

7-16-2021

"As Vigilant as Argus": A Military History of the Irish and Tejano Tories of the Texas Revolution

Jonathan Woodward

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rio.tamtu.edu/etds>

Recommended Citation

Woodward, Jonathan, "As Vigilant as Argus": A Military History of the Irish and Tejano Tories of the Texas Revolution" (2021). *Theses and Dissertations*. 154.
<https://rio.tamtu.edu/etds/154>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Research Information Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Research Information Online. For more information, please contact benjamin.rawlins@tamtu.edu, eva.hernandez@tamtu.edu, jhatcher@tamtu.edu, rhinojosa@tamtu.edu.

“AS VIGILANT AS ARGUS”: A MILITARY HISTORY OF THE IRISH AND TEJANO
TORIES OF THE TEXAS REVOLUTION, 1835-1836

A Thesis

by

JONATHAN LAMAR WOODWARD

Submitted to Texas A&M International University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2020

Major Subject: History and Political Thought

**“AS VIGILANT AS ARGUS”: A MILITARY HISTORY OF THE IRISH AND
TEJANO TORIERS OF THE TEXAS REVOLUTION, 1835-1836**

Copyright 2020 Jonathan Lamar Woodward

“AS VIGILANT AS ARGUS”: A MILITARY HISTORY OF THE IRISH AND
TEJANO TORIES OF THE TEXAS REVOLUTION, 1835-1836

A Thesis

by

JONATHAN LAMAR WOODWARD

Submitted to Texas A&M International University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Committee Chair, | Aaron A. Olivas |
| Committee Members, | Jerry D. Thompson |
| | Andrew J. Hazelton |
| | Alfonso R. Vergaray |
| Head of Department, | Jonathan W. Murphy |

May 2020

Major Subject: History and Political Thought

ABSTRACT

“As Vigilant as Argus”: A Military History of the Irish and Tejano Tories of the Texas Revolution, 1835-1836 (May 2020)

Jonathan Lamar Woodward, Bachelor of Arts, University of West Florida;
Chair of Committee: Dr. Aaron Alejandro Olivas

This thesis analyzes the Irish and Tejano Tories of the Texas Revolution from a military perspective. Emphasizing ideas of historical tradition and heritage, this work examines the Tories as continuations of the Wild Geese, *soldados de cuera*, and *compañías volantes*. This is done through an examination of Irish and Tejano Tory motivation in supporting Mexico and military participation in the Texas Revolution. This work also examines ideas of economic opportunity, social acceptance, personal conservatism, distrust of foreign settlement, and fear of invasion or reprisal as factors in Toryism or loyalism. Militarily, this thesis examines Tory military roles alongside Mexican forces as continuations of their historical predecessors. This work contributes to Texas and borderlands history through its focus on the conduct of the Texas Revolution and ideas of negotiable loyalty within a borderland.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family and friends, without whose love and support I could not have succeeded in this endeavor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the immeasurable guidance and assistance given to me by my thesis committee: Dr. Aaron Olivas, Dr. Jerry Thompson, Dr. Andrew Hazelton, and Dr. Alfonso Vergaray. They have all guided and assisted me in my research and writing process, and this work would not have been possible without them. I would also like to acknowledge the guidance of Dr. Stephen Hardin and David Vickers, both of whom used their immense knowledge of the Texas Revolution to assist me by suggesting sources and discussing my research at length. Finally, I must acknowledge the support of my fellow Texas Revolution living historians—Edward Teniente, Elfu Santos, Martin R. Vasquez and Adam Dominguez—who not only suggested my research topic, but enthusiastically supported my research and awaited its completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | iv |
| DEDICATION..... | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | vii |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE TORIES..... | 1 |
| 2 “IRISH PARTOZANS OF CENTRALISM”: THE SAN PATRICIO TORIES..... | 21 |
| 3 “WORTHY COUNTRYMEN”: TEJANO TORIES..... | 35 |
| 4 “IMPORTANT SERVICES”: MILITARY PARTICIPATION OF THE TORIES..... | 47 |
| 5 CONCLUSION..... | 70 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 77 |
| VITA..... | 80 |

CHAPTER 1

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE TORIES

Though the Texas Revolution (1835-1836) became a war for independence, it did not begin as such. The Revolution initially began as part of the centralist-federalist civil wars that Mexico had engaged in since the 1820s, specifically as a federalist revolt to restore the Mexican Constitution of 1824. This revolution only became a war of independence later in the conflict. And like many civil wars and revolutions, not everyone within Texas supported the rebels. There existed in Texas a portion of the population—both Anglo and Tejano—that supported neither revolution or independence and supported the Mexican government, and were noted as being “as vigilant as Argus” in their efforts.¹ These loyalists or “Tories,” as the revolutionary faction described them, decided to support the Mexican government for multiple reasons, with scholars generally agreeing that no single factor caused Tory sentiment. As described by Texas Revolution scholar Paul D. Lack, these factors ranged from regional disharmony to personality clashes, contests for leadership, and ethnic tensions.²

This thesis is a military history of the Tories of the Texas Revolution, focusing on the Irish Tories of San Patricio and the Tejano Tories of the Goliad-Lipantitlán area. It will first examine how scholars have approached the Tories in their own work, highlighting how they have portrayed these Tories and what they emphasized in their publications. This work will examine the factors that likely motivated the Tories in their Toryism, focusing on the Irish Tories of San Patricio and

This thesis follows the model of *The American Historical Review*.

¹ M. Hawkins to J.W. Robinson, Béxar, Jan. 24, 1836, in *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar*, ed. Charles Adams Gulick, Jr., Vol. 1 (Austin, TX: A.C. Baldwin & Sons, 1922), 307.

² Paul D. Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience: A Political and Social History, 1835-1836* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1992), 177.

Tejano Tories of Goliad, San Antonio, and Laredo. This examination will cover a range of ideas like social acceptance, economic opportunity, gratitude, and a sense of indebtedness as motivators for Toryism. These will also cover ideas of personal conservatism, distrust of foreigners, and fear of invasion or governmental reprisal. This work will then analyze the military participation of the Tories alongside Mexican forces by detailing their engagement in several battles during the Revolution. This will highlight Tory tactical and strategic contributions to the Mexican war effort and examine how these contributions were continuations of historical military precedents by the Tories.

It engages with new military history by arguing that the participation of Irish and Tejano Tories alongside Mexican forces was a continuation of the tradition of the Irish Wild Geese and the heritage of the Spanish *soldado de cuera* and *compañía volante* via their methods of war and motivations for supporting the Mexican government. Regarding old military history, an examination of Tory tactical and strategic contributions to the Mexican war effort will be conducted, focusing on physical warfare waged by the Tories. The Tories of the Texas Revolution have gained some attention from scholars, but they remain a marginalized topic. By studying them from a military context, this work hopes to shed light on their participation in the Texas Revolution and illustrate how and why they fought alongside the Mexican forces in Texas.

Scholars of the Texas Revolution have evolved within the last thirty or so years regarding their treatment of the Tories. Whereas scholars of the nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth often ignored the Tories, recent scholarship has worked to include them in discussions of the Revolution. This is part of a larger trend in scholarship focusing on the socio-cultural aspects of the Revolution. This new approach has produced works focusing exclusively on Tejanos, women (both Anglo and Tejano), African Americans, and slavery. Recent scholars have also attempted to produce less

Texian-centric studies by presenting the Mexican perspective, writing works detailing the political situation in Mexico during the 1830s, the experience of the Mexican Army in Texas, and Texas's place in the broader narrative of the Mexican civil war of the 1830s. The Tories are part of this approach because as part of the population of Texas, they experienced each of these three factors during the Texas Revolution. They were affected by Mexico's political situation of civil war, revolution, and governmental. Tories played a part in the experience of the Mexican Army in Texas by aiding and abetting Mexican troops against the Texian rebels. Finally, they demonstrate the place of Texas in the broader narrative of the Mexican civil war because they demonstrate that the Texas Revolution took the form of a civil war that was affected by the broader conflict in Mexico.

When scholars of the Texas Revolution have approached the Tories in their work, they have tended to focus on their motivations for supporting the Mexican government, and typically from a socio-political or economic-political perspective. For Anglo Tories, scholars typically emphasize their economic situation as key motivators for their Toryism, particularly those who had prospered under Mexican taxation and land laws. Regarding Tejano Tories, scholars have often emphasized their ethnic ties to Mexico and the tension that existed between Anglos and Tejanos in Texas.

One of the foremost pieces of scholarship on the Tories is Margaret Swett Henson's "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion, 1832-1836" (1986). She provides historical precedent and documentation to the use of the term "Tory," explaining that the term appears in Texas during the Anahuac Disturbances, where William B. Travis derides the citizenry that supported Mexican officials as "Tories and cowards."³ Overall, Henson examines Tory sentiment amongst Anglo-Texians in the years preceding the Revolution and at the very beginning of the conflict. Henson

³ Margaret Swett Henson, "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion 1832-1836," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 1, Vol. 90 (June 1986): 1-34; 18.

also examines what may have motivated these Tories to support the Mexican government as well as their demographics. Henson argues that Anglo Tories (specifically those along the Trinity and Brazos Rivers in East Texas) were generally older men who had settled in Texas before the 1830s, including those who settled in Stephen F. Austin's colony in the 1820s. These Tories also held vested interests in land titles, many having prospered under the immigration laws, relatively low taxation, and generous land grants the Mexican government gave to entice Anglo immigrants to Texas. By contrast, members of the revolutionary faction were generally younger men who had recently arrived in Texas shortly before the outbreak of hostilities, such as William Barret Travis. Henson also contrasts their places of origin. According to Henson, the revolutionary faction tended to originate from the former frontier settlements of the American South, whereas the Tories generally were not. These southern newcomers possessed strong attitudes concerning individual liberties that contributed to their revolutionary activity against the Mexican government when they felt that their rights had been violated.⁴ Henson states that because of the Tories' interests in land and prosperity under the Mexican government, they supported Mexico during the Revolution for economic reasons and not for political ideologies, such as a defense of their political rights as Mexican citizens.⁵ Henson also explains that Tory military activity along the Trinity and Brazos was extremely limited, with few if any Tories answering the call for militia on March 6, 1836.⁶

Henson even narrates two legends surrounding the Tories of the Trinity and the Brazos that supposedly occurred in April 1836 during the San Jacinto Campaign. The first is the story of a group of around twenty mounted Tories from the Trinity and Brazos settlements who appeared atop a hill on the east bank of the San Jacinto River on April 20, the day before the Battle of San

⁴ Henson, "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion," 7.

⁵ Henson, "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion," 31.

⁶ Henson, "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion," 27.

Jacinto. According to local legend, the men turned and fled upon seeing the Texian Army on the west bank preparing for battle, with the hill being nicknamed “Tory Hill” because of this incident. The second legend concerns a supposed list of around one hundred and fifty Tories that was recovered from Santa Anna’s personal baggage following the Battle of San Jacinto. This story was supplied by Lieutenant David L. Kokernot, a Texian officer who lead a company in the area of the Trinity River and San Jacinto battleground to drive livestock from Tory homes. However, Henson states that the list disappeared and that figures would likely have been much smaller than the stated one hundred and fifty.⁷ Henson exemplifies the socio-political argument for Toryism as she explicitly states that for Anglo Tories in East Texas, defense of their economic interests far outweighed any political ideology.

Perhaps the most in-depth research on the Tories is found in Paul D. Lack’s *The Texas Revolutionary Experience: A Political and Social History, 1835-1836*. Lack devotes an entire chapter to both Anglo and Tejano Tories. Lack strictly defines Tory behavior as giving aid to the centralist forces in Texas through military service and support. According to him, this support represented only a relatively low percentage of the population in Texas. Lack also states that military participation is the most effective means of discerning “genuine” Tory sentiment, based on the assumption that areas that provided the lowest number of volunteers to the Texian forces must have been populated mostly by Tories. Lack identifies the lower valleys of the Guadalupe, San Antonio, and Nueces Rivers as areas with the lowest support for the Revolution, with these municipalities providing less than fifty volunteers to the Texian Army.⁸ Of these areas, the greatest Anglo military support likely came from the Irish colony of San Patricio. In November 1835, Irish citizens from San Patricio fought alongside the Mexican Army at the Battle of Lipantitlán and

⁷ Henson, “Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion,” 26-27.

⁸ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 156-157.

provided intelligence to General José de Urrea during his campaign up the Texas coast in 1836. These Irish informants were able to convince some of Urrea's officers that the "war to the death" strategy of Santa Anna was "stupid" and "ill-conceived."⁹ The greatest Tejano military support came from the lower San Antonio and Guadalupe River valleys, specifically the Goliad-Lipantitlán area. Tejano Tories from this region provided intelligence to Mexican authorities, especially through an intelligence network headed by Mexican officer Manuel Sabriego and formed irregular militias that also aided Urrea's campaign.

Lack also examines the possible motivations for the Tories, stating that factors included ethnic tensions, regional disharmony, personality clashes, and contests for leadership.¹⁰ Another possible factor includes that for much of the Revolution, the centralists forces seemed the most likely to win. Thus for many Tories, particularly Tejanos, support for the Mexican government seemed the most prudent response.¹¹ Some Tejanos also feared the rising number of Anglos settling in Texas and the demographic change that might occur should Texas become independent, which would instantly make Tejanos a minority within the population.

Lack also provides some examples of the strategic and tactical contributions of the Tories when they participated alongside the Mexican military. Aside from the Battles of Lipantitlán and Coleto Creek, Lack gives descriptions of smaller engagements that the Tories participated in. These include an attack on Refugio by the Victoriana Guardes in March 1836, which he states was likely in retaliation for Texian assaults from February of that year. According to Lack, these Tories plundered the town for two to three days. On March 10, 1836, Texian forces from Goliad under

⁹ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 158.

¹⁰ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 156. Lack gives examples of how Tory militias were organized, citing the "Volunteers of the Nation" authorized by General Martín Perfecto de Cos in 1835, the *Victoriana Guardes* (a guerrilla unit commanded by Carlos de la Garza), and a scouting company commanded by Guadalupe de los Santos.

¹¹ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 165.

the command of A.B. King clashed with a force of around two hundred Tory guerillas near Refugio before taking refuge in the town and requesting reinforcements.¹² Texian reinforcements under William Ward arrived three days later and engaged the Tories before King's men barricaded themselves in the town church to better withstand the Tory assault. The next day, March 14, the Tories withdrew from Refugio and King's men left to subsequently burn and loot the ranch of Esteban López and other Tejano guerrilla leaders, reportedly killing eight Tejanos.¹³ When King returned to Refugio on the evening of March 14, his men encountered both the Tory guerillas and the bulk of Urrea's army, which proceeded to capture King's command on March 15. Lack states that these Tejano guerrillas contributed to Urrea's campaign by shielding his army with their presence. The threat of their presence caused Fannin to divide his forces, which allowed Urrea to defeat them in detail.¹⁴

Another work that examines Tory activity is Stephen L. Hardin's *Texian Iliad: A Military History of the Texas Revolution*. Throughout this book, Hardin generally refers to the Tories, particularly the Tejanos who fought alongside Urrea, as "loyalists" (rather than the actual term Tories), and notes that the Revolution was part of a larger Mexican civil war between centralists and federalists.¹⁵ However, unlike Henson and Lack, Hardin does not examine the political or economic situations of the Tories, nor does he discuss the possible motivations for their Toryism. Hardin instead analyzes battles that Tories are documented as having participated in, providing detailed tactical and strategic analyses of these engagements. Battles analyzed include the Battles of Lipantitlán, where Irish Tories fought alongside Mexican troops, and Coletto Creek, where

¹² Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 164.

¹³ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 164.

¹⁴ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 164.

¹⁵ Stephen L. Hardin, *Texian Iliad: A Military History of the Texas Revolution* (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 1994), 97. He does so by mentioning the federalist Zacatecas Revolt of 1835 and its suppression by Santa Anna, and the desire for support from Mexican federalists that Texian leaders hoped for at the outset of the conflict before the Revolution became an independence movement.

Tejano *rancheros* fought as scouts and irregular cavalry as part of Urrea's campaign. Hardin's analysis provides detailed information regarding Tory military participation, explaining how the Irish Tories at Lipantitlán fought as infantry alongside dismounted Mexican cavalry, while the Tejanos at Coletto Creek served as the Mexican scouts who encountered Colonel James W. Fannin's command attempting to leave Presidio La Bahia in Goliad. Hardin also emphasizes how Mexican cavalry in general—and specifically the Tejano Tory auxiliaries—outclassed the Texian cavalry in almost every engagement they participated in. Hardin credits these Tory irregulars with providing Urrea with invaluable service as scouts owing to their knowledge of the area and as cavalry due to their superb horsemanship combined with their skill with the lance and lasso.

Another work by Hardin detailing Tory involvement (specifically by Tejanos) is his chapter “Efficient in the Cause” in *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850*. Hardin focuses on the military participation of Tejanos in the Revolution, with a section devoted to Tory Tejanos. Here Hardin refers to Tory Tejanos as “centralists” rather than Tories or even loyalists. This is likely to distinguish them from Tejanos who supported the Revolution, whom Hardin refers to as “federalists.” Hardin details Tejano Tory participation on campaign by citing Manuel Sabriego's intelligence network in the Goliad-Lipantitlán area and the Victoriana Guardes as main examples. Hardin also examines the possible motivations of Tejano Tories, emphasizing factors such as: the desire for federalism but not independence amongst some Tejanos; mistreatment of originally neutral Tejanos by Texian troops, particularly volunteers from the US; and self-preservation. An example of events that likely turned neutral Tejanos into Tories is the mistreatment of Tejanos in the Goliad area by a unit of Texian volunteers authorized by Colonel James W. Fannin to root out Tory sentiment. This company terrorized local Tejanos by invading their homes, earning them the nickname “Mustangs” over the habit of kicking in doors and harassing inhabitants regardless of

any professed allegiance to the Texian cause or federalist sentiment. This caused many Tejanos, even those who had originally supported the federalist cause in Texas, to align themselves with the Mexican government and support the Mexican Army through intelligence work or combat support. Many of these Tejanos joined the intelligence network of Sabriego to operate within the Goliad-Lipantitlán area and report on Texian movements to the Mexican military, or joined companies of irregular horsemen like the Victoriana Guardes, which itself was likely based upon the earlier *compañía volante*.

