson to Ramón Musquiz, July 1, 1832. Diplomatic Correspondence, Department of State.

²Report of Piedras, July 12, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

³Filisola, I 212.

⁴Report of Piedras, July 12, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁵Piedras to Bradburn, July 4, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

the fortifying of the town to be carried on so that it would be perfectly secure. To Bradburn, Piedras writes:¹ "I ask you only to act prudently in order to prolong the armistice, which I only hold as such without interfering for the present by putting into execution some orders from the general commandant, which tend to increase the indignation, until the government is able to compel the colonists to obey the law and reduce them to the blindest obedience."

In a letter of June 26, 1832,² Ramón Musquiz speaks in the highest terms of the service, during these troubles, of the members of the *ayuntamiento* at Liberty, of Samuel Williams and Thomas J. Chambers, and of José Antonio Navarro, the commissioner, and of José M. Carbajal, the surveyor.

After these arrangements, Piedras set out for Nacogdoches, leaving an order for Subarán to follow him immediately. On his arrival in Nacogdoches, he learned that the Ayish people had held their meeting but did not embark in the revolt, owing to their fear of the Indians.³

An account of the pronunciamiento at Anahuac is given by Cortina in a letter to Piedras,⁴ which I translate as follows: "I have to inform you that at 12 o'clock the 11th inst., [in the month of July] the troops of this garrison revolted, taking up arms and turning them against me and the eleven officials who were trying to check the disorder. According to your direction, I gave up the command at the time to Colonel Davis, and he never succeeded in pacifying the spirit of insubordination of the soldiers who cried: 'Long live General Santana. We do not wish our officers to command us. Sr. Subarán is our commander.' Seeing this, Señor Davis caused Señor Subarán to be acknowledged commander of the force, who had never agreed that the officers they had should command the troop. On the 13th, six of us, officers, left Anahuac in order that we might save ourselves from the clutches of the insubordinate soldiery; for Señor Subarán said that within the limit of two hours he would be unable to answer for the lives of the officers, because the troops did not want them. We presented our-

¹In the letter cited.

²In the Nacogdoches Archives.

³Report of Piedras, July 12, 1832. Nacogdoches Archives.

⁴Nacogdoches Archives.

selves to Alcalde Thomson in Atascosito, and he offered us his protection. The follies committed by Subarán are many, and through the copy that I enclose you of the letter that I have passed on to the said chief, you will ascertain what they are. Colonel Davis also departed on the 14th, no one knows where. The troop of cavalry has gone, under its commandant, to La Bahia, as I am informed. In Anahuac the only forces are the Twelfth and the Tampico, risen in revolt and prepared to leave, with Tampico or Vera Cruz as destination, in the two vessels which they went to San Jacinto to get. I judge it to be necessary that you immediately set out for this post. You may feel assured that the colonists are for order."

Subarán consented for Bradburn to leave on the condition that he would go by water and without the knowledge of the troops. Bradburn found the port blockaded and was forced to go by land. His friends furnished him with a horse and guide. He succeeded in getting away from Anahuac at 8 o'clock on the night of the 13th of July, 1832.¹ It is said that he crossed the Sabine with eight men in pursuit. They came so close upon him that they got his horse, and he was forced to swim the river above the ferry.² On Bradburn's arrival in New Orleans, a vessel was immediately chartered, and he was sent back to Mexico. He afterwards appeared in Texas in the rear-guard of the Mexican invading army of the Revolution.

Subarán wrote to Alcalde Thomson, asking him to secure the officers, Montero, Landavazo, Dominguez, and Añorga, and to surrender them as prisoners. This, Thomson refused to do.

When Colonel Mejía left Brazoria on the night of the 23d of July, he made a short visit to Galveston, reaching that port about the 24th of July. As he passed the bar Subarán and his troop were going on their way to Matamoras. Cortina and his party were left in Anahuac, to depend upon the colonists for subsistence.

Later we hear of Cortina through a report from General Filisola. On his way to Texas, Filisola reached Saltillo March 20, 1833. While he remained there gathering information concerning the condition of affairs in Texas, he received a letter from the governor containing a report from Juan Cortina at Galveston. Cortina said

¹Filisola, I 220.

²Harry Moore to James F. Perry, Aug. 5, 1832. Austin Papers.

that on the 29th of September, 1832, the receiver of the Brazos, Juan Francisco Duclor, and Ensign Ignacio Dominguez, left for New Orleans, because they could not endure the ungovernable disposition of the inhabitants of Brazoria, who refused to pay duties. He reported, that on the night of the 29th of November, the colonists set fire to the military quarters of Hidalgo and the fortifications of the place, destroying part of the foundation and building materials for the fortified house that was being constructed. He concluded by saying: "My stay in this establishment, as well as that of Lieutenant Montero and Aspirante Añorga, is useless, because we have for our whole force only three to command respect as is shown by the statement that I have the honor of forwarding to you. The lack of resources, etc., compels me to send Añorga with these communications to you."¹

A letter from Stephen F. Austin, at Matamoras, May 30, 1833, tells of the plans to re-establish the custom-house at Galveston. He says:

"The General [Filisola] has orders to re-establish the custom-house and the military garrisons, and will proceed to do so, for the purpose of protecting the public revenue, and stopping the scandalous contraband that has been carried on in tobacco from the ports of Texas. I have assured him that he would receive the support of the colonists in sustaining the Revenue Law, and that they would do their full duty faithfully as Mexican citizens. . . . Mr. George Fisher will leave here shortly to enter upon the duties of Collector of Galveston, with only a sufficient number of troops for necessary guards, etc.

"Whatever ideas and opinions may have heretofore existed as to Mr. Fisher, they should now be consigned to oblivion and forgotten. He returns as an officer of the Government, and as such it is the duty of the people to respect and sustain him. I will also observe that I have investigated very minutely all the past transactions in which he was concerned, and have formed the opinion that the excitement which unfortunately grew out of them, was produced by misconceptions and suspicions too hastily entertained, and not from an intention to do wrong or injure any one. I believe there were misconceptions on both sides, and probably as much on one part as on the other. Mr. Fisher will make an useful collector.

¹Filisola, I 300-302.

His knowledge of the English language will give more facilities in his intercourse with the people than could exist with a collector who was unacquainted with that language. I therefore particularly recommend the utmost harmony with him, and that he be sustained in the discharge of his duty by all, regardless of the clamors of a few transient traders who would involve the honest farmer in difficulty with the authorities, if they could increase their profits thereby."¹

¹Brown, *Life of Henry Smith*, 20--21.