In “Efficient in the Cause,” Hardin examines the heritage of Tejanos, emphasizing their descent from Spanish presidial cavalry known as *soldados de cuera* (or “leather jacket soldiers”) stationed on the frontier during the colonial period, and the tradition of the *compañía volante* or “flying company” for militia service against hostile Native Americans.¹⁶ Hardin also notes their doctrine of “*vatir y perseguir*”—strike and pursue—as being borrowed from the mobile tactics of Native warriors and the necessity of conducting offensive campaigns against them. This is contrasted with the tactics of Anglos in Texas, with many coming from the southern US and typically fought defensively against Native attacks, while Tejanos fought offensively by taking the fight into their territory. Hardin explains that Tejano skill with lances, sword, and lassoes was owed to the scarcity of firearms and gunpowder on the frontier which required presidial and militia forces during the colonial and early Republic eras to rely on bladed weapons over firearms. He credits these factors—alongside the *ranchero* culture of horsemanship—as producing a tough and cunning trooper ideally suited for the nature of frontier warfare.¹⁷ Hardin also examines the favored tactics of Tejano horsemen when serving in the *compañía volante*, such as lassoing an enemy,

¹⁶ Stephen L. Hardin, “Efficient in the Cause,” in *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850*, ed. Geraldo E. Poyo (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1996), 50.

¹⁷ Hardin, “Efficient in the Cause,” 50-52.

pulling them from the saddle and dragging them to their death. The lasso was a primary tool of the ranchero and the frequent use of it in civilian life gave these men great skill that was deployed on militia duty. Another example was the ranchero's use of a cattle slaughtering tool known as a *desjarretadera*, a half-moon shaped blade or *luna* attached to a pole measuring ten to twelve feet in length.¹⁸ Rancheros would hold the tool under their right arm and ride up behind a cow to line the blade up with the animal's right hind leg. The ranchero would then flick the blade, severing the tendon and dropping the animal to ground. The ranchero then dismounted and drove the blade into the cow's head, severing the spinal cord and killing the animal instantly. Rancheros also used the *desjarretadera* to settle personal disputes, though a tradition lance replaced this tool when on campaign.¹⁹ This use of the *desjarretadera* developed the dexterity that allowed the lance to become a lethal primary weapon in the hands of Tejano horsemen.²⁰

What Hardin does not do is elaborate on why the presidial troopers garrisoned the forts in Texas, what they might have gained from their service, and what specific conditions caused the lack of powder and shot that led to the Tejano use of lance, lasso, and sword. Hardin also does not connect Tejano Tory participation in the Revolution alongside the Mexican Army as part of the heritage of frontier service of the *soldado de cuera* not only in their tactics and weaponry, but in their reasons or service. The *soldados de cuera* often enlisted in the presidial garrisons to gain social status that was denied them in central New Spain owing to their mixed-race ethnicity.²¹ Regarding tactics, the Tejano Tories campaigned as light cavalry, lightly armed cavalry on smaller horses best suited for scouting and skirmishing rather than shock actions like a full-tilt charge

¹⁸ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 50.

¹⁹ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 51.

²⁰ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 51.

²¹ For an example, see Vladimir Guerrero's "Caste, Race, and Class in Spanish California," *Southern California Quarterly* 92, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 1-18.

against infantry, this being fulfilled by heavy cavalry (e.g. cuirassiers). European light cavalry (examples being hussars, light dragoons and Cossacks) typically favored sabers, lances and pistols, with *soldados de cuera* and Tejanos favoring the lance and the *espada ancha*, a short sword often made by cutting down longer cavalry sabers. This work intends to fill this historiographical gap by not only examining how Tejano Tory tactics continued the heritage of the *soldado de cuera*, but also how their motivations for fighting alongside the Mexican Army continued the motivation of gaining social status through frontier service. Lack and Hardin's works exemplify the socio-cultural argument through their examination of Tejano motivations for Toryism being possibly influenced by fears of Anglo dominance, mistreatment by Texian troops, and desire for federalism within Mexico and Texas over independence from Mexico.

A final piece that examines Tories is "Models of Migration: The Historiography of the Irish Pioneers in South Texas" by Graham Davis. While this work is an examination of the larger historiography of Irish-Texan settlers, Davis also examines the history of the colony of San Patricio, which had a sizeable Tory population during the Revolution. Davis explains that the Mexican government wanted Irish immigrants to settle in Texas because of their Catholic faith, hostility to both the US and Great Britain, and their reputation as soldiers in Spanish service.²² The Mexican government hoped that such a population would provide Mexico with dependable soldiers on the frontier to defend its borders should war ever erupt with the US.²³ Regarding loyalty, Davis states that citizens of San Patricio were likely to remain loyal to Mexico because of the generous land grants provided to the settlers and the friendly relations the Irish citizens enjoyed with Tejanos and Mexican authorities.²⁴ This friendliness was a result of the Catholic faith of Irish

²² Graham Davis, "Models of Migration: The Historiography of the Irish Pioneers in South Texas," *The Southwest Historical Quarterly* 99, no. 3 (January 1996): 326-348; 333.

²³ Davis, "Models of Migration," 326-348; 333.

²⁴ Davis, "Models of Migration," 334-335.

and Tejano citizens of San Patricio, with some differences in practice, as well as cooperation within local government between the two groups.²⁵ Davis also states that the harsh conditions of life on the frontier created a bond of friendship and that Irish settlers owed much of their survival to the aid of Tejanos who taught these newcomers how to predict the weather, singe cactus so cattle may eat it, and plant crops in Texas.²⁶ The land that Irish citizens used for ranching had been given to them by the Mexican government and the San Patricio citizenry had sworn loyalty to the government as Mexican citizens.²⁷ Given these factors, it is not surprising that the citizens of San Patricio were likely to remain loyal to the Mexican government and fight alongside the Mexican Army in the early stages of the Revolution, with Cos describing them as “*los fieles Yrlandeses vecinos de San Patricio*” (the loyal Irish neighbors of San Patricio) in November 1835.²⁸

What historians have generally not done is approach the Tories from the viewpoint of military history. Some have produced works that partially approach the Tories from a military perspective, such as Lack, though this typically only amounts to mentioning and describing battles that Tories participated in. This approach is what is commonly called “old” military history, which generally focuses on overall campaigns, battles, specific commanders, tactics, weapons, logistics and organization, earning the nickname or “drum and trumpet” history.²⁹ This can be contrasted with “new” military history, which generally focuses on the interplay between society and the armies that a society produces, while typically not being interested in combat.³⁰ Hardin partially engages with this new school of military history in “Efficient in the Cause” through his description and examination of the Tejano ranchero culture and the effect it had on Tejano combatants, both

²⁵ Davis, “Models of Migration,” 334-335.

²⁶ Davis, “Models of Migration,” 335.

²⁷ Davis, “Models of Migration,” 335.

²⁸ Davis, “Models of Migration,” 335.

²⁹ Robert M. Citino, “Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction,” *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4, (October 2007): 1070-1090; 1070.

³⁰ Citino, “Military Histories,” 1070.

Tory and federalist. As stated earlier, Hardin emphatically states that the descent of many Tejanos from Spanish presidial cavalry and the ranchero culture of Texas produced a trooper that was ideal for mounted frontier warfare. Though Hardin mentions the Spanish descent of these Tejanos, he does not elaborate on this subject in detail, rather he simply mentions that Tejanos descended from these men and that the reliance on lances and lassoes resulted from the lack of firearms and shot on the frontier.

Regarding Anglo Tories, specifically the Irish of San Patricio, scholars have generally given little to any scholarly attention from a military perspective. On the rare occasions they do discuss these Tories with a military perspective, it is typically only to describe the services provided by Irish Tories to the Mexican Army (participation in the Battle of Lipantitlán and providing intelligence to Urrea) and typically as part of larger works in which they are only mentioned in passing. Little examination is given to the tradition of Irish service in foreign militaries, specifically the famous “Wild Geese” of the Spanish and French militaries, or how the participation of Irish Tories in the Texas Revolution was a continuation of this tradition. Wild Geese were Irish exiles who joined foreign militaries, specifically Spain and France during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early-nineteenth centuries because of a shared Catholic faith, social acceptance, and economic opportunity that was often unattainable in Ireland. Much economic opportunity- specifically land ownership- was typically restricted to Protestants in Ireland, particularly those of English and Scottish descent for much of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, at the exclusion of Catholics. Because Catholics were the majority of the Irish population, this effectively disenfranchised most of Ireland. A possible motivation for Toryism amongst the San Patricio Irish was the shared Catholic faith with Mexicans and Tejanos, and the land grants given to the citizens by the Mexican government. Wild Geese typically fought as

infantry, as the San Patricio Tories at Lipantitlán did while fighting alongside Mexican forces, and worked at gathering intelligence, as some San Patricio Tories supplied Urrea and his officers in 1836. The participation of the Irish Tories in the Texas Revolution was a continuation of the tradition of the Wild Geese not only in their methods of warfare, but in their motivation for serving a foreign government that rewarded them for doing so.

Another approach that scholars of the Texas Revolution and the Tories specifically have not taken is to engage the subject within the field of borderlands history. Borderlands history is a relatively new field that of study that focuses on the border between two nations. Popular areas in borderlands history are the US-Mexico border and the US-Canadian border, particularly around the area of the Great Lakes. Borderlands historians have established the idea that on a borderland, loyalty was often driven by self-interest rather than national interest. For example, in his article “Some Thoughts on Spanish East and West Florida as Borderlands,” James Cusick argues that self-interest took precedent when deciding loyalty on the borderlands, with this interest pulling individuals in different directions. Interestingly, Cusick focuses on Anglos in early nineteenth-century Spanish Florida, but also draws parallels to nineteenth-century Texas (including a direct reference to the city of Laredo).³¹ Cusick cites a study of Laredo’s citizen’s from 1755 to 1870 by Gilberto Manuel Hinojosa in which Hinojosa states “Laredoans acted primarily out of concern for their own best interests and only secondarily if at all to advance imperial or national goals.”³² The Tories of the Revolution have not been included in the historiography of borderlands history despite their representation of the idea of self-interest driven loyalty. The San Patricio Tories possibly chose to side with the Mexican government because of the prosperity that many enjoyed

³¹ James Cusick, “Some Thoughts on Spanish East and West Florida as Borderlands,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 133-156; 138.

³² Cusick, “Some Thoughts on Spanish East and West Florida,” 133-156; 138.

under the lax taxation and immigration laws that enticed Anglo immigration to Texas, while the Tejano Tories possibly maintained their loyalty to ensure Tejano dominance in Texas and push back against the rising Anglo population, fearing a negative outcome should Anglos become the majority. As such, the Tories fit into this historiographical theme by exemplifying the ideas of self-interest driving loyalty.

Another idea of loyalty exhibited by the Tories that is pertinent to borderlands history is the notion of loyalty being negotiable. This idea is that loyalty often changed depending upon the situation and how individuals responded to this. This idea is exemplified by some Tories switching sides during the Revolution. This often occurred amongst Tejanos when the Mexican government offered clemency, or after mistreatment by Texian troops caused some to change from supporting federalists to supporting centralists. An example given by Hardin is that of federalist Tejanos in the Goliad area, who after being forced by Texian officer Phillip Dimmitt to perform manual labor without pay, joined Manuel Sabriego's intelligence network and provided information to Mexican forces.³³

Borderlands history also emphasizes the often-multi-ethnic nature of borders since divisions between geography and culture are seldom clearly defined. This is the subject of Jeremy Adelman and Steven Aron's article "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in between in North American History." Adelman and Aron examine the relations between differing ethnic groups, here focusing on the relations between whites (specifically British and French) and Native Americans along the Great Lakes, and how imperial rivalry affected these groups during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Examples include the French and Indian War, the transfer of Canada from France to Great Britain, the fur trade (particularly the Hudson's

³³ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 63.

Bay Company), the Americans Revolution and the wars between Native Americans and the United States along the Great Lakes. These rivalries, according to Adelman and Aron, led to the development of international borders and solidified the divide between different groups along the borderlands.³⁴ The Texas Revolution fits into the historiography of borderlands history because of the admixture of Anglo and Mexican cultures in Texas during the 1830s and how the Revolution led to dispute over the Texas-Mexico border being either the Rio Grande or the Nueces River. The Tories fit into borderlands historiography because of the multi-ethnic composition of the Tories (Anglo, specifically Irish, and Tejano) and how they were part of a conflict that began as a civil war to restore federalism in Mexico and transformed into a conflict for Texian independence. The rivalry between Anglo-Texans and the Mexican government that eventually led to the creation of the modern US-Mexico border along the Rio Grande.

Another relevant piece that deals with cross-cultural contact along borderlands is “On Borderlands” by Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett, where the authors emphasize how cross-cultural relations along borders created bonds that subverted power from national centers.³⁵ Hämäläinen and Truett argue that these relationships were able to subvert this power by operating at scales too small for centralized powers to comprehend, control or contain.³⁶ The Tories fit into this theme but from the opposite approach: rather than subvert central power, the Tories aided it through their support of the Mexican government by aiding the Mexican Army. This does not disprove the notion that cross-cultural relations along borders could subvert central authority but

³⁴ Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, “From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation States, and the People Caught in between in North American History,” *The American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (June 1999): 814-841; 815.

³⁵ Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett, “On Borderlands,” *The Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 338-361; 348.

³⁶ Hämäläinen and Truett, “On Borderlands,” 338-361; 348.

shows that it could aid it and illustrates that just because groups resided along borders, they were not renegades by nature.

Aside from borderlands history, some scholars of the Texas Revolution fall into a historiographic trap of not engaging with the Revolution as part of a larger civil war between centralists and federalists in Mexico. When scholars have hit this pitfall, they typically view the Revolution in a vacuum by focusing only on Texas and not bringing the Revolution into the larger context of the federalist-centralist civil war. This is not to say that scholars of the Revolution do not endeavor to view the Revolution in this larger context, as many indeed have. Examples already given include Lack in *The Texas Revolutionary Experience* and Hardin in both *Texian Iliad* and “Efficient in the Cause.” Hardin in particular is very sensitive to this trend, noting in *Iliad* that many Texian leaders hoped for aid from Mexican federalists at the beginning of the conflict, and in “Efficient in the Cause” he states that many federalist-turned Tory Tejanos began the conflict in support of Mexican federalism, but could not abide when the war turned into war of Texian independence. This sensitivity firmly places the Texas Revolution within the larger Mexican civil war of the 1830s and is a historiography that this work seeks to continue.

Scholars have also engaged with the place of Texas and the policies of Mexico regarding immigration to Texas in the years preceding the Revolution. They typically focus on the motivation of the Mexican government for enticing immigration to Texas, what types of people were desired by the Mexican government, and what measures were enacted to motivate immigrants to come to Texas. An example is Nettie Lee Benson’s article “Texas as Viewed from Mexico, 1820-1834.” Benson focuses on the discussions amongst Spanish and Mexican bureaucracies, particularly the Committee on Foreign Relations, as to how Texas was to be populated. Benson emphasizes how the Committee wanted to primarily recruit Mexican citizens and foreign immigrants, particularly

European Anglos. Like Davis, Benson states that the Committee wanted Irish immigrants specifically because of their reputation as soldiers, and the Mexican government's desire to have dependable soldiers along the frontier.³⁷ She particularly focuses on the land grants and low taxation offered to immigrants. This historiographical approach typically does not take into consideration the impact of these policies on the motivations of individuals in Texas for supporting or opposing the Revolution, nor does mention the Tories.

Another topic that scholars of Mexican history have approached is the role of Texas in Mexican politics of the 1830s and 1840s. An example of this is Josefina Zoraida Vázquez's "The Texas Question in Mexican Politics, 1836-1845." Vázquez primarily focuses on the role of Texas in Mexican politics after the Revolution, such as the Mexican government's refusal to recognize Texian independence. She also illustrates the role of Texas in the centralist-federalists civil wars. Vázquez emphasizes the original Texian goal of achieving federalism by preserving the Constitution of 1824, and its relationship to the adoption of centralism by the Mexican government as well as the rise of Santa Anna.³⁸ Vázquez also illustrates the role of Texas in the years following the Revolution, emphasizing Mexican refusal to recognize the newly independent Republic of Texas, and ensuing conflict over the Texas-Mexico border during the 1840s. Vázquez ends the piece with the annexation of Texas by the US in 1845, which was followed by the Mexican-American War. This school of historiography typically focuses on Mexican perceptions of the Texas political situation from the Mexican perspective but does not typically mention any pro-Mexican sentiment in Texas during the Revolution, specifically the Tories.

³⁷ Nettie Lee Benson, "Texas as Viewed from Mexico," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 3 (January 1987): 219-291; 227.

³⁸ Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, "The Texas Question in Mexican Politics, 1836-1845," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 89, no. 3 (January 1986): 309-344; 311.

Another work on Texas's in Mexican politics of the 1830s is Andrew J. Torget's *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery, and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850*. Torget argues that the history of Texas during the early to mid-nineteenth century was part of a larger history where the global cotton economy made northeastern Mexico the "western edge of the American South."³⁹ Torget examines the history of Texas from 1800 to 1850, highlighting the role of slavery throughout. Torget states that though Mexicans generally opposed slavery, the desire to populate Texas with Anglo-American immigrants, many of whom were Southerners who brought their slaves with them, led to an exception to anti-slavery laws passed by the government of Coahuila y Tejas in the 1820s. Torget also claims that Tejano elites, like Juan Seguín's family, adopted slavery as a means of gaining economic prosperity for Texas.

Regarding the Texas Revolution, Torget states that slavery was the underlying cause of the Revolution because of Mexican governmental hostility to slavery including the Guerrero Proclamation of 1829, which outlawed slavery in Mexico, and Santa Anna's renunciation of federalism, which had allowed slavery to exist in Texas.⁴⁰ The slavery-friendly Tejano elites supported the Revolution because of their economic benefit from the system, which allowed a plantation economy to take root in Texas through cotton planting. While the Tories are not discussed in this work, Torget provides a unique perspective on Toryism through his examination of slavery in Texas. The Irish and Tejano Tories likely owned few if any slaves, as they came from cultures and regions of Texas that did not necessitate slave owning, as well as they likely lacked the finances to purchase slaves. By examining this, Torget provides a framework for viewing the Tories as also supporting Mexico out of a possible opposition to slavery.

³⁹ Andrew J. Torget, *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery, and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 5.

⁴⁰ Torget, *Seeds of Empire*, 141.

Scholars have also approached this era of Mexican history from a military perspective. A relevant piece of scholarship on this topic is Pedro Santoni's "A Fear of the People: The Civic Militia of Mexico in 1845." Santoni focuses on the militia's minimal presence during the Spanish colonial era in Mexico, how the militia was both disbanded and rebuilt during the 1830s after filling the vacuum left by the Spanish, and the state of the militia in 1845.⁴¹ What Santoni does not do however, is tie this topic into Texas and the Revolution. No mention is made of how Mexican militia law was applied in Texas, how the order by Santa Anna's centralist government to disband the civil militia was a key moment preceding the Revolution, and how Tory forces may have used their understanding of the militia system to form themselves into units for service alongside the Mexican Army.

While the Tories of the Texas Revolution have attracted the limited attention of scholars, they have not received a work devoted to them. Irish and Tejano Tories are an important piece of the Revolution because their role illustrates the complications of the Revolution via their loyalty to Mexico, illustrates how loyalty may be negotiable if a group may benefit from it, and how inter-ethnic relations may help rather than hinder central power. Most importantly, the participation of the Tories continued the tradition and heritage of the Wild Geese and *soldados de cuera* via their motivations for their Toryism and their methods of warfare.

⁴¹ Pedro Santoni, "A Fear of the People, The Civic Militia of Mexico in 1845," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (May 1988): 269-288; 269.

CHAPTER 2

“IRISH PARTOZANS OF CENTRALISM”: THE SAN PATRICIO TORIES

Possibly the most well-known Tories of Northern European descent are the Irish settlers of San Patricio. Located south of Goliad along the Nueces River, the colony was home to a prominent Tory community during the Texas Revolution, with most of the citizenry and local government supporting the Mexican government. The occurrence of Irish settlers supporting the Mexican government raises questions over what motivated these Tories to do so. Was the Toryism of San Patricio ideological? Did they support the policies of the Mexican government or favor a faction in the Mexican civil wars of the 1830s? Or was their Toryism more pragmatic and driven by self-interest? Taking the approach of borderlands history, where loyalty is viewed as negotiable and influenced by factors like self-interest, it can be argued that the San Patricio Tories supported the Mexican government because of the social acceptance granted to them by Mexicans and *Tejanos*, in tandem with the economic opportunity in Texas that Mexican immigration policies and Mexican-Irish relations afforded them. In turn, these created a sense of gratitude and indebtedness that served as conditions that they were not willing to discard in favor of rebellion and may have supported Mexico out of opposition to slavery. This combination of social acceptance and economic opportunity as factors of determining loyalty—specifically to a foreign government—also places the men of San Patricio in the historical tradition of Irish troops in foreign service.

From the Revolution's outbreak in 1835, Texian officials were not only aware of the Tory presence in San Patricio, but actively feared that they would support Mexican troops. This is especially prevalent in the correspondence of Phillip Dimmitt, the Texian commandant of Presidio La Bahía after its capture. As Dimmitt told Stephen F. Austin, “it is also rumored that the people

of Sn. Patricio have joined the military at the Nueces.”⁴² Dimmitt later reiterated “we are informed also, that, the population of San Patricio have almost unanimously joined the military,” in response to the arrest of Texians John Williams and John Tool in San Patricio.⁴³ Another revolutionary John Linn stated “it is reported that the people of St. Patricio have joined the soldiers but it is generally supposed that it was through necessity, they must of course be on the right side or they will belie their countrymen.”⁴⁴ Linn’s comments acknowledge the Tory sentiment of many San Patricio Irish, but also defend their supposed enlistment into the Mexican forces, though current evidence does not support any mass enlistment by San Patricio Tories.⁴⁵ Mexican officials were also aware of the San Patricio Tories, who General Martín Perfecto de Cos proclaimed “los fieles Yrlandeses de Sn. Patricio.”⁴⁶

To understand the rise of Toryism in San Patricio, the early history of the settlement must be examined. The settlement of San Patricio was the brainchild of two Irish-born empresarios, James McGloin and John McMullen. McGloin immigrated to the United States sometime in the early nineteenth century, first through Baltimore, Maryland before settling in Savannah, Georgia. By the 1820s, he moved to the Mexican port city of Matamoros.⁴⁷ McGloin worked as a merchant in Matamoros and it is through this business that he met McMullen. Both men learned the Spanish language and by 1828 had formed a partnership to seek permission from the Mexican government to establish an Irish colony in Texas as empresarios. As empresarios, the Mexican government required McGloin and McMullen to recruit two hundred families for their colony and inform

⁴² Phillip Dimmitt to Stephen F. Austin, October 17, 1835, in *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, ed. John H. Jenkins, Vol. 2 (Austin, TX: Presidial Press, 1973), 145.

⁴³ Phillip Dimmitt to Stephen F. Austin, October 25, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 218.

⁴⁴ John Linn to Austin, October 17, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 149.

⁴⁵ This is not to be confused with the “Saint Patrick’s Battalion” of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848).

⁴⁶ Martín Perfecto de Cos to José María Tornel, November 2, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 299.

⁴⁷ Graham Davis, *Land!: Irish Pioneers in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2002), 73. McGloin was born in Castleregall, County Sligo in 1801, and McMullen was born in east County Donegal in 1785.

bureaucrats of their resources and business pursuits. Upon meeting these terms, the Mexican government would designate the area of the colony.⁴⁸ After attaining the requisite two hundred families, empresarios were granted three *haciendas* and two *labors* (roughly 66,775 acres), but would lose these lands if they were not cultivated and populated within twelve years.⁴⁹ Mexican colonization laws allowed empresarios to provide the land for their colonists through the Mexican government. To receive their land grants, colonists had to declare their intent to settle in Texas, swear an oath to support the Mexican Constitution of 1824, and profess the Catholic faith (the national religion of Mexico).⁵⁰

Mexican colonization laws offered varying land grant sizes to induce immigrants into Texas, with the sizes typically dependent on an immigrant's marital status and if they paid their own expense for their migration. Article 16 of the Colonization Law of Coahuila y Tejas stated that single men or families who emigrated would receive one labor if they were farmers. Grazing land would be added to the labor to create a *sitio* if they also raised livestock.⁵¹ If an immigrant's sole occupation was stock raising, they would receive a plot equal to 24 million square bars.⁵² Article 15 of the Colonization Law of Coahuila y Tejas promised unmarried men the same quantity should they get married and an additional fourth of that quantity to immigrants who married native-born Mexicans.⁵³ Unmarried men would only receive one-fourth of this value until they married.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ David B. Edward, *The 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*, (Cincinnati, OH: J.A. James & CO., 1836), 145.

⁴⁹ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 145.

⁵⁰ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 143.

⁵¹ "Law for Promoting Colonization in the State of Coahuila and Texas, March 24, 1825," in *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*, ed. H.P.H. Gammel, Vol. 1 (Austin, TX: Gammel Book Co., 1898), 101.

⁵² Edward, *The History of Texas*, 143.

⁵³ "Law for Promoting Colonization", 101.

⁵⁴ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 143.

Once they received their empresario grant from the Mexican government, McGloin and McMullen were faced with the task of recruiting Irish colonists. To accomplish this, the empresarios turned to Irish communities already established within the US. These communities primarily existed in the northeast US in port cities such as New York City, where a sizeable Irish community had developed in the early years of the nineteenth century.⁵⁵ By the late 1820s, Irish immigrant communities also existed in the south, in particular Kentucky and New Orleans, another large port city with an incredibly diverse population.⁵⁶ It was from these three areas that McGloin and McMullen recruited their Irish colonists, who arrived in Texas from 1829 to 1836.⁵⁷ Aside from Irish colonists, McGloin and McMullen were able to recruit some Mexican and Spanish families for their new colony, specifically Pedro de Oro, his wife, and children from Louisiana.⁵⁸ With the recruitment of their colonists, McGloin and McMullen were able to establish their colony with the permission of the Mexican government, which they christened *San Patricio de Hibernia*.⁵⁹

Several factors likely motivated the colonists recruited by McGloin and McMullen to migrate to Texas and their later Toryism. First, it is likely that these immigrants encountered nativism based on anti-Catholic, anti-immigrant (particularly anti-Irish) sentiments—attitudes that had begun to take hold in the US by the 1820s, particularly in large urban centers like New York.⁶⁰ Irish immigrants also encountered a denial of economic opportunity, likely influenced by nativist sentiments and manifested by the outright refusal to hire Irishmen for jobs in the US.⁶¹ In Ireland, denial of economic opportunity took the form of a difficulty in acquiring land. Many of these

⁵⁵ Davis, *Land!*, 116.

⁵⁶ Davis, *Land!*, 116..

⁵⁷ Davis, *Land!*, 116.

⁵⁸ Davis, *Land!*, 265.

⁵⁹ Rachel Bluntzer Hébert, *The Forgotten Colony: The History, the People, and the Legends of the Irish Colony of McMullen-McGloin* (Burnet, TX: Eakin Press, 1981), 25.

⁶⁰ John Brendan Flannery, *The Irish Texans* (Austin TX: University of Texas Press, 1995), 67.

⁶¹ Flannery, *The Irish Texans*, 68.

Catholic immigrants were originally small farmers, laborers and displaced textile workers from southern counties of Ireland, mainly Wexford, Cork, and Waterford. These Irishmen typically occupied small plots owned by large landowners, typically Protestants of English and Scottish descent. Many likely emigrated from Ireland because of industrial developments closing linen mills, the expiration of leases causing the eviction of tenant laborers, and the failure of crops to yield enough income to pay rent. High rents and low prices for goods like textiles and crops provided incentive for emigration, while the possibility of economic advancement and generally bettering their circumstances. A description of the Irish peasantry from Samuel Carter Hall's book *Ireland: Its Scenery and Character* illustrates their economic woes:

The general want of employment, and the consequent anxiety of obtaining for their families the means of even temporary subsistence, produced such an eagerness on the part of the peasantry to get possession of land, as to induce them to engage for the payment of a rent, which the crops, even under the most favourable circumstances, must have failed to yield. This circumstance was too frequently taken advantage of; and the ultimate ruin of the miscalculating tenants was the inevitable result.⁶²

For landless Irishmen, the possibility of gaining their own lands in Texas was likely a powerful motivator for emigration from their communities in the United States and their Toryism. Finally, Irish immigrants were typically denied social acceptance in Ireland and the US, owing to their Catholic faith and the fact that many of these immigrants likely spoke little English, as Irish Gaelic was more commonly spoken by the Irish lower classes.⁶³

Given these restrictive circumstances of life in the US and Ireland, Irish immigrants likely saw life in Mexican Texas as an opportunity for economic opportunity via the promised lands grants of the Mexican government, and a powerful motivation for Toryism. Likewise, it promised a more hospitable community with Mexicans and Tejanos because of their shared Catholicism,

⁶² Noel Kissane, *The Irish Famine: A Documentary History* (Dublin, Ireland: National Library of Ireland, 1995), 3.

⁶³ Flannery, *The Irish Texans*, 68.

and friendly feelings towards Irishmen held by the Mexican government, as evidenced by the government's desire for Irish immigrants in Texas.⁶⁴ Following its independence from Spain in 1821, the Mexican government (here the Imperial government of Agustín Iturbide) decided that populating Texas with either Anglo-Americans or Hispanic Mexicans was an important policy that required governmental attention. To this end, the Mexican government formed the Committee on Foreign Relations on September 30, 1821 with the intent of creating colonization laws for the populating of Texas and Alta California.⁶⁵ The committee drafted a series of suggestions for the colonization of Texas, which was presented to the government on February 23, 1822.⁶⁶ The committee recommended that colonists should be recruited from the United States, specifically New Orleans, the poor population of central Mexico, and Europe.⁶⁷ Regarding European settlers, the committee recommended Irishmen as the most desirable settlers, owing to the shared Catholic faith of Ireland and Mexico, the outstanding "moral value" (though no explanation was given for this reason) of the Irish, their hard-working and industrious nature, their hostility to the United States and Great Britain, and their reputation as soldiers.⁶⁸ The committee hoped that by settling Irish colonists in Texas, they could rely on soldiers famous for their valor and fierceness should war break out with the United States.⁶⁹

This long history of Irish soldiers in Hispanic service was likely what influenced the committee in their desire for Irish settlers in Texas and may have influenced Toryism because of why these soldiers fought. Irish soldiers had long served in foreign militaries since the late sixteenth century, specifically in the Spanish and French monarchies. The earliest examples of

⁶⁴ Flannery, *The Irish Texans*, 68.

⁶⁵ Benson, "Texas as Viewed from Mexico," 224-225. This committee consisted of Juan F. Azcárate, Manuel de Heras Soto, and José Sanchez Enciso, and was assisted by Mariano Zardeta and Mariana Fernández de Almanza.

⁶⁶ Benson, "Texas as Viewed from Mexico," 225.

⁶⁷ Benson, "Texas as Viewed from Mexico," 226.

⁶⁸ Benson, "Texas as Viewed from Mexico," 227.

⁶⁹ Davis, *Land!*, 32.

Irish troops in Spanish service is found in the Spanish Army of Flanders during the Dutch Revolt, with some as early as 1582.⁷⁰ The most famous of the Irish troops in foreign service are the “Wild Geese,” Irish soldiers of the Spanish and French armies who served from the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth century. Following the Glorious Revolution of 1688, Irish Catholic Jacobites (supporters of James II) left Ireland to join the Spanish and French armies, with their red Jacobite uniforms becoming the mark of an Irishman in foreign service. Eighteenth-century Irish officers in Spanish service included Hugo O’Conor, Alejandro O’Reilly, and Ambrosio O’Higgins, all of whom became figures in Spanish colonial administration. Irish volunteers also fought in several Latin American wars of independence, with Irish descendants like Bernardo O’Higgins as key insurgents.

Like the San Patricio Tories, the Wild Geese and other Irish soldiers enlisted in the Spanish military for social acceptance as well as economic opportunity. By joining the military of Spain, a Catholic monarchy, Irish troops gained the social acceptance from their fellow soldiers and the wider population of the Spanish empire and economic opportunity through their pay. Some individual Irish soldiers, particularly officers, gained titles of nobility and additional wealth because of their service.⁷¹ These historical precedents place the Tories within a military tradition that they continued by supporting Mexico, as they gained the same benefits as their predecessors. This historical interplay produces combatants that serve a foreign government for personal economic benefit and social acceptance instead of purely ideological reasons. The generous immigration policies of the Mexican government helped motivate the San Patricio Irish in their

⁷⁰ George B. Clark, *Irish Soldiers in Europe, 17th-19th Century* (Cork, Ireland: Mercier Press, 2010), 32.

⁷¹ Examples include Alejandro O’Reilly, who was ennobled by Carlos III as a *conde* (count), and Ambrosio O’Higgins, who was made *barón de Ballinar* in 1778.

Toryism because it allowed them to finally experience what had long been denied them: the ability to freely earn their own living without prejudice or fear of losing it all.

The San Patricio Tories may have also supported the Mexican government out of a sense of genuine gratitude and indebtedness to Mexico. The Tories likely felt indebted to Mexico because of the government's generosity in land grants and the willingness of Mexican citizens to help them prosper. Because of this generosity, the Tories likely felt a strong gratitude towards the Mexican people and government. The Mexican government and people gave them the Tories the life that had long been denied to them in Ireland and the US, and this was likely an easy factor to forget. The San Patricio Tories may have also factored an opposition to slavery in their Toryism, as evidence does not suggest that the San Patricio Irish did not own slaves. This is in contrast to many Anglo-American immigrants into Texas, many of whom were Southerners that brought their slaves with them. These American immigrants worked to gain Texas an exception for slave ownership within the Mexican government, as they claimed their settlements would not prosper without the institution.⁷² Given the lack of slavery in Ireland, the Mexican government may have intended for San Patricio to serve as an Irish Catholic buffer against slavery in Texas and northern Mexico, as they may have believed the Irish were unlikely to own slaves. The arrival of the Irish to San Patricio in October 1829 roughly coincides with the Guerrero decree of September 1829, when President Vicente Guerrero outlawed slavery throughout Mexico.⁷³ Given their cultural baggage of not practicing slavery and Mexican governmental action outlawing the practice, it is possible that the San Patricio Tories supported Mexico out of a genuine opposition to slavery, which many Anglo Texian and Tejano leaders fought to protect.

⁷² Torget, *Seeds of Empire*, 140.

⁷³ Torget, *Seeds of Empire*, 142.

San Patricio and the Tories were quickly drawn into the Mexican centralist-federalist civil war of the 1830s. Under a federalist system, the state governments have greater power over their own affairs than the central government, which in Mexico was relatively weak, a system codified by the Constitution of 1824. Mexican liberals favored a federalist system and attempted to model the 1824 Constitution on the United States Constitution. Mexican conservatives, in contrast, advocated for a centralist government, where state governments are non-existent, and the central government wields supreme power. Conservatives argued that federalism was unable to effectively govern Mexico and led to lawlessness, disorder, high taxation and debt. In April 1833, Antonio López de Santa Anna, the victor of the Battle of Tampico in 1829, was elected president as a federalist. He switched political leanings to gain the support of conservatives when they sought to regain control of the government, disbanded the militias, and dissolved the federalist Congress in May 1834. In October 1835, the Constitution of 1824 was repealed and in December 1835 was replaced with the Seven Laws (*Siete Leyes*), which effectively made Mexico a military dictatorship with Santa Anna as dictator. The San Patricio Tories were drawn into the conflict soon after as federalist opposition to Santa Anna began forming in Texas after the dissolution of the Constitution of 1824. Though the citizens of San Patricio, and the Tories specifically, took no part in the skirmish at Gonzáles in September 1835 or any resistance to Mexico up to that point, the Revolution soon drew them into a larger conflict.

With the outbreak of the Texas Revolution the citizens of San Patricio were faced with the dilemma choosing to support the Texian rebels or the Mexican government. The pro-Mexican Tory population of San Patricio felt that as Mexican citizens they were indebted to the Mexican government for their prosperity and owed it their gratitude, even if they personally supported federalism and wished to return to that system. Those who supported the Texians—like Victoria

resident and federalist John Linn—felt that Santa Anna’s government had become despotic and necessitated revolt. As Linn stated, “We Irishmen know how to appreciate a despotic military government.”⁷⁴ The generous land grants given to the colonists allowed the citizens of San Patricio to establish themselves as cattle ranchers, providing a livelihood and income that had largely denied them in Ireland and the United States. Through this economic opportunity, the San Patricio Irish were able to farm, raise livestock, and participate in commerce in Texas and the rest of Mexico. Taking these opportunities into consideration, the Tories of San Patricio were unlikely to risk supporting open rebellion against (and later independence from) Mexico.

A factor that may have influenced the loyalty of the San Patricio Tories was the length of time before receiving their land grants.⁷⁵ Most of the colonists in San Patricio received their land grants in June 1835, likely causing many to view the centralist Mexican government favorably.⁷⁶ This is contrasted with the colonists of Refugio, who received their grants before 1835, so that by the outset of the Revolution their loyalty to the Mexican government was not tied to their land ownership. The San Patricio Irish, and the Tories specifically, were likely incredibly grateful to finally received their promised land grants, and this gratitude was likely on the minds with the outbreak of the Revolution. Another key factor that likely influenced the San Patricio Tories’ loyalty was the interrelations between the Irish colonists and their Mexican neighbors. The recruitment of Mexican colonists by McGloin and McMullen proved a boon to the colony because they were able to teach the Irish how to survive in Texas. For example, the Mexican settlers taught the Irish how to predict the local weather, and even singe cactus to allow cattle to eat it.⁷⁷ The knowledge passed on by the Mexican settlers allowed the Irish to integrate themselves into Texas

⁷⁴ John Linn to Henry, October 8, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 70.

⁷⁵ Davis, *Land!*, 116.

⁷⁶ Davis, *Land!*, 87.

⁷⁷ Davis, *Land!*, 114.

ranching culture, which combined with the land grants allowed the Irish of San Patricio to prosper. This style of agriculture may have also fostered an anti-slavery mindset when combined with Irish tradition of non-slave ownership, as stock raising did not require slaves. This likely made the Tories support Mexico because of Texian defense of slavery as a reason to revolt. The Tories likely felt indebted to the Mexican government and people for their prosperity, as governmental policy created the economic success and social acceptance they had long sought and wished to show their gratitude in their Toryism.

Aside from the knowledge of ranching passed on by the Mexicans in San Patricio and the shared rigors of frontier life, the Irish also enjoyed cooperation with their neighbors in sharing local government and worship within the Catholic Church.⁷⁸ The collective and individual relations of the San Patricio Irish with their Mexican neighbors likely influenced their allegiances because it possibly colored their view of all Mexicans. If those relations were positive, they would be more likely to view Mexicans, Tejanos, and the Mexican government positively. As such, they would be more likely to remain loyal to Mexico in the event of revolution. By contrast, federalist Texian revolutionaries were unlikely to view the Mexican government favorably owing to disputes over immigration, taxation and customs enforcement. This is best exemplified by the Anahuac Disturbances of 1832, when centralist Col. Juan Davis Bradburn's heavy-handed enforcement of the anti-immigration Law of April 6, 1830 and tariff dues. Anahuac federalist, most of whom were Anglo-American immigrants, revolted and drove centralist forces from Anahuac and East Texas. Current evidence does not suggest that any such tensions existed in San Patricio before the Revolution.

⁷⁸ Davis, *Land!*, 114.

Aside from their Mexican neighbors, the San Patricio Irish, and the Tories specifically, also enjoyed cordial relations with military officials representing Mexico's central government, likely making them view said government favorably. The San Patricians particularly got along with the garrison of the nearby fortress of Lipantitlán, as the soldiers could be seen on the streets of San Patricio in 1835 without causing any alarm amongst the citizens.⁷⁹ These troops may have conducted business with the colonists by purchasing food and supplies, as soldiers in Texas often had to feed themselves.⁸⁰ This possible economic relation would likely ingratiate Mexican troops to the San Patricio population, especially the Tories. Aside from the presence of troops in San Patricio, the town's leadership enjoyed friendly relations with the garrison's officers. McGloin enjoyed a friendship with Lieutenant Marcelino García, a popular junior officer amongst the Lipantitlán garrison, while William O'Daugherty, the former *alcalde* of San Patricio and Tory leader, was on friendly terms with the post's commander, Capt. Nicolás Rodríguez.⁸¹ The Lipantitlán garrison also had the support of the Tory-controlled *ayuntamiento*, headed by O'Daugherty's successor Henry Thomas. The conservative Tory element of San Patricio were prominent in the colony as late as November 1835, though many were indeed opposed to the dangers posed by Santa Anna's troops.⁸² The positive relations of the San Patricio Irish with their Mexican neighbors provided the social acceptance that influenced Tory motivation in the colony.

Through the relations between the San Patricio Tories, their Mexican neighbors, central government and troops is the borderlands idea of negotiable loyalty illustrated. The Tories felt that they owed their prosperity to the Mexican government and were willing to support the government

⁷⁹ Hébert, *The Forgotten Colony*, 30.

⁸⁰ Manuel de Mier y Terán, *Texas by Terán: The Diary Kept by General Manuel de Mier y Terán on His 1828 Inspection of Texas*, ed. Jack Jackson, trans. John Wheat (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000), 16.

⁸¹ Hébert, *The Forgotten Colony*, 30.

⁸² Hébert, *The Forgotten Colony*, 30.

to maintain that prosperity. Even if they personally supported federalism, the centralists were responsible for their land grants of June 1835 and centralist troops likely conducted business in the town providing economic incentive for their loyalty. This shows how personal loyalty can be negotiable if supporting a government or faction directly benefits an individual or community in the case of the Tories. The positive relations with Mexican neighbors and government allowed the Tories to prosper through land grants and ranching knowledge and provided a bargaining chip in choosing their loyalty to Mexico. This relationship of the Irish Tories and Mexicans also demonstrates another theme of borderlands history, that of multi-ethnic relations effecting central power. Here, the multi-ethnic relationship between Irish Tories and Mexican citizens aided central power instead of subverting it because it gave the Mexican government a population within Texas that remained loyal to Mexico and actively supported the Mexican war effort to suppress the Revolution. This illustrates how these relations could aid central power when the right motivation was in place instead of subverting it.

The Tories of San Patricio enjoyed effective control of the colony in the early days of the Revolution. This changed following the Texian victory in the Battle of Lipantitlán (where at least nine San Patricio Tories fought alongside Mexican troops) in November 1835, when the Tories were effectively ousted from power and a federalist ayuntamiento was formed. The fear of the Tories still loomed in Texian minds, as they still comprised a sizeable portion of the San Patricio population. This is expressed in a letter of November 30 to Dimmitt from a Texian named John Turner. Turner stated that the commandant of Lipantitlán (likely Capt. Nicolás Rodríguez) invited the San Patricio citizens to join his ranks, and threatened vengeance against them if they refused.⁸³ Dimmitt expressed this fear in a December 2nd letter to Henry Smith, describing another letter

⁸³ John Turner to Phillip Dimmitt, November 30, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, ed. John H. Jenkins, Vol. 3 (Austin, TX: Presidial Press, 1973), 51.

from Rodríguez to Susannah O'Daugherty, the wife of former Tory alcalde William O'Daugherty. Dimmitt calls William the leader of the "Irish Partozans of Centralism" and requests that Susannah now lead the Tory population after William was wounded in the Battle of Lipantitlán.⁸⁴ Rodríguez appears to have kept in contact with Susannah and other San Patricio Tories after Lipantitlán, as another letter from Dimmitt to James Robinson of December 28 mentions a rumor that Rodríguez met with the San Patricio population while coming to and from the town at his leisure.⁸⁵

The Tories of San Patricio were motivated to support Mexico during the Texas Revolution by self-interest through economic opportunity in conjunction with social acceptance, creating a sense of gratitude and indebtedness amongst some of the San Patricio Irish, as well as a possible opposition to slavery. The immigration policies and land grants of the Mexican government allowed the San Patricians to gain economic opportunity in agriculture and stock raising, while the social acceptance of the Mexican population fostered positive relations between Irish settlers and their Mexican neighbors and government actors. Finally, the Tories' support of a foreign government for these economic and social factors places them in the historical tradition of the Wild Geese, who joined the Spanish military for similar, if not identical reasons.

⁸⁴ Phillip Dimmitt to Henry Smith, December 2, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 3, 76.

⁸⁵ Phillip Dimmitt to James Robinson, December 28, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 3, 345.

CHAPTER 3

“WORTHY COUNTRYMEN”: TEJANO TORIES

Like the Irish of San Patricio, Tejanos were faced with the choice of supporting the Mexican government or Texian rebels at the outset of the Revolution. The motivation of the Tejano Tories likely varied amongst individuals. Tejano sentiment was divided, with some choosing to remain loyal as Tories and others siding with the rebels. The Tejano Tories were likely motivated by several factors or ideals, ranging from personal conservatism, distrust of Anglo settlers, possible opposition to slavery, and fear of Texian invasion or Mexican governmental reprisal.

With the outbreak of the Texas Revolution in 1835, the Mexican government mobilized to suppress the rebellion. This effort included the recruitment of Tory forces in *Coahuila y Tejas* and other northern Mexican states, particularly Tamaulipas. In an official response to the revolution's outbreak (dated October 31), the government declared “bodies of militia are ordered to be raised, [and] volunteers are to be called for.”⁸⁶ In Texas, Tejano Tory leaders worked to organize Tejano support for the Mexican government and raise militias to assist in suppressing the Texian rebellion. Texian leaders obviously feared that Tejano Tories would support the Mexican troops by passing intelligence or actively serving with Mexican forces. This caused some Texian leaders to distrust even federalist Tejanos and fear Toryism amongst them. A Texian Military Affairs Committee Report of December 6, 1835 accused Tejanos of deserting Texian forces to join the Mexican forces “with the intention of giving all the information in their possession to Genl. Cos.”⁸⁷ Texian governor Henry Smith warned Stephen F. Austin on December 17 that he was not to furnish

⁸⁶ Transcript of Report of Mexico's Response to the Texas Rebellion, October 31, 1835, Béxar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center of American History (hereafter BA-DBC).

⁸⁷ Military Committee Affairs Report, Dec. 6, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 3, 103.

supplies or troops for any Mexican (which possibly meant proclaimed federalists from northern or central Mexico and likely included Tejanos) “who pretend to be our friends, such as [José Antonio] Mexía and others, who profess to belong to the liberal party.”⁸⁸ Smith’s words illustrate his distrust of Mexicans, even those who profess to support the Revolution like Mexía, a known federalist. Finally, Sam Houston echoed this belief in Tejano duplicity in a speech to the Texian garrison of Goliad on January 15, 1836, where he stated:

Even many of the Mexicans who live between the Sabine and the Rio Grande have disdainfully forsaken the cause of freedom, and have not only denied us their support but united themselves with the troops of Santa Anna and as enemies waged war against the land. Others have even gone beyond the Rio Grande to smother us in conjunction with the next invasion. These, comrades, are for us the most dangerous, because he who is not with us is against us.⁸⁹

In the same speech, Houston issued a chilling warning concerning Tories:

Two different tribes on the same hunting ground will never get along together. The tomahawk will ever fly and the scalping knife will never rest until the last of either one tribe or the other is either destroyed or is a slave.⁹⁰

The words of the Military Affairs Committee Report, Smith, and Houston show a clear message: Tejanos are not to be trusted, that Tejanos will betray the Texian cause, and that Tories cannot coexist alongside the Texians

A personally conservative nature likely influenced some Tejanos in their Toryism. One of the most prominent Tejano Tory leaders was José Ángel Navarro, Tory leader of San Antonio de Béxar and brother of Tejano federalist José Antonio Navarro. Born in 1784, Navarro served as a royalist officer in the Mexican War of Independence and may have fought alongside the Spanish

⁸⁸ Henry Smith to Stephen F. Austin, Branch T. Archer, and Willian H. Wharton, December 17, 1835, BA-DBC.

⁸⁹ Sam Houston, “To the Soldiers of Goliad, January 15, 1836” in *The Writings of Sam Houston*, ed. Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker, Vol. 1, 1813-1836 (Austin, TX: Jenkins Publishing Company, 1938), 337.

⁹⁰ Houston, “To the Soldiers of Goliad,” 338.

at the Battle of Medina in 1813, the bloodiest battle ever fought on Texas soil.⁹¹ Navarro remained in Texas following Mexican Independence and worked in local politics, often cooperating with the Mexican government regardless of its system: imperial, federalist, or centralist. This suggests that he was less concerned with political ideology than expediency, preferring to benefit himself by working alongside an established government. In 1835, Navarro was elected political chief of Béxar. Apparently conservative by nature (evidenced by his Royalist service and cooperation with subsequent cooperation with Mexican governments), Navarro aided the Mexican government at the outset of the revolution, particularly the Inspector General of the Interior Provinces, Martín Perfecto de Cos. On August 1, 1835, Navarro wrote to Cos and claimed that the people of Texas were ready to support the central government against the colonists, unambiguously proclaiming his Tory leanings.⁹² Cos arrived in Texas in September 1835, and by October had established his headquarters at Béxar. Cos was keen to garner the support of the citizens of Béxar and the Texas frontier settlements. Cos echoed this sentiment in an address to his troops on October 13, urging his men to consider the Béxar Tories as “worthy countrymen” and to “rely upon their exertions to support a cause which has become national and therefore common to all.”⁹³ Here, Cos encouraged his troops to cooperate with Tory support for the Mexican war effort.

Cos obviously sought Navarro’s aid in garnering local support in his effort, as he wrote to Navarro on October 17 and expressed his hope that the citizens would support the Mexican government against the Texian colonists.⁹⁴ Cos also wrote to Navarro to explain that several armed citizens had come forward to volunteer their services “against the rebellious colonists.”⁹⁵ Cos then

⁹¹ David McDonald, *José Antonio Navarro: In Search of the American Dream in Nineteenth Century Texas* (Denton, TX: Texas State Historical Association, 2010), 19.

⁹² José Ángel Navarro to Martín Perfecto de Cos, August 1, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 1, 298.

⁹³ Martín Perfecto de Cos to Troops, October 13, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 1, 111-112.

⁹⁴ Martín Perfecto de Cos to José Antonio Navarro, October 17, 1835, BA-DBC.

⁹⁵ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 166.

ordered Navarro to organize these Béxar citizens into a company called the “Volunteers of the Nation.”⁹⁶ Navarro was also eager to support the central government and gather local Tories to do so, as he wrote to Béxar resident José María Flores on October 18, instructing Flores to organize a voluntary militia to combat the rebels, likely the volunteers that Cos ordered to be raised.⁹⁷ It is apparent that Tory sentiment and enthusiasm to volunteer existed in Béxar, as Navarro wrote to Cos on October 20 and mentioned that citizens were interested in volunteering “for the defense of the country.”⁹⁸ To aid in recruitment, Cos authorized Navarro to promise these Tory volunteers that they would “do battle with the citizens of the interior in this city only in case of an attack.”⁹⁹ It is unknown if these volunteers were fully organized before the siege and subsequent storming of Béxar from November to December 1835.

Cos was not the only Mexican general keen on gaining and maintaining Tory support in Texas. Antonio López de Santa Anna also sought to maintain this support amongst Texas citizens, which he made clear in a statement to the citizens of Béxar on March 7, 1836, the day after the Alamo fell. The statement claimed that should inhabitants of Béxar or other settlements:

who should not appear to have been implicated in such iniquitous rebellion, shall be respected in their persons and property, provided that they come forward and report themselves to the commander of the troops within eight days after they should arrive in a settlement.¹⁰⁰

Santa Anna clearly promised that those who presented themselves to Mexican commanders would see their property rights respected. This statement alone might have provided a powerful incentive for Tejanos to be Tories, especially those of a conservative nature like Navarro.

⁹⁶ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 166.

⁹⁷ José Ángel Navarro to José María Flores, October 18, 1835, BA-DBC.

⁹⁸ José Ángel Navarro to Martín Perfecto de Cos, October 20, 1835, BA-DBC.

⁹⁹ Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience*, 166.

¹⁰⁰ Antonio López de Santa Anna to Citizens, Béxar, March 7, 1836, in *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, ed. John H. Jenkins, Vol. 5 (Austin, TX: Presidial Press, 1973), 103.

Men like José Ángel Navarro may have chosen to support the centralist Mexican government out of a conservative temperament or a desire to maintain political power. As political chief of Béxar, Navarro may have believed that the best way to maintain his position was to support Mexico instead of the Texians. It is possible that he did not care for political ideals of federalism versus centralism, as his royalist past and work with the Mexican federalist government suggest that he preferred to cooperate with established governments instead of rebelling.

Other Tejano Tories may have been motivated by a distrust of Anglo settlers and other foreigners. Perhaps the best-known and most active of the Tejano Tories was Carlos de la Garza. Born at Presidio La Bahía in Goliad, De la Garza was the son of a presidial soldier and the descendant of three generations of military men. As presidial troopers, his family fought armies of rebels and filibusters in the early nineteenth century, which made De la Garza distrustful of foreigners because of the rebellion and revolution they generally brought with them.¹⁰¹ The best known of these rebellions was the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition of 1813, an American led filibustering expedition to wrest Texas from Spain. The expedition was brutally suppressed by Spanish, Mexican and Tejano Royalists, and culminated in the Battle of Medina, the bloodiest battle ever fought on Texas soil. For Tejanos of a military background like De la Garza, these memories served as powerful motivators for their Toryism.

De la Garza also opposed the empresario colonies that brought many foreigners into Texas and often marginalized Hispanics by effectively making them a minority within Texas and making it difficult for Tejanos to gain their own land grants. De la Garza hoped to acquire his own ranch after the mission land in Goliad was secularized, but instead the land was given to the empresarios

¹⁰¹ Ana Carolina Castillo Crimm, *DeLeón: A Tejano Family History* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2003), 98.

James Power and James Hewetson by the state government of Coahuila y Tejas in June 1828.¹⁰² From 1828 to 1829, De la Garza and other Tejanos around Goliad petitioned the Mexican government for their own land grants, but were ignored.¹⁰³ From 1833 and 1834, Powers accepted Tejano land petitions when he realized he could not recruit enough Irish colonists, and De la Garza established his own ranch, Carlos Rancho, nine miles south of La Bahía along the San Antonio River.¹⁰⁴

De la Garza became involved with the Texas Revolution after Martín Perfecto de Cos arrived in Texas in September 1835. Cos landed in Copano and was greeted by a Tejano Tory delegation led by De la Garza, which pledged its loyalty to Mexico.¹⁰⁵ Upon meeting Cos, De la Garza offered to raise a Tory cavalry troop of local Tejanos and Karankawa Indians.¹⁰⁶ De la Garza made good on his offer and raised such a company, which was christened the *Victoriana Guardes*. Consisting of mounted Tejano Tories and possibly Karankawas, the company was described as “well armed and well mounted”¹⁰⁷ De la Garza and his Guardes joined the division of General José Urrea in March 1836, where they acted as scouts and guerrilla cavalry during Urrea’s campaign.¹⁰⁸ These Tories were likely recruited from De la Garza’s neighbors, as many Tejanos from the Goliad area fled to his ranch between November 1835 and March 1836.

¹⁰² Crimm, *DeLeón*, 98.

¹⁰³ Crimm, *DeLeón*, 101. Despite his distrust of foreigners and opposition to empresario colonies, De la Garza was willing to help new colonists. In 1829, he invited Powers’s newly arrived Irish colonists of to take shelter on his father’s ranch near Refugio. The Irish were sick and lacked food after their voyages from New York and New Orleans, and De la Garza provided them with food, clothing, and supplies while they stayed with his family.

¹⁰⁴ Crimm, *DeLeón*, 101.

¹⁰⁵ Alonzo Salazar, “Carlos de la Garza: Loyalist Leader,” in *Tejano Leadership in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas*, ed. Frank De la Teja (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2010), 202. This delegation included Guadalupe de los Santos, Manuel Sabriego, Juan and Agustín Moya, and Father José Antonio Valdéz, whom were prominent local leaders and ranchers in the Goliad area.

¹⁰⁶ Crimm, *DeLeón*, 101.

¹⁰⁷ Vicente Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis of José Urrea’s Military Diary: A Forgotten 1838 Publication by an Eyewitness to the Texas Revolution*, ed. Gregg J. Dimmick, trans. John R. Wheat (Austin, TX: Texas State Historical Association, 2007), 23.

¹⁰⁸ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 23.

The reason for this exodus was the “great harshness” Goliad Tejanos received from Phillip Dimmitt, the Texian commander of Presidio La Bahía.¹⁰⁹ This abuse included requisitioning private property without pay, slaughtering sheep without attempting to find the animal’s owner, threatening to saw down doors, and forcing citizens to bring water in oxcarts for the Texians.¹¹⁰ Fleeing such abuse, Tejanos came to De la Garza’s ranch, which became a Tory safe-haven for much of the Revolution.

Tories like Carlos de la Garza may have been distrustful of foreign immigration to Texas and the effect on local Tejanos such immigration brought. These effects included marginalizing Hispanics from land grants and empresario contracts and populating Texas with white immigrants. De la Garza himself was likely motivated by a desire to protect his land grant that he was recently awarded and those of other Tejanos. Tejanos motivated to protect these grants may have feared that they would lose their land in the event of a Texian victory.

Like the Irish Tories of San Patricio, Tejano Tories might have taken a possible opposition to slavery into consideration in determining their Toryism. Many Tejanos opposed slavery, but Tejano elites embraced the system because of economic benefits and actively worked to support slavery in Texas.¹¹¹ These Tejanos hoped that through the introduction of slavery and cotton into Texas would provide a robust economy and a stable population in the region.¹¹² These Tejanos were more likely to support the Texians at the Revolution’s outbreak in 1835. Tejano Tories, by contrast, were unlikely to own slaves and more likely to support the policies of the Mexican government in abolishing the practice. Like the Irish Tories, Tejano Tories came from a tradition of non-slave owning, as slavery was not popular in the frontier of northern Mexico because of the

¹⁰⁹ Stephen F. Austin to Phillip Dimmitt, before November 18, 1835, BA-DBC.

¹¹⁰ Roberto Galán to Stephen F. Austin, November 13, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 394.

¹¹¹ Torget, *Seeds of Empire*, 71.

¹¹² Torget, *Seeds of Empire*, 174.

agricultural methods of stock raising. Tejano Tories, particularly those from the Goliad area, were engaged in cattle ranching which was not a feasible business for slave owning because it required an unfree labor source. Like the Irish of San Patricio, current evidence does not suggest that the Tejanos of Goliad, and the Tories specifically, did not own slaves or support slavery. Because of these factors, Tejano Tories likely opposed slavery and supported the Mexican government's anti-slavery policies, which they considered in their Toryism.

Tejano Tory desire to protect not only their fellow Tejanos from Texian abuse, but also their land grants is similar to the desire of cuera troopers to earn land through military service. Tejano Tories were a continuation of the heritage of the soldado de cuera because of their motivation and methods of warfare. Soldados de cuera often earned their own land from the Spanish government when mission land was secularized as a reward for their service. These cuera troopers also protected the Hispanic frontier from foreign incursion, native attacks and rebellion. By allying themselves with the Mexican government to protect their lands and the Tejano citizens of the frontier, Tejano Tories like De la Garza continued the heritage of the soldado de cuera. Tory use of irregular cavalry tactics alongside Mexican troops reflect the methods of cuera cavalry and the *compañías volantes*, through their offensive patrols and possible use of improvised weapons like lances and lassoes. Through their service alongside Mexican troops, Tejano Tories continued the heritage of the cuera cavalry and proved that it was alive in 1830s Texas.

Tejanos were also motivated in their Toryism out of fear of Texian invasion, specifically of northern Mexican states like Tamaulipas. Even before the official response by the central government—and independent of the actions of Navarro and De la Garza—state officials in northern Mexico attempted to recruit Tory forces and support. This is evident in a series of letters from José Antonio Fernández, governor of Tamaulipas, to the *ayuntamiento* of Laredo. In the first

letter, dated October 24, 1835, Fernández advises that the Laredo *alcalde* have the citizens defend Laredo.¹¹³ This was likely in response to the Texian seizure of Presidio La Bahia in Goliad on October 9. The seizure of Goliad removed one of the two largest Mexican army garrisons in Texas—the other being San Antonio de Béxar. In his second letter, dated November 17, Fernández instructs the Laredo ayuntamiento that soldiers have the right to ask for horses that are owned by local rancheros to replace worn-out mounts.¹¹⁴ In the same letter, Fernández also specifies that rancheros are obligated to give their horses to soldiers need of new horses.¹¹⁵ In Fernández's third letter of November 20, he instructs the ayuntamiento to give the citizens permission to possess arms for their defense, possibly in response to the Texian victories at the battles of Concepción and Lipantitlán.¹¹⁶

Fernández was likely interested in recruiting local forces in Laredo for two reasons. First, Laredo was evidently a Tejano Tory city even before the outbreak of the Revolution, as a July 1, 1835 letter from Martín Perfecto de Cos attests. Cos, as Inspector General of the Interior Provinces, acknowledged Laredo's declaration of support to the central Mexican government.¹¹⁷ This declaration was likely in response to the Anahuac Disturbances of June 1835 over customs enforcement in Texas. Second, it is likely due to shortages of regular troops along the Rio Grande, Texas, and other areas of northern Mexico. In May 1835, Fernández wrote to the Laredo ayuntamiento, stating that the frontier towns must fortify themselves whenever troops are needed elsewhere in Texas.¹¹⁸ Arms were apparently available in Laredo, as Francisco Lojero wrote in

¹¹³ José Antonio Fernández to the Alcalde of Laredo, October 24, 1835, Spanish Archives of Laredo (hereafter SAL).

¹¹⁴ José Antonio Fernández to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, November 17, 1835, SAL.

¹¹⁵ José Antonio Fernández to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, November 17, 1835, SAL.

¹¹⁶ José Antonio Fernández to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, November 20, 1835, SAL.

¹¹⁷ Martín Perfecto de Cos to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, July 1, 1835, SAL.

¹¹⁸ José Antonio Fernández to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, May 29, 1835, SAL.

February that he was sending weapons for defense against Native Americans, as ordered by the federalist Mexican government.¹¹⁹

Fernández was not the only Mexican figure interested in garnering Tory support in Laredo. In October 1835 José María Guerra (a colonel of Mexican cavalry in Matamoros) warned the alcalde to watch for weapons and supplies heading to Texas and informs the alcalde of the Texian capture of Goliad.¹²⁰ The Laredo alcalde was also warned to arm the farmers and ranchers of the city in case of a possible Texian invasion of Tamaulipas.¹²¹ The citizens of Laredo apparently followed these requests, as military comandante José Sánchez to the alcalde thanked the citizens of Laredo for its loyalty and vigilance on November 14, and advised the alcalde on enemy movements near Béxar.¹²² This was explicitly in response to the Texian siege of San Antonio de Béxar which began on October 12, 1835. General Joaquín Ramírez y Sesma, Santa Anna's chief cavalry officer, also wanted the support of Laredo Tories. Sesma wrote the political chief (likely the alcalde) on November 30, ordering that Laredoans gather supplies for 1,500 troops Sesma was mustering.¹²³ Sesma also informed the political chief that his troops should arrive by December 11 and would proceed immediately to Béxar, likely to break the siege and relieve the centralist garrison under Cos.¹²⁴

Another possible motivating factor was fear of reprisal should the revolt fail. Many people in Texas, Tejanos and Anglos alike, were probably aware of Santa Anna's brutal suppression of the Zacatecas Revolt and feared a similar occurrence in Texas. Federalist governor Francisco

¹¹⁹ Francisco Lojero to the Ayuntamiento of Laredo, February 16, 1835, SAL.

¹²⁰ José María Guerra to the Alcalde of Laredo, October 15, 1835, SAL.

¹²¹ José María Guerra to the Alcalde of Laredo, October 18, 1835, SAL.

¹²² José Sánchez to the Alcalde of Laredo, November 14, 1835, SAL.

¹²³ Joaquín Ramírez y Sesma to Political Chief, Laredo, November 30, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 3, 50.

¹²⁴ Joaquín Ramírez y Sesma to Political Chief, Laredo, November 30, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 3, 50.

García Salinas opposed Santa Anna's order to dissolve the militia and mustered the Zacatecas militia to oppose the centralists. Santa Anna personally led the regular army to subdue the rebellion, defeating the federalist rebels in the Battle of Zacatecas in May 1835. As punishment for the revolt, Santa Anna rewarded his victorious troops by allowing them to pillage the city of Zacatecas for two days before returning to Mexico City.¹²⁵ Older Tejanos may have also remembered General Joaquín de Arredondo's reprisals after the Gutiérrez Magee Expedition's defeat in 1813. Arredondo executed anyone that was even thought to have supported the expedition or any rebellion against Spain, which practically depopulated Texas. A young Santa Anna served as an officer in Arredondo's army and took note of the general's methods. Ironically, Arredondo's ruthlessness created the very depopulated Texas that the Mexican government sought to correct with colonization and American immigration, which led to the Texas Revolution. Santa Anna used Arredondo's methods with impunity in his suppression of the Zacatecas Revolt and while working to suppress the rebellion in Texas.

Like the Irish Tories, Tejano Tories illustrate the idea of the negotiability of loyalty. Aside from ethnic ties to Mexico, Tejano Tories negotiated their loyalty by siding with the faction that they felt could protect their best interest, here protecting land from foreign incursion by Texian rebels and American volunteers and maintaining the political status quo in Texas. Their coinciding loyalty with the San Patricio Irish Tories also illustrates that multi-ethnic relations may help a central power rather than subvert, as both Tejanos and Irish Tories supported the Mexican war effort by communicating with Mexican officials and fighting alongside Mexican troops.

Tejano Tories were motivated in their Toryism by a variety of factors that often varied between individuals. Those like former Royalist José Ángel Navarro were motivated by a

¹²⁵ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 6.

personally conservative nature that sought to maintain the status quo. Others like Carlos de la Garza were motivated by a distrust of foreign settlement in Texas, which often marginalized Tejanos because they made it difficult for Tejanos to acquire their own land grants, and often brought revolution with them. Some Tories may have opposed slavery and the efforts of Texians to expand the institution into Texas, and so supported Mexico to continue their opposition. Other Tejano Tories were motivated by a fear of Texian invasion, like the people of Laredo who organized Tory forces to guard against such an incursion. Finally, Tejano Tories feared reprisal by the Mexican government should they support the Texians, likely remembering the brutal suppression tactics of Arredondo and Santa Anna's suppression of the Zacatecas Revolt. Whatever their motivation, Tejano Tories sought to support Mexico and be counted as the worthy countrymen that Gen. Cos believed them to be.

CHAPTER 4

“IMPORTANT SERVICES”: MILITARY PARTICIPATION OF THE TORIES

Military participation of the Tories during the Texas Revolution was limited when compared to that of regular Mexican troops and even Texian rebels. Yet their presence on the battlefield undoubtedly warranted unusual attention and even praise whenever they did so. Mexican *Zapador* (Sapper) officer José Enrique de la Peña described Tory auxiliaries as rendering “important services” to Mexican troops and claimed that the Mexican government would never be able to adequately recompense the Tories.¹²⁶ Aside from the political ramification of Toryism, what makes these instances of Tory military action noteworthy is how they fought. Tories filled a variety of military roles during the Revolution, including garrison troops, infantry, scouts, and cavalry. Through their military roles during the Texas Revolution, specifically their tactical contributions and methods of fighting, the Tories continued the historical tradition of the Wild Geese that was couched in the Mexican militia laws that existed in Texas prior to the Revolution in the case of the Irish, and the *soldados de cuera* and *compañías volantes* in the case of the Tejanos.

The roles that Irish Tories played mirror the roles played by the Wild Geese in the Spanish and French armies, specifically that of infantry, garrison troops, and cavalry. Most Wild Geese served as infantry, fighting on foot in battle with musket and bayonet. Wild Geese infantry also acted as garrison troops, manning fortifications throughout the Spanish and French Empires. Examples of this include the Spanish infantry regiments of *Hibernia* (Hibernia) and *Ultonia* (Ulster), who famously wore red uniforms in mimicry of the Jacobite roots of early Irish troops in

¹²⁶ José Enrique De La Peña, *With Santa Anna in Texas: A Personal Narrative of the Revolution*, ed. and trans. Carmen Perry (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1997), 76.

foreign service.¹²⁷ Hibernia served throughout the Spanish Empire, fighting in the 1781 Siege of Pensacola and the 1812 Siege of Badajoz. Ultonia also served in the colonies and Peninsula, garrisoning New Spain from 1768 to 1771 before returning to Spain, where the served alongside the Hibernia and *Irlanda* (Ireland) regiments during the Peninsular War. Wild Geese cavalry served in smaller numbers than the infantry, though one regiment is well-known: the French cavalry regiment Fitzjames's Horse. Raised in 1692 as a larger King's Regiment of Horse, the regiment served in the War of the Spanish Succession, the War of the Austrian Succession, and most famously at the Battle of Culloden in 1745, where seventy troopers served in the Jacobite army. At Culloden, Fitzjames's Horse was the only Jacobite cavalry to remain mounted during the engagement but were badly mauled by British dragoons. A popular cavalry tactic of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was to operate as mounted infantry or dragoons, using horses to reach their destination before dismounting to fight.

Despite the well-known support for Mexico the colony, the San Patricio Tories played a minor, but noteworthy role in the Texas Revolution, where they played the same military roles as their Wild Geese forebearers. The Irish Tories of San Patricio are documented as only participating in one action alongside the Mexican Army: The Battle of Lipantitlán. This battle occurred out a desire of Texian leaders—particularly Goliad commandant Phillip Dimmitt—to capture the centralist garrison at Fort Lipantitlán. The fort was located along the Nueces River just outside of San Patricio, which likely comforted the local Tories with the presence of Mexican troops. Dimmitt urged Stephen F. Austin to capture the fort because he believed it possessed artillery, small arms, ammunition, and a “valuable caballada”—all supplies that the Texians desperately

¹²⁷ Eduardo de Mesa, *The Irish in the Spanish Armies in the Seventeenth Century* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2014), 216.

needed.¹²⁸ The fort's capture would also upset Tory control in San Patricio and allow federalists within the colony to take power. These federalists would ensure San Patricio remained supportive of the Texian cause, a vital strategic consideration given the town's proximity to Goliad. In early October 1835, Dimmitt sent two Irishmen, John Williams and John Tool, to San Patricio to contact federalist leaders within the colony. The two were arrested by local Tories and turned over to Mexican troops at Lipantitlán.¹²⁹

With the capture of Williams and Tool, Dimmitt's desire to capture Lipantitlán only grew. Dimmitt also received information stating that two hundred Mexican dragoons were riding to reinforce the garrison, with an additional two to three hundred cavalry from Matamoros behind them.¹³⁰ The alleged purpose of the Matamoros cavalry was to recapture Goliad.¹³¹ Convinced of the importance of Lipantitlán, Dimmitt dispatched Ira Westover with thirty-five mounted riflemen on October 31 with orders to capture the garrison. That same day, Captain Nicolás Rodríguez led the bulk of the Mexican cavalry out of Lipantitlán to capture Goliad. Accompanying Rodríguez's cavalry were at least nine Tories from San Patricio, including the town's alcalde, judge, and sheriff.¹³² Westover's detachment moved south and swept east to approach San Patricio, while Rodríguez's dragoons and Tory allies moved north towards Goliad. Additionally, Mexican dragoons patrolled the Atascosito Road, a vital connection between Texas and central Mexico, just north of San Patricio. Guided by Francisco de la Portilla, a local Tejano and brother-in-law of Colonel James Power (one of Westover's advisors), the Texians reached San Patricio shortly after sundown on November 3. They soon learned of the garrison's emptiness and sought to capture the

¹²⁸ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 41.

¹²⁹ Phillip Dimmitt to Stephen F. Austin, October 25, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 217.

¹³⁰ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 42.

¹³¹ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 42.

¹³² Ira Westover to Sam Houston, November 15, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 432.

fort as soon as possible. Realizing that many San Patricio citizens were Tories, Westover arrested James O'Riley, whom Westover accused of "aiding and assisting the enemy."¹³³ O'Riley was forced to accompany the Texians to Lipantitlán as prisoner, where he negotiated with Westover for his freedom. O'Riley offered to convince the garrison to surrender if Westover would guarantee his personal safety, to which Westover agreed. O'Riley approached the fort and made good on his word, convincing the twenty-seven men within the garrison to surrender by eleven o'clock that night.¹³⁴ Amongst the captured garrison were a small number of Tories, five Irishmen, and one Englishman from San Patricio.¹³⁵ Of these Tories, Westover claimed that some joined the Mexican garrison from choice, while others joined from compulsion.¹³⁶

The captured Tories and centralist troops did not participate further in the campaign. The Texians offered them generous parole terms upon their capture: they would be immediately released if they swore not to take up arms for the remainder of the conflict.¹³⁷ The Texians were decidedly unimpressed with Lipantitlán once they occupied the fort. Irish federalist John Linn described the fort as a "single embankment of earth" that was "lined within by fence-rails to hold the dirt in place."¹³⁸ Linn's apparent disgust was so great that he believed the fort was better suited as a "second rate hog pen" than a military installation. The supposed arms held within the fort were found to be lacking, consisting of "two four-pound cannon, eight 'escopets' or old Spanish guns, and three or four pounds of powder; but no balls for the guns were discovered."¹³⁹ This shows that the Tories and centralist troops at San Patricio, at least those within the garrison, were woefully underequipped to fight the Texians. Westover's men occupied San Patricio for the night,

¹³³ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 431.

¹³⁴ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 44.

¹³⁵ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 431.

¹³⁶ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 431.

¹³⁷ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 44.

¹³⁸ John L. Linn, *Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas* (New York, NY: D. & J. Sadler and Company, 1883), 119.

¹³⁹ Linn, *Reminiscences*, 120.

and on the morning of November 4 they burned several wooden huts around Lipantitlán and partially dismantled the earthen embankment.¹⁴⁰ Around three o'clock that afternoon, the Texians prepared to return to Goliad by securing the two cannon, and rounding up fourteen of the "public horses," possibly from the Lipantitlán caballada.¹⁴¹ During the Texian occupation of San Patricio and Lipantitlán, it does not appear that they had any conflict with local Tories other than those captured from the garrison.¹⁴²

While the Texians were preparing to withdraw from San Patricio, Rodríguez's dragoons and Tory auxiliaries were still heading north to Goliad. They had almost reached their destination when a local informant of Captain Manuel Sabriego informed Rodríguez of the Texian capture of Lipantitlán. Turning his force south, Rodríguez led his men back to San Patricio, where they arrived at the outskirts of Lipantitlán around four o'clock in the afternoon of November 4.¹⁴³ Fortunately for the Texians, Westover spotted the Mexican and Tory forces, and ordered his men to prepare for battle. Westover ordered half of his riflemen to cross to the eastern bank of the Nueces, where they took cover amongst a grove of trees.¹⁴⁴ This was a preferred tactic of Texian rifleman, because it allowed them to shield themselves and bring the accuracy of their long rifles to bear, generally outclassing the musket-armed Mexican infantry. Realizing that his dragoons could not operate as cavalry in a wooded area, Rodríguez ordered his dragoons and Tories to dismount. The Tories and dragoons were then forced to attack the Texian position on foot.

Rodríguez deployed his men a single battle line, with the Tories on the Mexican left flank.¹⁴⁵ In his official report of the action to General Sam Houston, Westover gives a description

¹⁴⁰ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 432.

¹⁴¹ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 432.

¹⁴² Westover's official report to Houston does not suggest any conflict with San Patricio Tories, but more research is needed into this incident.

¹⁴³ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 45.

¹⁴⁴ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, 432.

¹⁴⁵ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, 432.

of the Mexican and Tory movements: “the enemy came up in front and made a move from their centre around our flanks on the river leaving a few men under cover of a mote in front. The enemy on our right flank dismounted and took the advantage of the timber led on by nine of the Irish of San Patricia [sic].”¹⁴⁶ The Tories appear to have acted as guides and scouts, guiding the Mexican dragoons through the timber along the western bank of the Nueces. It is apparent that Texians were not entirely sure of the number of Tories that fought at Lipantitlán, with Westover’s report stating that nine Tories participated, while A. H. Jones claims that twenty Tories fought with the Mexicans.¹⁴⁷ Regardless of exactly how many Tories were at Lipantitlán, it is clear that they were in the middle of the action.

The Mexicans and Tories advanced to about two hundred yards from the Texian position and opened fire, though this was ineffective because the smoothbore carbines carried by the cavalry were woefully inaccurate at such a range. By contrast, the Texian long rifles were fully capable at two hundred yards and inflicted severe casualties on the Mexicans and Tories. Jones claimed that Texian riflemen killed three and wounded fourteen of the Mexican force, three of which were Tories.¹⁴⁸ Westover corroborated the number of Tories wounded, and both he and Jones claimed the men were the judge, sheriff, and alcalde of San Patricio. The Tories and Mexicans pressed their advance on the Texians but were forced to withdraw after a half hour engagement. At dawn on November 5, Rodríguez sent a courier under a flag of truce to Westover in San Patricio, requesting a truce and permission to bring the Mexican wounded into the town. Westover agreed and the Mexican wounded, possibly including the Tories, made their way into San Patricio.

¹⁴⁶ Ira Westover to Sam Houston, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, 432.

¹⁴⁷ A. H. Jones to James Fannin, November 12, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 384.

¹⁴⁸ A. H. Jones to James Fannin, November 12, 1835, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 2, 384.

After burying his dead and treating his wounded, Rodríguez withdrew his dragoons to Matamoros, leaving the Texians in possession of the town. The Tories who fought with Rodríguez likely remained in San Patricio. Westover's men withdrew from San Patricio and arrived at Goliad on November 12. The Texians failed to leave a force within San Patricio to protect the federalists amongst its population, which left the door open for the Tories to regain control of the local government. Federalist John Turner claimed that Rodríguez had written to San Patricio leaders and invited the town's populace to join his ranks, promising the "vengeance of the Mexican army" if they did not.¹⁴⁹ Though evidence does not suggest any enlistment of San Patricio Tories in the Mexican Army, it is likely that the Tories regained control of San Patricio by at least March 1836, as the town was very welcoming to the division of General José de Urrea.¹⁵⁰

Militarily, the San Patricio Tories played a small but distinguished role in the Lipantitlán affair. They composed a relatively small portion of the Mexican force, with at least nine and possibly twenty participating in the battle and six captured by the Texians in the garrison. It is currently unknown what these Tories were armed with, possibly Brown Bess muskets or Paget cavalry carbines, both surplus British weapons purchased by Mexico for its army.¹⁵¹ The Tories may have also carried privately owned firearms like hunting rifles and shotguns, as civilians in Texas generally owned such weapons and early Mexican militia regulations called for men to supply their own arms if available.¹⁵² How these Tories stand out is in their manner of fighting. The Tories filled two roles in the Lipantitlán episode, those of garrison troops and mounted infantry. By garrisoning the fort of Lipantitlán, the Tories acted as guards of the fort and town in

¹⁴⁹ John Turner to Phillip Dimmitt, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, 51.

¹⁵⁰ De La Peña, *With Santa Anna in Texas*, 76.

¹⁵¹ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 99-100.

¹⁵² "Decree, Regulation of the Civic Militia, 1822," in *A Collection of Documents on the History of the Mexican War for Independence*, ed. J. E. Hernández y Dávalos, Vol. 1 (Mexico City, Mexico: 1877), 427-55; 50.

case of a Texian attack. Those who rode and fought with Rodríguez acted as mounted infantry that rode into battle and then dismounted to fight, a continuation of the classic dragoon tactic. On foot, these Tories acted as infantry, likely skirmishers and guides for the dragoons as they moved through the timber to engage the Texians. The Tories at Lipantitlán followed in the footsteps of their Wild Geese predecessors in the roles as garrison troops, infantry, and cavalry—and continued the tradition of the Wild Geese by doing so.

The Irish Tories' participation at Lipantitlán also mirrors Mexican militia law, as these Irishmen organized and fought as a civic militia. Generally, colonies in Texas were required by Mexican law to form a militia upon the foundation of their settlements. This was generally in the form of a civic militia, a locally raised and recruited force comprised of all male citizens between the ages of 18 to 50.¹⁵³ On August 3, 1822, the Mexican Congress passed a law to create a civic militia that was essentially an almost word-for-word reprint of a similar decree of the Spanish Cortes of October 14, 1820.¹⁵⁴ Between 1822 and 1827, several Mexican states had implemented the terms of the militia law, and as a result a militia that was not under national regulations arose during this period.¹⁵⁵

On December 29, 1827, the Mexican government passed a civic militia law that effectively brought militia units under federal control.¹⁵⁶ These regulations stated that the civic militia was to consist of all male citizens of the states with officers elected from the local property-owning populace.¹⁵⁷ Militia law also allowed states to draw upon their own ordinances for their militias, nominate their own inspectors and set up their own property qualifications for officers.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵³ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 270.

¹⁵⁴ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 271.

¹⁵⁵ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 271.

¹⁵⁶ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 271.

¹⁵⁷ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 272.

¹⁵⁸ Santoni, "A Fear of the People," 272.

Regarding ordinance and weapons, this allowed states to issue weapons to their civic militias, though regulations also stipulated that militiamen were to bring their own arms into service if they possessed any, which was likely the norm for militias in Texas.¹⁵⁹ The civic militia was also intended to act as support arm for the regular army, and by 1835 the combined strength of the Mexican army and active militia was estimated at 200,000 men, with 50,000 belonging to the regular army and 150,000 in the active militia.¹⁶⁰ The civic militia in 1835 was calculated as 800,000 men, bringing the entire Mexican military forces to around 2 million troops.¹⁶¹ The civic militias was very popular in Texas, and it was Santa Anna's dissolution on the militia in 1834 that helped spark the Revolution, as the militia was a key means of defense for settlements on the Texas frontier. The Tories of Lipantitlán likely organized themselves in a quasi-civic militia manner that coincided with Mexican law, as they were locally organized, likely armed themselves with their own firearms or borrowed from Mexican stores and acted as support for regular Mexican troops.

Like the Irish Tories and their Wild Geese predecessors, Tejano Tories possessed a rich military heritage that they imitated while fighting alongside Mexican forces. Many Tejanos, particularly those from the Goliad area like Carlos de la Garza, were the descendants of Spanish cavalry that garrisoned the *presidios* (fortresses) that dotted the northern frontier of New Spain during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The duty of these cavalry was to protect the various missions and settlements of the New Spain frontier from Native American attacks and foreign incursion. These troopers were known as *soldados de cuera* or "leather-jacket soldier," named for a large, sleeveless buckskin coat worn as protection from native arrows. These troopers were trained to fight from horseback and also fought on foot a the situation required, again as part of

¹⁵⁹ "Decree on the Regulation of the Civic Militia, 1822," *Collection of Documents*, 50.

¹⁶⁰ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 136.

¹⁶¹ Edward, *The History of Texas*, 136.

the dragoon tactic for cavalry.¹⁶² Another military tradition that Tejano Tories drew experience from was the *compañías volantes* or “flying companies,” mounted militias that were responsible for aiding the regular Spanish and later Mexican military in Texas and at times conducting independent campaigns in the absence of regular forces. The *compañías* origins can be traced to 1713, when Spanish Viceroy Linares ordered frontier landowners of New Spain to organize “flying companies” of militia to resist attacks by Native Americans, specifying that each company was to number seventy mounted men.¹⁶³

Further regulation of the *compañías* occurred with the Reglamento of 1772, which ordered more formal organization of the companies by staffing them with local volunteers trained by professional officers and calling for longer terms of duty through extensive campaigns.¹⁶⁴ The *compañías volantes* were likely a key factor in the organization of Carlos de la Garza’s Victoriana Guardes, as they were a mounted force that conducted offensive patrols of Texian forces around Goliad. Each cuera trooper was also to be heavily armed, with the 1772 Reglamento specifying each soldier was to carry a flintlock *escopeta* (musket) or a *carabina* (“carbine”) with a shorter barrel, making it easier to wield from horseback, and a brace of pistols that had barrels no longer than ten inches and of the same caliber as the musket or carbine.¹⁶⁵ *Compañía* volunteers were also to be heavily armed, with regulations dictating each man to carry a carbine and two pistols.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² Max L. Moorhead, *The Presidio: Bastion of the Spanish Borderlands* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975), 188.

¹⁶³ Andrés Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas under the Mexican Flag, 1821-1836* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1994) 79.

¹⁶⁴ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 79.

¹⁶⁵ Moorhead, *The Presidio*, 189.

¹⁶⁶ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 81. Because of their status as local volunteers and militia, the *compañías volantes* were required by government regulations to arm and equip themselves, including a saddle, a blanket, spurs, a hat, and several horses.

Tejano Tories likely possessed similar firearms during the Texas Revolution, as they may have been available in Texas in 1835.¹⁶⁷

Alongside their firearms, cuera cavalrymen were regulated to carry a lance measuring eight to nine feet in length, with a head measuring just over thirteen inches long, one and a half inches wide, with a reinforced ridge along the spine, cutting edges on both sides, and a guard at its base.¹⁶⁸ Finally, each trooper was to carry a sword like the broadsword-like cavalry swords of the Spanish Army. Though these regular swords were issued and use by the cuera cavalry, another popular sword in New Spain was the *espada ancha* or “broad sword,” a short sword with a broad blade measuring about eighteen inches, often made by cutting down the blade of regular military sword.¹⁶⁹ The *espada ancha*’s short blade made it easier to wield from horseback than the regular cavalry sword, becoming very popular amongst civilians. The *espada ancha* saw widespread use among *vaqueros* and *rancheros* and was commonly used by mounted militias throughout New Spain. These bladed weapons likely saw use amongst the Tejano Tories, as they would have been available, and many Tejanos were familiar with their use.¹⁷⁰ A favorite weapons combination of the *compañías* was the lance and lasso, a skill gained from their work as *rancheros*. Skill with the lance came from the *desjarretadera*, a tool with a ten to twelve-foot shaft and half-moon shaped blade or *luna*, which was used in slaughtering cattle.¹⁷¹ The *vaquero* would tuck the tool under his arm and ride behind a cow to position the blade against the rear leg of the animal, then flick his

¹⁶⁷ It is currently unknown what firearms the Tories used, but Garay’s description of the Victoriana Guardes as “well armed” suggest that Tejanos possessed arms that Mexican officers thought enough.

¹⁶⁸ Moorhead, *The Presidio*, 190.

¹⁶⁹ Moorhead, *The Presidio*, 190.

¹⁷⁰ Period illustrations of *vaqueros* and irregular horsemen often show swords attached to the saddle and lances held in an offhand. Troopers and militia often relied on bladed weapons as the inefficient Spanish supply system was centrally based in Mexico City and required all supplies to pass through the city before moving north. This slowed resupply to often one annual visit to presidios, if they survived banditry and Indian attack. Spanish restrictions on gunsmithing and a lack of skilled gunsmiths led to a general lack of firearms on the frontier, and the supply system caused a deficiency in shot and powder.

¹⁷¹ Hardin, “Efficient in the Cause,” 50.

wrist to sever the tendon and cause the cow to drop to the ground.¹⁷² The vaquero then dismounted and drove the luna into the cow's head, severing the spinal cord and killing the animal.¹⁷³ The dexterity gained from using such a tool allowed *compañía* members to be effective lancers while on campaign.¹⁷⁴ Lassoos were a key piece of equipment for vaqueros, used in the wrangling of cattle for branding and herding. On campaign, it proved an effective weapon in the hands of skilled vaqueros, whose favored tactic was to lasso an enemy combatant, pull him from the saddle, and drag him along the ground to his death.¹⁷⁵ Mounted Tejano Tories may have been familiar with this technique either through their own militia service or secondhand knowledge passed down from other Tejanos.

Aside from the obvious influence of the Spanish military, the *compañías volantes* also borrowed aspects of Native American military influence that was utilized by the Tejano Tories. Tlaxcalan Indians of the *Compañía Volante de San Carlos de Parras* introduced the practice of the *caballada* to the *compañías* sometime during the eighteenth century.¹⁷⁶ The *caballada* was a herd of horses that accompanied the *compañía* on campaign, with a designated ten horses per man.¹⁷⁷ As mentioned earlier, presidial cavalrymen were also issued multiple horses per man. This allowed each *compañía* member to always have a fresh horse to continue their campaigns and reduce the rigors of campaign on horses. It is possible that the Tejano Tories, specifically the Victoriana Guardes may have continued the practice of the *caballada* when they campaigned alongside Urrea's division.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷² Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 50.

¹⁷³ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 50-51.

¹⁷⁴ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 51.

¹⁷⁵ Hardin, "Efficient in the Cause," 50.

¹⁷⁶ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 81.

¹⁷⁷ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 80.

¹⁷⁸ More research is needed into this area, though Colonel Francisco Garay's description of the Guardes as "well mounted" suggests that the Guardes possessed good horses.

Compañía volantes also adopted a strategic and tactical outlook that was colored by their experience with horse-born Native American warriors, specifically the Comanches. Rather than retaliatory raids against native villages in response to aggression on Tejano settlements, the *compañías volantes* were now required to maintain constant offensive patrols known as *cortadas*, a duty they performed until the late 1820s.¹⁷⁹ If a Comanche war party raided Tejano settlements, the *compañías volantes* would mount an offensive counterstrike into Comanche territory. This doctrine was known as *vatic y perseguir* or “strike and pursue.” Aside from their military duties of patrolling and pursuing Native Americans, the *compañías volantes* also functioned as a sort of mounted police force or *gendarmerie*. A specific example is that of the Laredo and *San Antonio de Béxar* *compañías*, who during the late eighteenth century were made responsible for pursuing criminals in the *despoblado* or unpopulated areas around the two cities.¹⁸⁰ This tradition of offensive patrols and aggressive strikes within enemy territory was likely the fighting style of Tejano Tories like the Victoriana Guardes, evidenced by their raid of Refugio and their scouting operations around Goliad.

In contrast to the relatively small military role played by the Irish Tories, Tejano Tories participated in several military engagements of the Texas Revolution. Tejano Tories specifically fought alongside the division of General José de Urrea as he conducted a campaign along the southeastern Texas coast from February to April 1836. Urrea began his campaign by marching north from Matamoros along the Atascosito Road. His main objective was to recapture the fortification of Presidio La Bahía, then held by Texian under the command of Colonel James Walker Fannin. Urrea was then to proceed north into the heart of the Anglo colonies in East Texas and consolidate with the wing of the army commanded by Santa Anna. As Urrea proceeded north

¹⁷⁹ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 81.

¹⁸⁰ Tijerina, *Tejanos and Texas*, 81.

into Texas, he was joined by various Tejano Tories from the area surrounding Goliad and La Bahía. After leaving Matamoros, Urrea was joined by Tejano Tory Don Salvador Cuéllar, the brother of Mexican Army deserter Jesús Cuéllar, also known as “Comanche” because he had been a captive of the tribe.¹⁸¹ Jesús was originally a sergeant in the Second Company of Flying Cavalry of Tamaulipas who deserted to the Texians as they besieged Béxar in December 1835 and by March 1836 was serving with the Texian garrison of La Bahía.¹⁸² After Urrea captured San Patricio from Texian troops on February 27, he remained in the town to drill his men. On the evening of March 7, Urrea was visited by Jesús Cuéllar, who announced his defection from the Texians and offered to assist Urrea.¹⁸³

Cuéllar told Urrea that Fannin’s Texians were moving to attack the Mexican forces at San Patricio and offered to guide Urrea’s men to spot where they could ambush and easily defeat the Texians.¹⁸⁴ Cuéllar also swore that he had originally deserted to the Texians at Béxar “for the purpose of better serving the government in the field of the enemy, convincing proof of which would be the fulfillment of the promise he was making to us.”¹⁸⁵ After Salvador vouched for his brother’s sincerity, Urrea agreed to Cuéllar’s plan and departed San Patricio with two hundred infantry, one hundred and fifty cavalry and one artillery piece on the morning of March 8.¹⁸⁶ Cuéllar led Urrea’s troops to Arroyo de las Ratas, a wooded area along the road to Refugio Mission roughly eight leagues (twenty-four miles) north of San Patricio, upon which he departed Urrea’s forces.¹⁸⁷ Finding the spot ill-suited for concealing his troops, Urrea departed the Arroyo around midnight on March 8 and returned to San Patricio.

¹⁸¹ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 19.

¹⁸² Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 21.

¹⁸³ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 20.

¹⁸⁴ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 20.

¹⁸⁵ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 20.

¹⁸⁶ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 20.

¹⁸⁷ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 20.

On March 12, Urrea received Tory reinforcements that played a major role in his campaign. That afternoon a group of thirty civilians from Goliad presented themselves to Urrea and offered their services. Colonel Francisco Garay described these Tories as “well mounted and well armed, under the command of a presidial (Mexican frontier cavalry) sergeant,” and General Vicente Filísola claimed that these were Carlos de la Garza and his Victoriana Guardes, as well as several soldiers of the company of La Bahía del Espiritu Santo.¹⁸⁸ Filísola in particular singled out De la Garza and the Victoriana Guardes for their subsequent role in the action at Refugio Mission two days later, stating that they served in “a commendable way.” With the addition of these Tory auxiliaries, who made excellent scouts because of their knowledge of the local terrain, Urrea took the Guardes and six hundred men of his division north towards Refugio.¹⁸⁹

Tejano Tories might have played a part in an important action of Urea’s campaign before they arrived at Urrea’s camp. On March 2, Texian officers Dr. James Grant, Ruben Brown and Plácido Benavides were driving a herd of several hundred horses with fifty-three mounted Texians north towards San Patricio, unaware of the town’s capture by Urrea. Grant, Benavides and Brown rode roughly a half mile ahead of the column and approached the crossing of Agua Dulce creek at El Puerto de los Cuates de Agua Dulce, which sits roughly twenty-six miles south of San Patricio. Unbeknownst to the Texians, one hundred and fifty Mexican troops, eighty cavalry and seventy infantry, were under cover of two timber groves at the crossing, awaiting the opportunity to ambush the Texians.¹⁹⁰ Urrea was informed of the Texians’ position and route of march before the

¹⁸⁸ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 24-28.

¹⁸⁹ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola’s Analysis*, 22.

¹⁹⁰ José Urrea, “Diario de las operaciones de la división que al mando del General José Urrea hizo la Campaña de Tejas,” in *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution (1836) by the Chief Mexican Participants: General Antonio López de Santa Anna, D. Ramón Martínez Caro (Secretary to Santa Anna), General Vicente Filísola, General José Urrea, General José María Tornel (Secretary of War)*, ed. Carlos E. Castañeda (Austin, TX: Graphic Ideas Incorporated, 1970), 223.

ambush, possibly be local Tories.¹⁹¹ The bulk of the Texian force reached the timber between ten and eleven o'clock on the morning of March 2, at which point the Mexican cavalry attacked. Most of the Texians were killed in the opening moments of the skirmish, either shot or lanced as they attempted to flee.¹⁹² Five Texians dismounted and attempted to run, two of whom were killed by the Mexican infantry and the rest escaped.

Grant, Benavides, and Brown turned their horses to join the Texians upon the initial attack, but upon arrival quickly realized that the battle was lost. Brown had dismounted for an unknown reason, though it is possible he did this to load his rifle, as long rifles were impractical on horseback, or his horse was killed. Grant pulled Brown onto his own horse and rode away alongside Benavides. Pursued by the Mexican cavalry, Brown shot a Mexican officer and the horse herd stampeded. This pushed the cavalry aside and allowed the Texians an avenue of escape, as they followed the herd. Galloping for roughly six or seven miles, the men fired their pistols at the cavalry to keep them at a distance and refused to believe Mexican entreaties that they would be spared if they surrendered. Grant ordered Benavides to gallop to Goliad and alert Fannin of Urrea's proximity to the area. Benavides obeyed and Mexican cavalymen surrounded Grant and Brown shortly after. Grant was lanced to death after he killed a Mexican who had pierced Brown's arm with a lance.¹⁹³ Brown attempted to defend himself with a pistol and stolen lance but was lassoed and pulled from the saddle. Brown was then taken to the site of the ambush as a prisoner. The use of a lasso to subdue Brown suggests that Tejano Tories may have participated in the ambush at

¹⁹¹ Urrea, "Diario," *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 223. A likely candidate is either Guadalupe de los Santos himself or one of his rancheros who helped guide Urrea around the area of San Patricio

¹⁹² Herman Ehrenberg, *With Milam and Fannin: Adventures of a German Boy in Texas' Revolution*, ed. Henry Smith, trans. Charlotte Churchill (Austin, TX: The Pemberton Press, 1968), 157.

¹⁹³ De la Peña, *With Santa Anna in Texas*, 69. Peña states that Mexican troops recognized Grant from his time as a landowner in Matamoros and killed him over a grudge and to gain his silver saddle and "flashy firearms." This description of a grudge and of Grant's killer as a "cossack" suggests that Grant may have been killed by a Tory.

Agua Dulce, as lassoes were popular tools and weapons amongst Tejanos, but was not issued to Mexican cavalry.

Tories also raided Refugio as they rode south to join Urrea. The Victoriana Guardes arrived in the town on February 27, where four Tories visited the house of a Mrs. Foley. The four Tories accosted Mrs. Foley and called for whiskey.¹⁹⁴ The next day, the Guardes looted the town, which Texian politician Lewis Ayers described in his journal. According to Ayers, the Tories opened feather beds and scattered the feathers in the hopes of finding money.¹⁹⁵ Seven armed Tories also came to Ayers' house, ostensibly with the intention to plunder the property and possibly to kill Ayers.¹⁹⁶ These Tories were driven away by Ayers and Horborn, after which the Tories withdrew from Refugio and continued south towards Urrea.

As De la Garza's Guardes departed Goliad to reconnoiter with Urrea and raid Refugio, the Battle of Refugio was initiated by Tories and Texians near the Mission River. Twenty-eight Texians under Captain Amon B. King had been dispatched from Goliad to Refugio to evacuate Texian families in the area, likely a result of the previous Tory raid. Arriving at Refugio on March 12, King's forces successfully gathered the families around the settlement, but delayed their return to Goliad by attempting to harass local Tories. Hearing of a Tory encampment on the ranch of Estevan López on the Mission River below Refugio, King's men moved to engage these Tories. The Texians found the ranch to have been abandoned, and likely frustrated at the loss of opportunity to engage any Tories, burned it. This proved to be a fatal mistake, as the time taken to conduct this punitive expedition gave Urrea's cavalry, including Tories under De la Garza and De los Santos, enough time to reach Refugio.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁴ Lewis Ayers's Journal, *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar*, Vol. 1, 335.

¹⁹⁵ Lewis Ayers's Journal, *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar*, Vol. 1, 335.

¹⁹⁶ Lewis Ayers's Journal, *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar*, Vol. 1, 335.

¹⁹⁷ Urrea, "Diario," *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 225.

As King returned his forces to Refugio, he ran into the vanguard of Urrea's cavalry and was ambushed by De la Garza's and De los Santos's Tories on the outskirts of the town. Unable to match the Tory and Mexican cavalry on the open prairie, King withdrew his men into the Mission Nuestra Señora del Rosario and sent word to Fannin in Goliad to request reinforcements. According to Ehrenberg, King described the besieging forces as "a band of one-hundred and fifty Mexicans and Indians."¹⁹⁸ While taking cover within the mission, King's riflemen could hold the Tories and Mexican cavalry at bay. The Tories and cavalry then proceeded to besiege the mission, likely to keep the Texians from escaping, and a task that would likely have required them to dismount to perform. Fannin received King's request for help and ordered Colonel William Ward's Georgia Battalion to assist their besieged comrades. Ward's battalion arrived at Refugio around three o'clock on March 14, where the two quarreled over who was in command of their forces.¹⁹⁹ The Mexican forces retreated from the mission with the arrival of Ward's men, with King deciding to pursue the retreating adversaries while Ward moved to attack a supposed Tory ranch. Ward heard reports of a small fort built by Mexicans and Karankawa Indians about five miles away from Refugio, and he decided to locate this fort and destroy it.²⁰⁰ Finding no fortress, Ward returned to Refugio and took up quarters in the mission.

As Ward returned to the mission, Mexican infantry under Garay and cavalry under Cpt. Rafael Pretalia reinforced the Tories and cavalry around five o'clock, bringing artillery with them.²⁰¹ The Mexicans besieged the mission once again, shelling the church with artillery and driving King's forces out of a timber grove on the south bank of the Mission River.²⁰² King's men

¹⁹⁸ Ehrenberg, *With Milam and Fannin*, 160.

¹⁹⁹ Samuel T. Brown, "Battle of the Mission [Refugio]," in *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar*, ed. Charles Adams Gulick, Jr., Vol. 2 (Austin, TX: A.C. Baldwin & Sons, 1922), 10.

²⁰⁰ Ehrenberg, *With Milam and Fannin*, 160.

²⁰¹ Urrea, "Diario," *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 223.

²⁰² Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola's Analysis*, 26.

escaped and were pursued by thirty Tories, likely De la Garza's men, and thirty six of them were captured on the morning of March 15.²⁰³ The Tories brought the Texian prisoners back to Refugio, where they were handed over to Urrea and subsequently executed.²⁰⁴ Garay intercepted a Texian courier carrying a message from Fannin to Ward ordering him to abandon the mission and retreat to Goliad, which Garay allowed the courier to deliver. Ward subsequently evacuated the mission before dawn on March 16 and escaped.²⁰⁵ De la Garza's men hunted Ward's battalion on the plains between Refugio and Goliad until Ward surrendered on March 22 and brought to Goliad under guard after the Battle of Coletto Creek and occupation of La Bahía by Urrea.

After Agua Dulce, Urrea sent Tory scouts to reconnoiter Goliad and Presidio La Bahía, though scouts were reported in that area as early as February 29. A scouting party of Tories and Mexicans attacked a party of Texian pickets near La Bahía and drove the pickets into the presidio. Tory scouts harassed the garrison at La Bahía for the remainder of March 1836, using the superior horsemanship and knowledge of the terrain to great advantage. Texians within La Bahía acknowledge this themselves, like volunteer John Duvall who claimed that "the greater portion of the Mexican troops are mounted, and of course have greatly the advantage over us."²⁰⁶ The Tories seem to have favored a push-and-pull tactic while scouting Goliad preferring to remain out of the reach of Texian infantry and taunting the Texian cavalry. Texian volunteer Abel Morgan described this tactic in his account of the campaign:

The Mexicans have fled, and our brace little squad (of) horsemen pursued them. When our men would turn around to come back the Mexicans would pursue them until they would get within gunshot of our footmen, when they would turn around and our men they pursue again. They kept alternatively chasing and being chased until dusk when the Mexicans left. Our men retreated into the fort, all having

²⁰³ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola's Analysis*, 26.

²⁰⁴ Salazar, "Carlos de la Garza: Loyalist Leader," 201. De la Garza has been credited with saving the life of his Irish neighbor Nicholas Fagan by releasing him and ordering him to return home before King's men were executed.

²⁰⁵ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola's Analysis*, 28.

²⁰⁶ Duvall to Duvall, March 9, 1836, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 5, 33.

escaped without injury. What damage was done to the Mexicans we never learned.
²⁰⁷

John Sowers Brook claimed that Tory scouts were so bold as to “frequently push up to our walls” and that Texians were unable to pursue them “for want of horses.”²⁰⁸ Aside from this aggressive, somewhat playful scouting and harassment, Tory horsemen played a vital role in shielding Urrea’s advance towards Goliad and helping thin Fannin’s forces. By attacking Agua Dulce and Refugio, Tories forced Fannin to disperse his forces away from Goliad, which allowed Urrea to destroy these small forces in detail. This reduction of his forces was not lost on Fannin nor was the threat posed by the Tories and Urrea. Fannin realized that Urrea was advancing towards Goliad and that with his forces reduced by Tories and Urrea’s men, he could likely not hold La Bahía, but did not withdraw. Fannin even rationalized his staying in Goliad on March 17, acknowledging that Mexicans (likely Tories) were within sight of La Bahía roughly five miles away, that he was preparing to resist “to the utmost” and the “for want of time” he had not withdrawn from Goliad.²⁰⁹ Tory scouts continued to harass Fannin’s garrison until he finally withdrew on the morning of March 19.

On the morning of March 19, Fannin used a morning fog and rain shower as cover to evacuate his four hundred men force from the presidio, burning parts of the fort while retreating. Tory scouts along the San Antonio River were unable to witness the evacuation because of the fog, which lifted around late morning. Once the fog lifted, the Tories began to suspect that the Texians had withdrawn from the presidio, likely seeing smoke from the fires meant to destroy the

²⁰⁷ Hardin, *Texian Iliad*, 166.

²⁰⁸ Brooks to Brooks, March 4, 1836, in *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, ed. John H. Jenkins, Vol. 4 (Austin, TX: Presidial Press, 1973), 509-510.

²⁰⁹ James Fannin to Editors (Telegraph, San Felipe), Goliad, March 17, 1836, *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vol. 5, 119.

fortifications. The Tories were then able to approach the presidio without being attacked and one even entered the presidio's main compound.²¹⁰ Once these Tories confirmed the Texian retreat, they quickly reported this information to Urrea, who ordered eighty cavalry and three-hundred and six infantry to pursue Fannin.²¹¹ Tories informed Urrea when they were the Texians, and at around one o'clock the Tories and Mexican cavalry attacked Fannin and cut off his retreat on an open plain a few miles away from Goliad.²¹² Realizing that his infantry was defenseless against cavalry on the plains, Fannin had his infantry form square with the artillery at the corners. Urrea arrived with his infantry around the same time, having them take cover in tall grass and behind timber while the Texian square was in the open. The cavalry dismounted and advanced on foot before firing a volley, then advancing again with the infantry. When the Mexicans got within one hundred yards, Fannin ordered his men to fire. The combined small-arms and artillery halted the advance and the cavalry remounted to engage on horseback. Several subsequent charges were halted by the Texian fire, and Urrea ordered them to again dismount. The dismounted cavalry now joined the infantry in sniping the Texian square for the remainder of the afternoon of March 19. Tory participation is supported by Ehrenberg, who stated that

“300 Indians of the tribes of the Caranchuas and Lipans” were lying in the tall grass on the Texian left towards the San Antonio River, where they wounded several Texians with rifle fire.²¹³

The sniping by Tories and Mexicans killed the Texian draft animals, eliminating their means of transporting artillery and wounded, killed nine and wounded forty, including Fannin himself. The Texians remained in the square until the morning of March 20, when they realized

²¹⁰ Filísola, *General Vicente Filísola's Analysis*, 37.

²¹¹ Urrea, “Diario,” *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 230.

²¹² Urrea, “Diario,” *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 230.

²¹³ Herman Ehrenberg, *Texas und Seine Revolution* (Leipzig, Saxony: Otto Wigand, 1843), 121. Ehrenberg's estimation likely included Tejanos whom he believed to be Indians.

that Urrea had received reinforcements of one-hundred infantry, two four-pounder artillery pieces, and a howitzer.²¹⁴ After the Mexican artillery fired a single salvo, Fannin raised a white flag to discuss surrender. After negotiating with Urrea and his staff, Fannin agreed to surrender under the condition that his men be treated as prisoners of war and not executed. The Texians were marched back to Goliad and held as prisoners in La Bahía, while Urrea continued the march and took Guadalupe Victoria on March 21. There he was joined by De la Garza's Victoriana Guardes, who captured the remnants of Ward's battalion after they attempted to enter Victoria and flee to Dimmitt's Landing on the coast. De la Garza marched these prisoners to Goliad, where he supposedly saved the lives of several of his Irish neighbors from Santa Anna's order to execute the prisoners.²¹⁵ The Tories rejoined Urrea and served with him until April 1836, when news of the Texian victory at the Battle of San Jacinto forced Urrea and the rest of the Mexican Army to retreat south to the Rio Grande. The Tories subsequently followed the army and fled to Mexico or returned to their homes, like De la Garza.

Tejano Tories continued the military heritage of the soldado de cuera and compañías volantes while campaigning with Urrea's division through their style of fighting and what they likely used to do so. Their use of offensive patrols and aggressive scouting parties are reminiscent of the compañías volantes, particularly their raid on Refugio and harassment of Fannin's garrison at La Bahía. Their tactical use as cavalry in combat mirrored that of the soldado de cuera, who campaigned against Native Americans as cavalry, and their dismounted action was also like the cuera cavalry, who received training on foot as well. These Tories were possibly armed with lances, swords and other bladed weapons, as these were popular amongst Tejanos and Mexican

²¹⁴ Urrea, "Diario," *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution*, 234.

²¹⁵ These prisoners are credited as Nicholas Fagan, whom De la Garza had saved at Refugio, John Fagan, James Byrne, Edward Perry, and John and Nicholas Sydick.

cavalry, and were often relied upon by cuera troopers and compañías volunteers. The lassoing of Brown at Agua Dulce supports the use of that tool as a weapon, again a common use amongst the compañías volantes and other mounted militias. Firearms, if carried, were likely surplus British arms used by the Mexican Army or privately-owned civilian weapons, possibly weapons left over from the colonial era. These Tejano Tories campaigned like their predecessors in the soldados de cuera and compañías volantes and showed that their heritage was alive in Texas in 1836.

The Irish and Tejanos continued the military tradition and heritage of their historical predecessors while fighting alongside Mexican troops. Their roles as infantry, garrison troops, cavalry and scouts mirrors the roles played by the Wild Geese, soldados de cuera, and compañías volantes and placed the Tories firmly into their respective traditions. Though their efforts did not ultimately ensure a Mexican victory in the Texas Revolution, the Tories military participation provided a valiant contribution to the Mexican war effort, and simultaneously honored their historical forebearers.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

A military history approach to the Tories of the Texas Revolution gives scholars a new means to study a fascinating topic. Utilizing this approach, scholars may examine the economic, cultural, religious and social dynamics of 1830s Texas, Mexico, Ireland, Great Britain and the United States that motivated these people in their Toryism. Their motivation for Toryism differed between individuals and even entire ethnic groups, from the Irish of San Patricio to the Tejanos of Goliad, San Antonio de Béxar and Laredo. This ranged from social acceptance and economic opportunity to a personal conservatism, distrust of foreign settlement in Texas, and fear of Texian invasion of Mexico or Mexican governmental reprisal should the revolt fail. Scholars may also use this approach to examine how the Tories' military participation in the Revolution mirrored the roles of their historical predecessors the Wild Geese, the *soldados de cuera* and the *compañías volantes*, and continued the respective tradition and heritage of these predecessors. The Tories filled a variety of military roles including garrison troops, infantry, cavalry (lancers and dragoons), scouts and guerrilla forces that mirrored the fighting styles of their historical predecessors and continued their military tradition. The Tories remain shrouded in relative mystery, but wherever they participated they made their presence conspicuous, from the Battles of Lipantitlán and Refugio to the operations around Goliad.

The Irish Tories of San Patricio were motivated in their Toryism by a combination of social acceptance and economic opportunity. With most of these emigrants being Catholic tenant farmers, laborers, and textile workers from southern Ireland, where peasant populations struggled to earn a living, Texas may have seemed like a paradise on Earth. The generous land grants of the

Mexican colonization laws allowed these Irishmen to gain large tracts of land for their own use, something that had been denied them in Ireland by landlords and the inability to pay rent for tenancies. This economic opportunity allowed these Irish immigrants, whom had largely been denied this in Ireland because of land ownership laws and the US because of nativist refusal to employ Irishmen to finally prosper, a factor that was likely a powerful motivator in their Toryism.

Aside from the ability to finally own their own land, the Irish Tories enjoyed friendly relations with their Mexican neighbors, who taught them how to prosper on the Texas frontier. Mexicans taught the Irish how to tend cattle, singe cacti for bovine fodder, predict the weather, and generally to integrate into the Texas ranching culture. The Irish Tories also got along well with Mexican government officials, who distinctly wanted Irish settlers in Texas as early as 1823 because of their Catholicism and fierce reputation as soldiers, and who awarded the Irish their land grants in June 1835. The Irish Tories enjoyed cordial relations with the Mexican garrison of Lipantitlán, who often visited the town of San Patricio (possibly to conduct business with the Irish) and the garrison's officers Cpt. Rodríguez and Lt. García enjoyed friendship with community leaders like Tory former alcalde William O'Daugherty and empresario James McGloin. Finally, the Tories practiced their Catholic faith openly with their Mexican neighbors, a far cry from the preferred Protestantism of Britain and the anti-Catholic nativism they likely encountered in the US. This social acceptance in tandem with economic opportunity motivated the Irish of San Patricio in their Toryism, as it created a positive situation that they were unlikely to risk losing by rebelling against Mexico. These motivations place these Irish Tories in the historical tradition of the Wild Geese and other Irish troops in foreign service, as they joined the French and Spanish militaries for similar, if not identical reasons.

Militarily, the San Patricio Tories played identical roles to their Wild Geese predecessors while serving alongside the Mexican Army. During the Lipantitlán episode, these Tories served as garrison troops within the Lipantitlán fortress, rode alongside Mexican dragoons as cavalry, and fought alongside them as infantry during the battle of Nueces Crossing (Lipantitlán). The Wild Geese filled the same roles in the Spanish and French armies, with the Spanish infantry regiments Hibernia and Ultonia serving as infantry in various actions around the world, as well as garrisoning Spanish colonies like Mexico in the eighteenth century. In the French army, the Irish cavalry regiment Fitzjames's Horse served as both typical cavalry and mounted infantry (dragoons), including at the Jacobite defeat of the Battle of Culloden in 1745.

Tejano Tories were motivated in their Toryism by several factors that often differed between individuals. Some, like José Ángel Navarro, were motivated by a personally conservative nature that sought to maintain the status quo by supporting the established government. These Tejanos were not willing to risk the loss of their livelihoods by supporting the Texian rebels. Others like Carlos de la Garza, the descendant of frontier presidial soldiers, were motivated in their Toryism by a distrust of foreign settlement in Texas. These Tejanos distrusted these settlers because the empresario contracts often marginalized Tejanos by making it difficult for them to acquire their own land grants and granting land to Anglo immigrants. This helped create an influx of Anglos that effectively made Tejanos a minority within Texas. Tories like De la Garza also distrusted this settlement because they often brought rebellion and revolution into Texas, as had occurred in 1813 with the Gutierrez-Magee expedition.

The Tories of Laredo were motivated to be Tories out of fear of Texian invasion of Tamaulipas other areas of northern Mexico. They responded to Mexican governmental calls to form militias to guard against any such incursion and worked to watch the roads into Texas for

any weapons heading to the rebels. Finally, Tejano Tories feared that should they support the rebels and the revolt fail, that they would suffer retribution from the Mexican government. They likely remembered Arredondo's brutal suppression of the Gutierrez-Magee expedition and his subsequent depopulation of Texas, which a young Santa Anna took note of. Santa Anna later used similar tactics when suppressing the Zacatecas Revolt, allowing his soldiers three days to plunder, rob, and rape with impunity in Zacatecas after defeating the federalist rebels.

When Tejano Tories fought alongside Mexican forces, they continued the heritage of the soldado de cuera and the compañías volantes in their tactics and organization. Like the soldado de cuera, Tejano Tories generally fought as frontier cavalry, fighting both mounted and dismounted as the situation dictated. These Tories, particularly De la Garza's Victoriana Guardes, borrowed the tradition of the compañías volantes, fighting as a mounted "flying company" that operated as light cavalry, guerrillas, and scouts alongside Spanish and Mexican forces. The preferred strategy of these horsemen was *vatic y perseguir* ("strike and pursue"), which Troy horsemen demonstrated around Refugio and Goliad. The push and pull strategy and superior horsemanship of Tejano Tories allowed them to harass Texians around Goliad, generally outclassing Texian cavalry. These Tories likely continued the practice of the *caballada*, keeping a horse herd with the company to ensure that troopers always had fresh horses, a practice that cuera cavalry and compañías volantes utilized. Tories also used similar weaponry to their predecessors, mainly lances, which both cuera troopers and compañías volunteers used, often with great dexterity. Tejano vaqueros gained this dexterity by slaughtering cattle with the *desjarretadera*, an employed it in the compañías volantes with the lance. Tories also used lassoes, a popular weapon with the compañías volantes and effective at unhorsing opponents, as demonstrated at Agua Dulce.

The Tories also illustrate the borderlands history idea of negotiable loyalty, where personal allegiance is driven by self-interest and often determined by what benefits the loyalist best. The Irish Tories supported Mexico because of the economic boon provided to them by the Mexican government, even if they recognized the danger of Santa Anna's centralist regime. Some Tejano Tories were loyal because they both distrusted and feared the loss of lands to foreign settlers and believed the centralist Mexican government could protect them from this. The Tories also illustrate the borderlands history ideal of multi-ethnic relations affecting central power, here aiding rather than subverting that power. Irish and Tejano Tories joined in a multi-ethnic alliance with the Mexican Army that fought the Texians in several battles, in many cases directly contributing to the success of a campaign or engagement, like the Victoriana Guardes alongside Urrea's division.

The Tories were heavily influenced by Mexican politics and history, specifically the San Patricio Irish. The Irish Tories were positively affected by the policies of Mexico, which granted them the social acceptance and economic opportunity that they desired in Ireland and the US. This gave heavy personal motivation for their Toryism and encouraged them to support Mexico. The Tories were also firm participants in the centralist-federalist civil war that engulfed Mexico in the 1830s. Irish and Tejanos fought alongside the centralist government that had previously suppressed other federalist revolts, most famously in Zacatecas, and contributed to multiple Mexican victories in the Revolution.

This is by no means the definitive work on the Tories, as there is much more to be done. Future work may examine the fates of the Tories following the Revolution, specifically the Irish of San Patricio. Some Tories are documented as to their fates, like Carlos de la Garza, who remained at his ranch in Goliad and died in the 1870s.²¹⁶ The Irish Tories appear to disappear from

²¹⁶ Salazar, "Carlos de la Garza: Loyalist Leader," 202.

the historical record following the Revolution, though they may have fled into Mexico with the retreating Mexican Army. Did they make such a journey? If so, where did they settle once in Mexico? Did they form Irish communities in Mexico? Regarding Tejano Tories, did they remain in Texas or migrate to Mexico after the Revolution? Did the Republic know of these Tories and seek to persecute them for their Toryism? The Tory activity in Laredo may also gain scholarly attention, examining how these Tories organized themselves and if they provided any aid to Mexican forces like the Tories of Goliad. Did the Laredo Tories organize themselves like the *compañías volantes* or did any Laredoans enlist in the Mexican Army? Future scholarly work can examine and hopefully answer these and other questions that pertain to the Tories.

The Tories of the Texas occupy a unique place in military history. Motivated by economic opportunity, social acceptance, gratitude and indebtedness, the Irish Tories of San Patricio cast their lot with Mexico, supporting the government at the Revolution's outset and fighting alongside Mexican troops at the Battle of Lipantitlán. The Tejano Tories were motivated by conservatism, distrust of foreign settlers, fear of Texian invasion or governmental reprisal, and supported Mexico by raising local forces that supported Cos and Urrea in Texas. Both Irish and Tejano Tories negotiated their loyalty to support Mexico and used their respective motive as bargaining tools in their decision making. Using the same motivation and tactics as their predecessors, the Irish and Tejano Tories continued the historical tradition and heritage of the Wild Geese, *soldados de cuera* and *compañías volantes*, fighting as cavalry, infantry, garrison troops and scouts. They also illustrate how a multi-ethnic relationship may aid rather than hinder a central power, and firmly established themselves as part of the centralist-federalist civil war by fighting alongside a centralist government. The Tories of the Texas Revolution may have only been a portion of the Mexican

forces during the Revolution, but they left a distinguished trail for historians to follow, which this present work has endeavored to do.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ARCHIVES

- SAL Spanish Archives of Laredo, St. Mary's University (San Antonio, Texas)
- BA-DBC B exar Archives, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin (Austin, TX)

II. PUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES

- Casta eda, Carlos E., ed. *The Mexican Side of the Texas Revolution (1836) by the Chief Mexican Participants: General Antonio L pez de Santa Anna, D. Ram n Mart nez Caro (Secretary to Santa Anna), General Vicente Fil sola, General Jos  Urrea, General Jos  Mar a Tornel (Secretary of War)*. Austin, TX: Graphic Ideas Incorporated, 1970.
- De la Pe a, Jos  Enrique. *With Santa Anna in Texas: A Personal Narrative of the Revolution*. Translated by Carmen Perry. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1975.
- Edward, David B. *The 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*. Cincinnati, OH: J. A. James & CO., 1836.
- Ehrenberg, Herman. *With Milam and Fannin: Adventures of a German Boy in Texas' Revolution*. Edited by Henry Smith. Translated by Charlotte Churchill. Austin, TX: The Pemberton Press, 1968.
- . *Texas und Seine Revolution*. Leipzig, Saxony: Otto Wigand, 1843.
- Fil sola, Vicente. *General Vicente Fil sola's Analysis of Jos  Urrea's Military Diary: A Forgotten 1838 Publication by an Eyewitness to the Texas Revolution*. Edited by Gregg J. Dimmick. Translated by John R. Wheat. Austin, TX: Texas State Historical Association, 2007.
- Gammel, H.P.H., ed. *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897, Vol. 1*. Austin, TX: Gammel Book Co., 1898.
- Gulick, Jr., Charles Adams, ed. *The Papers of Mirabeau B. Lamar, Vols. 1-2*. Austin, TX: A. C. Baldwin & Sons, 1922.
- Hern ndez y D valos, J. E., ed. *A Collection of Documents on the History of the Mexican War for Independence, Vol. 1*. Mexico City, Mexico: 1877.

Jenkins, John H., ed. *The Papers of the Texas Revolution*, Vols. 1-5. Austin, TX: Presidial Press, 1973.

Kissane, Noel, ed. *The Irish Famine: A Documentary History*. Dublin, Ireland: National Library of Ireland, 1995.

Linn, John L. *Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas*. New York, NY: D. & J. Sadlier and Company, 1883.

Mier y Terán, Manuel de. *Texas by Terán: The Diary Kept by General Manuel de Mier y Terán on His 1828 Inspection of Texas*. Edited by Jack Jackson. Translated by John R. Wheat. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000.

Williams, Amelia W., and Eugene C. Barker, eds. *The Writings of Sam Houston*, Vol. 1, 1813-1836. Austin, TX: Jenkins Publishing Company, 1938.

III. PUBLISHED SECONDARY SOURCES

Adelman, Jeremy, and Stephen Aron. "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation States, and the People Caught in Between in North American History." *The American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (June 1999): 814-841.

Benson, Nettie Lee. "Texas as Viewed from Mexico." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 3 (January 1987): 219-291.

Citino, Robert M. "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction." *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4, (October 2007): 1070-1090.

Clark, George B. *Irish Soldiers in Europe, 17th-19th Century*. Cork, Ireland: Mercier Press, 2010.

Crimm, Ana Carolina Castillo. *DeLeón: A Tejano Family History*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2003.

Cusick, James. "Some Thoughts on Spanish East and West Florida as Borderlands." *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 133-156.

Davis, Graham. *Land!: Irish Pioneers in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2002.

———. "Models of Migration: The Historiography of the Irish Pioneers in South Texas." *The Southwest Historical Quarterly* 99, no. 3 (January 1996): 326-348.

- De la Teja, Frank, ed. *Tejano Leadership in Mexican and Revolutionary Texas*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2010.
- Flannery, John Brendan. *The Irish Texans*. Austin TX: University of Texas Press, 1995.
- Hämäläinen, Pekka, and Samuel Truett. "On Borderlands." *The Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 338-361.
- Hardin, Stephen L. *Texian Iliad: A Military History of the Texas Revolution*. Austin, TX: University of Texas, 1994.
- Hébert, Rachel Bluntzer. *The Forgotten Colony: The History, the People, and the Legends of the Irish Colony of McMullen-McGloin*. Burnet, TX: Eakin Press, 1981.
- Henson, Margaret Swett. "Tory Sentiment in Anglo-Texan Public Opinion, 1832-1836." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 90, no. 1 (July 1986): 1-34.
- Lack, Paul D. *The Texas Revolutionary Experience: A Political and Social History, 1835-1836*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1992.
- McDonald, David. *José Antonio Navarro: In Search of the American Dream in Nineteenth Century Texas*. Denton, TX: Texas State Historical Association, 2010.
- Mesa, Eduardo de. *The Irish in the Spanish Armies in the Seventeenth Century*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2014.
- Moorhead, Max L. *The Presidio: Bastion of the Spanish Borderlands*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.
- Poyo, Geraldo E., ed. *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1996.
- Santoni, Pedro. "A Fear of the People, The Civic Militia of Mexico in 1845." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 2 (May 1988): 269-288.
- Tijerina, Andrés. *Tejanos and Texas under the Mexican Flag, 1821-1836*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1994.
- Torget, Andrew J. *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery, and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
- Vázquez, Josefina Zoraida. "The Texas Question in Mexican Politics, 1836-1845." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 89, no. 3 (January 1986): 309-344.

VITA

Name: Jonathan Lamar Woodward
Address: 8903 Cornell Dr., Laredo, TX, 78045
Email Address: historyfan1102@bellsouth.net
Education: B.A., History, University of West Florida
Major Subject: History